

AN ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR
THE STATE OF TEXAS EMERGENCY SHELTER
GRANTS PROGRAM

BY

LESLIE ATWOOD

AN APPLIED RESEARCH PROJECT
SUBMITTED
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
FOR THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
SPRING 1999
POSI 5397
DR. PAT SHIELDS

FACULTY APPROVAL:

Patricia Shields
Charles Snow

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of Proposals Submitted for the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs' Emergency Shelter Grants Program.

An Applied Research Project submitted to Southwest Texas State University. The paper begins by describing the issue of homelessness in a national context, as well as federal programs created to alleviate homelessness. The discussion then focuses on the administration of the federal Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) for the homeless through a state agency, the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA). The conceptual framework for the research is developed from the Request for Proposals for ESGP, issued by TDHCA. Proposals submitted for Fiscal Year 1998 are analyzed to see if they conform to the requirements of the Request for Proposals. The methodology and results of the research are described in the latter half of the paper, and recommendations are developed in response to the results.

By Leslie Atwood

Table of Contents

Chapter One-Introduction	1
Research Purpose	3
Description of Chapters	3
 Chapter Two-Review of the Literature	 5
Introduction	5
Description of the Homeless	5
Homeless Estimates	6
Demographics	8
Veterans	10
Senior Citizens	11
Families	12
Victims of Domestic Violence	13
Mentally Ill	14
Rural Homeless	16
Causes of Homelessness	17
Personal Limitations	18
Substance Abuse and Mental Illness	19
Lack of Education	20
Structural Factors	21
Lack of Affordable Housing	21
Employment Limitations	23
Cuts in Federal Funding of Social Programs	26
The Shelter System	28
Types of shelters	28
Shelter services	30
Funding for Non-profit Shelters	31
Federal Grant Programs	32
Types of Grants	34
Effects of Grants	35
Homeless Assistance Grants	36
Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act	36
Homeless Programs Under the McKinney Act	37
 Chapter Three-Setting	 41
Introducing the Conceptual Framework	41
The Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP)	42
The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs	43
Request for Proposals	44
Conceptual Framework Summary	45
Table 3.1-Conceptual Framework	49

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter Four-Methodology	50
Introduction	50
Content Analysis	50
Table 4.1-Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework	54-55
Chapter Five-Results	56
Introduction	56
Required Elements	57
Table 5.1-Required Elements: Summary of Findings	58
Description of Organization	59
Table 5.2-Description of Organization: Summary of Findings	60
Unmet Need	60
Table 5.3-Unmet Need: Summary of Findings	62
Project Description	62
Table 5.4-Project Description: Summary of Findings	63
Chapter Six-Conclusion	65
Summary of Findings	65
Table 6.1-Summary of Findings	66
Recommendations	67
Conclusion	70
References	71-74
 Appendix A. US Bureau of the Census: 1990 Census of Population: Count of Persons in Selected Locations Where Homeless Persons Are Found	
 Appendix B. Request for Proposal for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program (partial)	
 Appendix C. Sample of Applicant Organizations for the State of Texas FY98 ESGP	
 Appendix D. Summary Sheet for ESGP Proposals	

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Homelessness is an issue that has become more visible in recent times, and more desperate. Many people have probably seen, at one time or another, transients on the street, sleeping in doorways or asking for money. Sometimes, a homeless person will wander into a fast food restaurant or public facility, only to be kicked out for loitering or disturbing the peace. It is obvious that homeless people exist, but it can be hard to understand the life of a homeless person and be sympathetic to their situation unless experienced firsthand. For many people, homelessness simply does not exist because they have never been exposed to it. For others, those who have witnessed homelessness, the mere existence of it produces fear- a fear of ending up in a similar situation- and they turn a blind eye to it. However, sometimes that same sense of fear can develop into a motivator that animates people to encourage legislation that addresses homelessness.

The issue of homelessness rightly falls within the scope of Public Administration because homelessness is a *social* problem that requires appropriate policy and policy implementation to adequately address the problem. The government is expected to respond to a social crisis, such as homelessness, in a comprehensive and efficient manner. In the United States, homelessness has been addressed through a federal response that came about due to the increasing visibility of homeless people during the 1980s. This has been in the form of federal legislation and, subsequently, grant programs that attempt to address certain aspects of homelessness. There are several grant programs that address issues pertinent to the homeless, such as employment or education. Many of these

programs are funded by the Stewart B. McKinney Act of 1987, an act designed to address some of the fundamental needs of the homeless population. This act is discussed in further detail in the following chapter. What is important to know about the Act is that although it has been criticized for failing to bring about the kind of results that were expected of it—that of alleviating homelessness—the Act is the first comprehensive piece of federal legislation that has taken into consideration the great complexity of the homeless issue.

This paper discusses the issue of homelessness in a national context, as well as some of the programs created under the McKinney Act as a federal response to the homeless crisis. More specifically, the paper focuses on one particular program under the McKinney Act: The Emergency Shelter Grants Program. This program is described within the context of state administration through the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, which provides a good example of intergovernmental relations in action. The research for this paper concentrates on the administrative mechanism used to solicit applicants for the grant program: the Request for Proposal. The Request for Proposal or RFP is a tool that is used by organizations to lay out precisely the standards by which a proposal for a grant will be accepted. RFP can be a valuable method by which organizations can assure themselves of choosing the most deserving of grant applicants.

The need for an administrative tool such as an RFP cannot be underestimated. The funds for any federal grant program frequently come from tax dollars; thus, taxpayers have a stake in the funding of federal social programs. In light of this, grantor organizations that administer tax-funded programs must take *accountability* into consideration. Webster's Dictionary defines 'accountability' as, "an obligation or willingness to accept

responsibility or to account for one's actions.”¹ An RFP is the best method for Public Administrators to ensure administrative accountability because it provides for an open, competitive, and unbiased method of selecting potential applicants. It is the author's hope that this paper will provide an example of Public Administration in action through the description of an actual public program.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the research is two-fold. The first purpose is to describe the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) issued by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. The second purpose is to assess grant proposals submitted for ESGP using the RFP as a standard of comparison.

Description of Chapters

ESGP is a federal assistance grant that is specifically designed to assist the homeless. Chapter Two begins by providing a review of the literature on the issue of homelessness and then briefly describes the federal grants system and national programs created to alleviate the incidence of homelessness in the United States. The background information on homelessness and grant funding provides the basis for understanding the use of the RFP to solicit eligible grant applicants for ESGP.

Chapter Three is the Setting chapter. This chapter narrows the focus of the research to discuss ESGP in more detail, providing the guidelines for the program that are used to create the RFP. It is in this chapter that the conceptual framework is developed.

¹ Source: Miriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10th Edition.

The role of the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) as the administering agency for the federal ESGP is also described. The RFP for ESGP that is used for the research was created by TDHCA; therefore, it is important to understand the context in which the RFP was developed.

Chapter Four specifies the Methodology used for the research. The complete conceptual framework that provides the guiding principle for the organization of the entire paper is summarized. The method of analysis is described, while the statistical technique and unit of analysis are explained and justified. Finally, the statistics that are used and the sampling frame are described. Chapter Five is the Results chapter. This chapter describes the statistical results of the quantitative analysis. Chapter Six will summarize the research paper and present conclusions, as well as recommendations that may result from the research findings.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In order to understand the Request for Proposals for the Emergency Shelter Grant, it is important to first understand what the grant's purpose is: to assist the homeless. This chapter examines the homelessness issue in two ways. To begin, the homeless population and the causes of homelessness in the United States are discussed. In addition, a description of emergency shelters and their role in assisting the homeless is examined. What follows is a description of the federal grants system and national programs created to alleviate the incidence of homelessness in the United States. The material discussed in this chapter is intended to build the conceptual framework that guides the research in this paper.

Description of the Homeless

To begin to tackle any social problem, it is important to become familiar with the subject at hand. In the case of the homeless, an important and striking feature is the great diversity of its population. This diversity is important because it indicates that homelessness crosses all gender, racial, and socio-economic lines, and for a multitude of reasons. The following section discusses the relatively current demographics of the homeless population in America.

Homeless Estimates

Who are the homeless? The homeless person of today is not simply a “bum” who lives on the street. In the 1990s, anyone could be one of the homeless. According to Burt (1996), the homeless are not simply the people we see living on the street- the chronic homeless- but also include people in shelters, and people who are in precarious situations where their housing could be at risk. This broad definition resulted from the gathering and analysis of information on the homeless from the 1980s and early 1990s. As discussed further on, the federal government has created a similar definition of homelessness that is commonly used by governmental, non-profit, and private homeless service providers. Defining homelessness is important because it clarifies the dimensions of homelessness and facilitates the creation of legislation and programs specifically targeted for this population.

There are differences in definitions of homelessness and differences in the methods used to count this population that can affect the overall estimates for the homeless. The census may be affected by political pressure from public officials whose political agenda could influence homeless estimates and result in an undercount. Advocates for the homeless tend to have a more inclusive, or liberal, definition of homelessness that affects estimates by increasing the number of people who are considered homeless.

Up until 1990, the homeless were not counted in a systematic way, which may explain the rise in homeless estimates from the 1980s to the 1990s. During the 1990 census, the US Bureau of the Census made a special effort to include those not normally counted- mainly the homeless. Census-takers dedicated one night, “shelter night,” to undertake the count and only looked for the homeless in pre-identified shelters and locations. This method is generally referred to as a point-in-time count.

The 1990 census estimated the homeless population of the United States at around 450,000 people (US Bureau of the Census, 1990). Although greater sophistication in counting the homeless was used during the 1990 census, scholars and advocates for the homeless maintain that the census undercounted the homeless. The census did this in spite of the fact that the Bureau made a special effort to reach the homeless population. Presently, estimates for the homeless population go as high as seven million homeless people, according to the National Coalition for the Homeless (NCH, 1998). That is a fifteen-fold increase in the homeless population within eight years. However, any great increase in the estimates of the homeless population may not be wholly attributed to growth in the population, but perhaps methodological problems in counting the homeless. Foster (1993) believes that the point-in-time method of counting the homeless resulted in an inadequate count. Although the census revealed important information about the number of homeless in shelter settings, "The intention was only to augment the traditional census procedures since the lack of a universally agreed-upon definition of homelessness prevented an accurate count" (Foster, 1993, p. 3).

The political implications of this undercount of homeless people were severe, because the data recovered from the census are incorporated into national poverty figures. As stated earlier, it is necessary to obtain the accurate number of homeless people in America because the census count is directly tied to social programs created to help these individuals. It is these data regarding the homeless estimates that are the basis for federal grants and funding of programs to assist the homeless. Presently, the concern arises that the actual number of homeless people in America may never be known, which yields great challenges to sociologists, social service providers, and legislators.

Another method of counting the homeless population is referred to as a period prevalence count. This method takes into account the number of people who are homeless over a certain period of time (NCH, 1998). However, this method is also flawed because during the time period of the research, the homeless are not located in places that researchers can readily find. This can include the literal homeless or those people who are “doubling-up,” that is, temporarily residing with other people. Those individuals doubling up are usually referred to as the “hidden” or “invisible” homeless. For this method of counting, once again, the definition of homelessness is important because it determines who is to be included in the count and where these individuals are likely to be found.

A snapshot of the homeless population can provide insight into the great diversity of the homeless and the ultimate needs of the homeless population. The remainder of this section describes certain general characteristics of the homeless population and discusses the various groups that comprise the homeless in America today.

Demographics

Of the available homeless counts that have been conducted, the statistics on their numbers reveal some interesting facts. According to the 1997 US Conference of Mayors, over thirty-five percent of the homeless population consists of families with children. Children make up a staggering twenty-five percent of the total homeless population. The remaining sixty-five percent are comprised of single, adult males (roughly forty-seven percent) and females (fourteen percent). Minority representation in the homeless population is quite high: Roughly fifty-eight percent of the homeless are African-

American, twenty-nine percent are white, ten percent are Hispanic, two percent are Native American, and one percent are Asian (NCH Home Page, Fact #3, 1998, p. 3).

Lack of education is quite noticeable among the homeless. Nunez (1996, p. 79-80) tells us that up to, "...forty-five percent are functioning at or below an eighth grade literacy level....most of these adults are unable to perform the basic tasks necessary to fully participate in the work force." According to Foster (1993), less than twenty percent of the homeless population have completed high school. Due to this lack of education, the homeless are generally unemployed, which can also leave them without health insurance.

The general health of homeless people is poor, especially if an individual already has disorders, such as diabetes or high blood pressure. The harsh living conditions of the homeless and the lack of a proper diet, especially when combined with alcohol or substance abuse, contribute greatly to the failing health of the homeless. Much of the physical health experienced by the homeless stems from lack of affordable health care. In 1996, over forty million Americans had no health care insurance.² Even those individuals who managed to carry some health insurance seldom had enough coverage to see them through a catastrophic illness (NCH Home Page, Fact #1, 1998, p.4).

There are several ways to categorize the demographics of the homeless population. The following sections describe some of the more prevalent groups of homeless people, such as veterans, the elderly, and the mentally ill. It is interesting to note that none of these groups are mutually exclusive. It is entirely possible to be, for instance, a homeless veteran suffering from mental illness.

² These figures come from the US Bureau of the Census (1997 estimates)

Veterans

The homeless have become more visible in society since the 1970's. Much of this visibility was due to increased growth in the homeless population, especially in the period following the Vietnam War. Many displaced soldiers returning from Vietnam found themselves facing an unsympathetic public and an insensitive government. In addition, the lack of re-housing efforts for veterans, coupled with the depressed economy of the mid- to late-1970s, made a bad situation worse.

Vietnam veterans make up a very large part (22%) of the homeless population (NCH, 1998). Currently, the typical homeless veteran is older than most adult homeless men, is white, suffers from substance abuse problems, and probably has served some jail time. Recent studies indicate that homeless veterans are more educated than their non-veteran counterparts. But according to Rosenheck, the most striking difference between homeless veterans and non-veterans was health status (Rosenheck 1996, p. 104). In general, homeless veterans tended to have severe health problems that include hypertension, substance abuse, and mental illness. Considering the harsh living conditions that homelessness imparts on an individual, it should be no surprise that being homeless and being healthy do not go hand in hand (Rosenheck 1996).

The fact that there are so many homeless veterans seems unusual considering that retired and/or disabled veterans usually enjoy numerous benefits, such as medical care and educational opportunities. They also tend to have higher incomes and lower unemployment rates in comparison to other men of similar ages. Rosenheck (1996, p. 97) concurs with this notion when remarking that veterans should have been, "less vulnerable to homelessness than other Americans."

Why did so many veterans from the Vietnam era become homeless? According to Rosenheck (1996), one factor that may have contributed to their homelessness is post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), commonly referred to as “shell-shock.” PTSD is the result of exposure to combat situations and is characterized by highly traumatic war-zone stress. Some veterans have reported flashbacks while performing normal, everyday activities; they felt as if they were suddenly back in the midst of a combat situation. For many veterans, PTSD produced psychological problems as a result of their military service. Vietnam wartime stress studies conducted by the Veterans Administration in the late 1980s examined the effects of PTSD. According to the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study conducted in 1987, “PTSD was significantly related to high levels of war-zone stress and to other postwar readjustment problems, such as substance abuse, troubled interpersonal relationships, and unemployment problems frequently identified as risk factors for homelessness” (Rosenheck 1996, p. 98). Rosenheck’s findings suggest that PTSD has made it difficult, if not impossible, for some vets to negotiate the basics of modern life and, therefore, has contributed greatly to their homelessness.

Senior Citizens

The elderly are a small fraction of the overall homeless population (6%) whose homeless numbers are steadily increasing (Foster, 1993). The elderly homeless are commonly identified as fifty years of age or older. The typical elderly homeless person suffers from extremely poor health; more so than other homeless people. Since many of the elderly have chronic health problems, such as high blood pressure, few reach ages beyond 65 years. The severe living conditions associated with homelessness ages people

quickly. Poor nutrition also aggravates their physical health problems. Ironically, many of the elderly homeless aged 50 to 65 years of age fall between the cracks because they do not qualify for Medicare, thus they are left without any form of health care (NCH, 1998).

For those aged homeless that do qualify for Social Security, there are other problems. Some of the increase in the homelessness is blamed on the cost of living exceeding current benefits for Social Security. For example, in 14 states and 69 metropolitan areas, Social Security Income (SSI) is not adequate to pay the Fair Market Rent for a one-bedroom apartment (NCH, 1998). Many elderly live on fixed incomes, and one emergency can cost an elderly person the loss of a place to live. The reliance on a fixed income leaves the elderly quite vulnerable, since they are left with very little income to pay for food, medication, or even incidental items. For the most part, homelessness for the elderly is a result of, "the declining availability of affordable housing and increased poverty among certain segments of the aging" (NCH Home Page, Fact #16, 1998, p. 1). These two issues, lack of affordable housing and increased poverty, are two very prevalent causes of homelessness, and are discussed in further detail later in this paper.

Families

One of the largest growing groups of homeless people in the 1990s are families with children (Mihaly, 1996). As stated at the beginning of this section, over thirty-five percent of the homeless population is comprised of families with children (NCH, 1998). Mihaly believes that it is the shortage of affordable housing that is the cause of the rise of homeless families that occurred in the 1980s. Due to the unavailability of housing, "many

homeless families are 'hidden' in doubled-up households where two or more families share housing" (Mihaly 1996, p. 42).

A study performed in New York City by the Institute for Children and Poverty indicated that the typical homeless family is headed by a young, single woman who does not have a high school diploma or any real work experience. In many cases, she has or is experiencing substance abuse, may have been a victim of domestic violence, and may have been in a foster home as a child. In addition, there is a higher than fifty percent chance that she is currently pregnant (Nunez, 1996). Female head-of-households are more likely to be at risk of homelessness because the women have limited education, few vocational skills, or simply lower wages (Mihaly, 1996).

For many, there is a stigma that accompanies being a homeless parent. Fear keeps homeless families hesitant to seek help. Homeless parents may be labeled as negligent and have their children taken away for not providing a stable and safe home life. In addition, shelters are not a pleasant option for homeless families. Many homeless shelters are considered scary places, filled with strange people. The lack of security in many shelters also makes them unappealing to homeless families (Mihaly, 1996).

Victims of Domestic Violence

In the 1990s, part of the increase in homeless families is attributed to domestic violence. The 1997 US Conference of Mayors found that, "domestic violence was a primary cause of homelessness" (NCH Home Page Fact #1, 1998, p. 4). In general, the victims of domestic violence tend to be women and their children.³ Victims of domestic

³ Very few men are victims of domestic violence, with many cases going unreported to the authorities.

violence often endure emotional and physical abuse, and in their attempt to leave an abusive situation, find themselves, and their children, with no place to go. Women in this situation usually lack the resources to get out on their own, and must choose between staying in the abusive situation, taking their chances at a shelter, or living on the streets—none of which are pleasant options.

In domestic violence cases, the cycle of violence that exists within the home is what eventually leads to a resourceless victim. Organizations dealing with domestic violence, such as the Texas Council on Family Violence (TCFV), have identified the ways in which batterers intimidate and control their victims. The batterer begins to take control of the victim by controlling her financial capabilities and her support system (family and friends). By isolating the victim from their support system and by keeping the victim from working so that they can make their own money, the batterer creates a situation where the victim has no real means of escaping the situation. When a victim finally does decide to leave, usually the only viable option is to stay at a domestic violence shelter. Families in domestic violence shelters are considered homeless. It is difficult for these families to transition out of the shelter because there is a lack of affordable housing (TCFV, 1998).

Mentally Ill

Approximately twenty-five percent of the homeless population suffers from some sort of mental illness (NCH Website, Fact Sheet #3, 1998, p. 2). The rise in the numbers of mentally ill homeless people is believed to be the result of mass de-institutionalization of the mentally ill from state hospitals and mental institutions. For roughly thirty years, up until 1987, the inpatient census of mental institutions dropped by almost eighty percent

(Lamb, 1990, p. 304-305). What is relevant about the drop in patient numbers is that the newly-discharged patients were ill-equipped to cope with modern life. Lamb and Lamb (1990) believe that the mental health system failed to provide effective services to the mentally ill. Support systems were simply not in place to assist the newly released mentally ill in making the adjustment to life outside the institution. Many of the chronically ill patients were left to unsuccessfully fend for themselves.

The symptoms of mental illness contribute greatly to a person's homelessness and to keeping them from obtaining proper assistance.⁴ Mental deficiencies that result from mental illness, such as paranoia, contribute greatly to the homelessness of the mentally ill. Mental illness keeps individuals from having the coping skills to deal with everyday stresses and responsibilities. It also keeps them from seeking professional assistance from mental health care professionals. Once mentally ill individuals are actually identified and offered services, many of them willingly accept the assistance. This seems to suggest that the mental health system has not readily provided opportunities for mentally ill individuals to seek help.

Another factor contributing to the mentally ill's homelessness is a shortage of housing. Housing for the mentally ill is an important concern because the mentally ill, especially the severely mentally ill or mentally retarded, require supervised and structured living, and in many cases, long-term management (Lamb, 1990). The focus now turns to the homeless that live outside the urban homeless experience.

⁴ Ironically, just being homeless can contribute greatly to the mental illness of individuals. It is not uncommon to suffer from depression as a result of being homeless.

Rural Homeless

The rural homeless are usually forgotten because most homeless studies tend to focus on urban areas. A 1990 study indicates that the rural homeless made up around fourteen percent of the general homeless population (Foster, 1993). Homelessness in the rural community generally takes the form of homeless individuals moving from one place to the other. The rural homeless stay at friends, relatives, shelters, or in an inadequate place (Zawisza, 1991).

Rural homelessness increased substantially in the 1980s. Some of the reasons for the increase was due to the decline in the farming and manufacturing industries. As was the case in urban areas, manufacturing jobs were replaced by low-paying service-oriented jobs. These types of jobs did not allow people to earn a living wage. In addition, deteriorating housing stock in rural areas have made affordable housing difficult to obtain. The rural community has been left with jobs that pay too little and housing that is too expensive (Zawisza, 1991).

The rural homeless are mainly comprised of young women and their families. There is little ethnic diversity in the rural homeless population, and many of the female heads-of-household are likely to be a farm widow living on the bare minimum. According to Zawisza, "The resources available to help cope with homelessness are very limited in rural areas; little of the federal funding available for homeless assistance programs reach these communities and small local government cannot support these services." (Zawisza, 1991, p. 57). It may be up to rural non-profit organizations that cover several counties to provide services to the rural poor and homeless, especially since small, local governments have limited financial resources.

There are other categories of the homeless that have not been explored here, such as substance abusers or teenage runaways. As stated earlier in this chapter, none of these categories of homelessness are mutually exclusive; however, it is important to know the unique traits of each homeless group in order to identify them and develop services that meet their particular needs.

As can be seen by the preceding description of the homeless population, its diversity is due largely in part to several factors that have been identified as risk factors for homelessness: mental illness, substance abuse, troubled interpersonal relationships, and unemployment problems. It is the overall complexity of *why someone becomes homeless* that provides a real challenge for homeless service providers. The following section discusses some of the more prevalent causes of homelessness in the United States.

Causes of Homelessness

Overall, there seem to be several often overlapping and complicated explanations for the rise in homelessness. There are, however, certain generalizations that can be made as to why homelessness occurs. The following section discusses the major factors that helped to contribute to the increased homelessness of the United States during the 1970s and into current times.

A conservative explanation suggests that homelessness is voluntary. In other words, people are homeless because they choose to be homeless.⁵ During his presidency, President Ronald Reagan, a conservative Republican, favored this voluntaristic view, which could explain the huge cuts in social programs for the homeless that occurred

⁵ This voluntary view of homelessness often rationalizes the need for cuts in programs for the homeless.

during his administration (Snow, 1993). Economists see people as consumers who freely make “utility-maximizing” decisions (Shields, 1989, p. 72). In terms of the homeless, this means that voluntary homelessness is a decision based on the alternatives available, such as dehumanizing and insensitive institutions which are usually the only alternative to sleeping on the streets. In contrast, social workers see people as clients who need help in making decisions, therefore, they do not necessarily choose to be homeless and do not fit the utility-maximizing model suggested by economists. However, the voluntaristic theory simply does not justify the rise in the homeless population, especially homeless families with children who are unlikely to “choose” to be homeless.

There are two ways to categorize homelessness and its causes: personal limitations and structural factors. These categorizations are important because they identify the major factors believed to be the root causes of homelessness, and place them into like classifications. The end result is a clearer picture of what homelessness is and how varied the causes are.

Personal Limitations

Some advocates suggest that homelessness is, “caused by personal limitations” (Koegel, 1996, p.25). In other words, certain individuals are so dysfunctional that they can not take care of themselves. People with mental illnesses or drug-abuse problems fall into this category. Unfortunately, mental health and alcohol/substance abuse programs are inadequate and as a consequence, homelessness among this population is a serious problem. Policy in this viewpoint should address rehabilitation as they key to alleviating the problem. Rehabilitation provides individuals the practical skills and behavioral tools

needed to function at some level of competency. The result is an individual who learns to take care of themselves so they can begin to overcome their homelessness. The following two sections discuss some of the causes of homelessness that fall under the category of personal limitations.

Substance Abuse/Mental Illness

Koegel (1996) argues that substance abuse and mental illness are major contributors to the homeless problem. Within the homeless population, the rate of substance abuse is disproportionately high, while severe and persistent mental illness afflicts twenty-five percent of the adult homeless population (NCH Website, Fact Sheet #3, 1998, p. 2).

Lehman and Cordray (1993) conducted a study to determine a more precise estimation of the prevalence of substance abuse or mental illness in the homeless. Psychologists and researchers are aware that disorders of this nature are not mutually exclusive. Part of their study focused on the existence of dual diagnosis; whether or not both disorders co-existed in an individual. The results indicated that high proportion of homeless people have some type of mental or substance abuse problem. The study also found that there were several other medical and social problems that contributed to and perpetuated homelessness, such as lack of health insurance or poverty. The findings support the position of the NCH. According to the NCH (1998), the rise of the homeless in the 1980s is not wholly contributable to either the release of mentally ill patients from mental facilities or to the rise of substance abuse, but mental illness and substance abuse are still prevalent among the homeless.

In sum, the literature indicates the pervasiveness of substance abuse and/or mental illness in the homeless population, but certain homeless advocacy groups do not believe these disorders to be a formal “cause.” This contradiction creates an obstacle for the development of appropriate policy and methods for treating this segment of the homeless population.

Lack of Education

Lack of education is very noticeable in the homeless population. Only about nineteen percent of the homeless complete high school. Often members of the homeless population function at an eighth grade level or less. Studies have been performed that establish a “direct link between low literacy levels and larger social problems such as substance abuse, unemployment, and homelessness” (Nunez, 1996, p. 82). This lack of education is seen as a personal limitation which makes it difficult to successfully overcome homelessness.

A 1998 study which examined the link between low educational achievement and homelessness found “teen pregnancy” as often-cited connection. Other factors associated with dropping out of school included lack of support in the household and a basic dislike of school. However, many homeless parents recognized the value of education, indicating the need for a high school diploma or higher as necessary for independence (Homes for the Homeless, 1998). Unfortunately, recognizing the need for an education did not result in action. Only 19 percent of the homeless in the study actually participated in educational programs.

Foster (1993) found that the homeless are generally unemployed or underemployed because their education is inadequate. Many of the homeless lack the knowledge and skills they need to succeed competitively in the job market. Nunez (1996, p. 54) believes that education is necessary for, "better family planning, more stable family structures, and a greater chance of escaping poverty." The problem that exists is that government programs to assist the homeless rarely address education and literacy. Education is not seen as terribly important since the goal of homeless programs is usually to provide only basic needs, and not more intensive, long-term approaches to overcoming homelessness. However, the literature indicates that education can be the key to opening doors and creating opportunities for the poor and homeless.

Structural Factors

Some advocates suggest that homelessness is caused by structural factors. A structural factor is defined as, "a function of the way our society's resources are organized and distributed" (Koegel, 1996, p. 25). The structural factors that apply to the homeless, are the availability of jobs and housing. The following three sections discuss some of the causes of homelessness that fall under the structural factors category.

Lack of Affordable Housing

Liebow (1993) point out that having one's own home is important physically as well as emotionally. A permanent residence allows people to transition from being an outcast of society to a real citizen. Advocates for the homeless maintain that the lack of affordable housing is the real cause of the increase in homelessness that began in the 1980s

(Mihaly, 1991). Liebow (1993) believes that the homeless are victims of the free market system which has failed to provide, among other things, decent jobs and affordable housing. Affordable housing, in this case, refers to rental units, such as apartments, and is usually meant for those who are of low-to-medium income. During the 1970s, affordable and low-income housing was decreasing while the poor people who actually needed the housing were growing in number. Over time, this has resulted in a true housing crisis in America. The housing crisis has forced people into overcrowded or substandard housing, placed many at risk of losing their housing, and forced others into homelessness (Foster, 1993). The decrease of affordable housing units stems from the demolition and the gentrification of deteriorating housing units (Nunez, 1996). Very few new units were built to replace this older housing, thus creating a shortage. "During the 1970s alone, about one-half of the nation's total stock of single room occupancy units (SROs) was destroyed, leaving many former occupants on the streets or in shelters." (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 1998, p.1).

Federal standards for housing costs suggest that for low-income families, no more than thirty percent of family income should be applied to housing costs (US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1998). However, a 1995 study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that as rents have increased for available rental units, low-income renters are applying more than half of their income toward housing (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1998, p. 1 and Foster, 1993). As a result there is little disposable income left over for other basic necessities such as food or clothing.

In addition to the availability of fewer affordable units for the poor, the reduction of housing assistance programs has also contributed to this housing crisis. Although

housing subsidies, usually in the form of rental vouchers, have managed to keep the housing gap from getting larger over the last twenty years, few new housing assistance obligations have been approved for low-income renters (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1998, p. 1). Section 8 housing is a federally-funded voucher program for low-income families. This program is typically operated through local housing authorities and contracts with apartment owners to provide housing subsidies. However, it is not uncommon for Section 8 housing to have up to a two year waiting list, which leaves several low-income families with no other alternatives for housing except for emergency shelters, doubling-up with friends or relatives, or even living on the streets (NCH, 1998). The policy solution here seems to call for the provision of housing as the first step in assisting the homeless. However, housing policy cannot address the myriad of other social factors that keep homeless individuals from achieving self-sufficiency, such as the ability to get a job.

Employment Limitations

Homeless service providers are beginning to focus more on the issue of employment because a job is important if an individual is to achieve self-sufficiency. It is perhaps not surprising that poorly educated people are unable to find jobs. Koegel (1996, p. 27) discusses the rise in poverty and homelessness in the 1980s as resulting from prevailing economic factors. He notes that, ".....this period coincided exactly with the coming of age of those born during the 'baby boom.'...when huge numbers of good, new jobs were required to absorb the boomers successfully, the American occupational structure was transformed by intensification of an older process called

“deindustrialization.” Deindustrialization refers to a structural shift which occurred in the economy whereby higher-paying manufacturing jobs were replaced by lower-paying, temporary service jobs, which had fewer benefits and little or no job security. This deindustrialization created a group of young, poverty-bound workers who were chronically unemployed or in low paying jobs. The economic recession of the 1970s resulted in rising unemployment, especially within the labor pool of unskilled or low-skilled workers (Nunez, 1996).

Deindustrialization and a booming economy have made lower-paying service jobs more abundant. The low paying dead end jobs, however, do not provide a living wage and thus create a working homeless population (Liebow, 1996). An individual that works full-time and makes minimum wage, currently \$5.15 per hour, cannot realistically support themselves.⁶ For example, the average one-bedroom apartment in Austin, Texas, according to 1998 US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) fair market rents (HUD, 1998), is \$516 per month. In order to afford that amount of rent, an individual working forty hours per week would need to earn at least \$8.93 per hour. Given this analysis, low-paying, service-oriented jobs that pay minimum wage are inadequate for a person to support themselves.

A national organization called House the Homeless (HtH) has recently worked on a campaign asking the federal government to raise the minimum wage. HtH maintains that raising the minimum wage will allow a living wage, which is adjusted for different

⁶ HUD standards dictate that no more than one-third of an individual's gross income should be spent on housing. If rent was \$516 per month, then $\$516 \times 3 = \$1,548$ gross monthly income. To make \$1,548 a month, minimum wage needs to be \$8.93 per hour: $40 \text{ hours/week} \times 4.33 \text{ weeks/month} = 173.33 \text{ hours per month}$. $173.33 \text{ hours per month} \times \$8.93 = \$1,547.83$. This does not include after tax figures of net income. (HUD, 1998)

local economies. Essentially, the argument is that if a person works forty hours per week, they should be able to pay for the most basic forms of housing and other necessities (House the Homeless, 1998).⁷

Another interesting point is that many of the homeless are not employable because they lack the basic skills necessary to obtain and retain employment. As stated earlier, one of the factors contributing to homelessness is a lack of education and skills that allow individuals to compete in the job market (Foster, 1993). Several organizations that serve the homeless have realized the importance of job readiness and job training. In addition, they have honed in on the skills that employers expect of their employees in the workplace. Social workers describe them as soft and hard skills.

Job readiness refers to the ability to meet the minimum requirements of a job training program. Before job training can even occur, the skills that job readiness supplies must be focused on. Many of these basic skills should have been learned by individuals in school, such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. During job readiness, programs for the homeless also concentrate on refining soft skills, such as punctuality, cooperation, hygiene⁸, organizational skills, etc. The educational aspects of job readiness addresses the employer's concern. Job training begins when individuals learn more advanced skills, such as working with computers, and basic word processing or spreadsheet programs, which are a must in today's competitive job market.

⁷ Raising the minimum wage can be argued to be inefficient and unnecessary. The minimum wage may be designed to encourage new entrants in to the labor market, such as teenagers who have no need to support themselves. In addition, employers who offer minimum wage jobs may be forced to lose money by taking on the burden of paying a higher wage.

⁸ This may seem obvious, but for many, it is not.

In sum, although a homeless individual may want to work, there may be several obstacles in her way. There are few good paying jobs. Often, available jobs pay wages below a reasonable cost of living, or the individual lacks skills for employment. Koegel (1996) believes that these obstacles have perpetuated homelessness into the 1990s. The following section discusses another major structural factor that contributed to the rise of homelessness- cuts in social programs.

Cuts in Federal Funding of Social Programs

As mentioned earlier, a surge in the homeless population took place during the 1980s. Nunez (1996, p.8) believes that this rise in homelessness can be directly linked to not only deteriorating housing and job opportunities, but, "perhaps the most important was the systematic dismantling of the safety net that had long supported the nation's poor and disadvantaged."

The term safety net has been commonly used to describe the numerous federal programs that existed to provide assistance to the public, such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or food stamps (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 1998). Funding cuts during the Reagan and Bush administrations eliminated social programs intended for the poor. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act cut or capped federal funding for several social programs. Coupled with the large national budget deficit left at the end of the 1980s, the slashing of programs left the nation with increased homelessness and fewer mechanisms to alleviate it. The poor, "fell further and further into poverty as the income support and social services they needed most desperately of all, including education, disappeared or deteriorated" (Nunez, 1996, p.11).

Koegel (1996) suggests that the steady erosion of the real dollar value of such federal entitlement programs as AFDC, combined with increasing rental rates, contributed to growing poverty in the 1970s. This trend continued well into the 1980s. By 1993, roughly 5 million families were on AFDC. Critics felt that federal welfare programs were failing the people they were intended to benefit. The structure of the welfare programs created an incentive to remain poor. Once an individual in a welfare-subsidized family was employed, the benefits were stopped. However, the wages from employment were not sufficient enough to induce a person to continue to work. It was simply easier to receive welfare benefits and not work (Koegel, 1996).

AFDC and other entitlement programs have undergone reform in the mid- to late 1990s. AFDC has been dismantled and a new program exists. TANF or Temporary Aid to Needy Families has replaced AFDC. Much of the authority over TANF programs now belongs to the states. Many states have begun to impose time limits on recipients of assistance. Time limits have caused concern because a family who reaches the time limit and is unable to obtain or sustain employment may eventually find themselves homeless (Koegel, 1996). Income supports provide a safety net for those individuals who require assistance while they finish their education or find employment. It is possible that welfare reform could create a new surge in homelessness by cutting off income support to the impoverished.

The following section briefly describes the emergency shelter system. Shelter programs for the homeless and funding needs to continue the provision of services to the homeless are also discussed.

The Shelter System

Most homeless people eventually turn to the emergency shelter for help. However, the shelter system has been criticized as an unhealthy environment for its clients. In addition, it is felt that shelters create dependency among its clients because they provide for basic needs, such as shelter, food, and clothing (Foster, 1993). This section describes various examples of shelters, the role shelters play in assisting the homeless, and finally, the funding of shelters.

Types of Shelters

There are several different types of shelters that were created to assist certain segments of the homeless population. First, there are general population shelters, which take in anyone, such as single, adult men, and women and their children. An example of this type of shelter would be the Salvation Army, which is a nation-wide organization founded on Christian principles intended to assist the homeless and the poor. The second type of shelter is a domestic violence shelter, or a shelter for battered women. These shelters are primarily intended for victims of domestic abuse and usually only take women and their children who are fleeing abusive situations. On occasion, these shelters will take in an abused man if he is accompanied by his children, but this situation is rare. The third type of shelter is a children's shelter. These shelters are intended for children only, usually from the ages of infancy to seventeen years of age. The children in these shelters have either been abused by family, abandoned, or have run away from home. There are other types of unique shelters, such as shelters for individuals with AIDS, but the three aforementioned types comprise the majority of shelters.

The general atmosphere of most shelters is one of distress and despondency. Since shelters are the last resort for many individuals, their resistance to be in there is quite evident in the faces and attitudes of the people who reside there. Shelters are not designed with the comfort of individuals in mind. They are primarily intended to provide the most basic of needs. Many urban shelters that serve a large homeless population are simply large, warehouse-type facilities that require everyone to sleep in the same area, usually on cots. This situation is not necessarily safe. People find that they cannot sleep well in these facilities because of the strangeness and newness of the place, and because of fear of having their only possessions stolen from them if they do fall asleep. Shelters can be scary and foreboding places for families, and the lack of security keeps people from going to them (Mihaly, 1991).

The shelter is home to several different types of people. All segments of the homeless population are represented. The largest group to reside in shelters are families. Of these families, roughly seventy-five percent are headed by single, young women. The numbers for this population may actually be underrepresented because single mothers often fear that authorities will take their children away and place them in foster care (Foster, 1993). Since there are many families residing in shelters, children make up a large portion of the overall shelter population (60%). Many of the children found in shelters were part of families that had experienced domestic violence (Foster, 1993).

Critics of the shelter system believe that shelters are uninhabitable (Blasi and Preis, 1987). Individuals may choose to remain on the streets in order to avoid “dehumanizing and insensitive institutions,” such as shelters, which are many times the only alternative to sleeping on the streets (Snow, 1996). Liebow (1996, p. 66) believes that, “until

permanent and affordable housing for the poor becomes a reality, we need more and better shelters.”

Shelter Services

Shelters provide the homeless with the most basic of needs: food, clothing, and physical shelter. In addition, several emergency shelters provide some basic form of counseling to their clients (NCH, 1998). Counseling on domestic violence or family issues can assist shelter clients in working through the emotional hardships that homelessness imposes. The counseling also helps the case worker or counselor to assess a client's immediate and future needs, and to develop goals that will provide them a plan for becoming self-sufficient.

Several assistance programs intended to help the homeless often require a person to provide an address when they apply (Blasi and Preis, 1987). Homeless advocates believe that the requiring of an address for access to these social service programs is discriminatory and unfair to the homeless and are lobbying legislators to pass laws protecting the homeless and ensuring their basic rights (National Law Center On Homelessness and Poverty, 1998). However illegal and discriminatory this procedure may be, having an address is still necessary for shelter clients to gain access to other support services that require an address be provided or when they need to apply for employment.

Service providers that work within the shelter system know of the importance of case management of their homeless clients. Social work is a helping profession in which the social worker helps clients to manage their lives (Shields, 1989). Because of the importance of client case management, those shelters that can afford it provide more

intensive psychological counseling, as well as substance abuse treatment programs. Some shelters have developed educational and vocational programs intended to assist the homeless in becoming self-sufficient and ultimately transitioning out of homelessness. However, services such as these are not free, and shelters must often sacrifice quality care for efficiency due to lack of funding.

Can shelters meet the demands of the homeless population without having the proper resources? The simple answer is no. The shelter system must accomplish three things in order to be well-equipped to provide services to the homeless. First, shelters should involve themselves in coordination with other service providers, such as public assistance organizations or access to medical service providers. Second, shelters and homeless service providers need to work with existing homeless coalitions, or work with other organizations to create a local homeless coalition that addresses further long-term needs of the homeless, such as transportation and childcare issues. Third, shelter services need to be developed to include such things as family counseling, legal advocacy, job training, budgeting, parenting skills, and a plethora of other support services intended to address long-term needs of the homeless. The bottom line, however, is that many shelters simply cannot afford to provide these kind of expanded programs due to staffing or budget shortages. As a result, shelters are constantly seeking funding sources to keep them up and running (NCH, 1998).

Funding for Non-Profit Shelters

Prevailing shelters are generally private, non-profit organizations whose operations depend on donated funds and publicly-funded programs. Non-profit organizations usually

exist to serve a constituency or a cause (Gelatt, 1992). In the case of shelters, the cause is homelessness and the constituency is the homeless. In order to meet the needs of the constituency (the homeless), shelters must seek funding opportunities to support their activities. Non-profits seek out funding for their organizations through private donations or the government. Government funding for non-profits usually comes in the form of a grant (Gelatt, 1992). For many shelters, grant funds are the life blood of the organization. Grants provide the shelter with a steady source of operating funds that free up other resources so that larger projects can be taken on to assist the homeless and provide more long-term intervention with their clients.

The following section discusses the nature of the grant system and also describe current federal grant programs that exist to assist the homeless. Keep in mind that the development of several different homeless assistance grants reflects the diversity of the homeless population and the wide variety of needs that arise due to that diversity.

Federal Grant Programs

Grant funding is an example of fiscal federalism in action. Fiscal federalism is a term used to describe how the national government achieves its policy objectives through financial grants-in-aid. Fiscal federalism operates within the context of intergovernmental relations, which refers to different levels of government, such as the national government and the states, working together and sharing administrative, fiscal, and programmatic responsibilities (Rich, 1993).

Many states have relied on federal funds to assist them in attacking a variety of social problems such as homelessness or poverty. In order for the federal government to

achieve the national policy objective of providing for the social welfare of its citizens, it provides the states with funding and endows them with the authority to allocate funds and/or administer programs. Much of the funding comes in the form of grants to the states. A grant is money provided by the federal government to recipient governments in order to carry out certain national policy goals (Nice, 1995).

All federal assistance programs are created by an act of Congress. There is a three-step process by which programs are enacted. The first step of the process is called Authorization. This is where legislation is created that allows an agency to implement a program and set the limit of funding for that program. The next step is called Appropriations. This is an act of Congress that makes the funds available and establishes funding limits and the duration of the funding. The final step is Apportionment, where funds are divided among various programs (Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, 1981).

Through the use of grants, the national government can expand into further areas, while state and local governments that receive the grants have the role of “primary service providers” (Rich, 1993, p.12). Grants can provide state and local governments with a great deal of discretion, depending on the type of grant program. The federal government, however, often influences the behavior of recipients through regulatory mechanisms. Administrative fragmentation limits federal influence because it lessens the legislative intent of elected officials and the increase of negotiations and interaction among administrators of the programs (Hale and Palley, 1981, p.93). The result is a diffusion of authority that reduces strict federal control over many grant programs.

Types of Grants

There are several types of federal grants. Categorical, Block, and Formula grants are but a few. Categorical grants are used for very specific reasons and fund specific programs. In 1995, over ninety percent of all national grants were categorical (Nice, 1995). Block grants are intended for very broad objectives such as community development, which allows recipients some flexibility in spending. Formula grants use a specific, legally mandated formula, which determines how much each jurisdiction receives. For example, a federal grant for the poor may be allocated to a state based on the percentage of poverty within that state.

A basic goal of grants is to minimize waste (Nice, 1995). One way to achieve this is to require recipient organizations to contribute their resources before they can receive the grant. This procedure is called "matching." A matching grant requires recipients to match up to 100 percent of the grant funds they are to receive.

Grants usually contain program regulations set forth by the federal government, usually through the federal agency that administers the grant. These regulations can be agency-wide or program-specific. Whichever type of regulation is used, the regulations governing the program are published in the US Code of Federal Regulations and also in the Federal Register. It is up to the recipient to follow all grant program rules and regulations to stay in compliance with the grant provisions. When possible, the federal granting agency performs periodic monitoring visits to the recipient to ensure compliance with the grant.⁹ Occasionally, the federal government requires a recipient to pay back the grant funds if they are found to have been used for ineligible activities.

⁹ This is not always possible due to staff shortages within federal granting agencies. The federal government must rely on recipients to maintain compliance, but sometimes this is purely on faith.

Effects of Grants

There are several ways that grant programs influence recipient behavior. Studies of grants have primarily focused on the “stimulative effect of federal grants on state and local expenditures” (Rich, 1993, p.13). Grants increase recipient spending by producing income, which increases the spending on a given program. In addition, price effects occur, where matching a grant dollar for dollar will have the effect of cutting the price of a program in half. The recipient now has twice as much money to spend on a program than they did without the grant (Nice, 1995).

Grants create a centralizing effect, in which all recipients, whether they be governmental units or non-profits, fall under the control of federal grant regulations (Hale and Palley, 1981). The centralizing effects are somewhat limited because recipients are often able to sidestep these regulations through a process called “fungibility.” Fungibility is defined as, “the ability to use grant money as a substitute for money the recipient planned to spend anyway; the recipient’s money can then be spent on some other program” (Nice, 1995, p.65). While recipients must abide by federal regulations as far as the grant program is concerned, they are free to use their own resources to expand upon an existing program in any way they wish; they can also venture into a new program.

An important thing to note about studies of grant effects is that they do not clearly demonstrate whether there are, “distributional consequences of federal spending” (Rich, 1993, p.14). This means whether or not the grant moneys actually reached those it was intended to serve. Therefore, knowing that grants increase recipient spending does not indicate at all whether or not intended beneficiaries ever actually received any type of service. Future studies on the distributional effects of grants should first ask: Who

benefits from the federal grant programs? To understand federal programs, it is necessary to look at the process of negotiating objectives at the national level, and to look at the actual administration of programs by recipients.

Homeless Assistance Grants

This section discusses federal homeless assistance programs and the legislation that created them. In particular, the Stewart B. McKinney Act is discussed as the primary legislation developed to address the problem of homelessness in America.

Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987

The Stewart B. McKinney Act (PL 100-77) was signed into law by Ronald Reagan on July 22, 1987. It originally funded 15 categorical grant programs that provided for homeless assistance tied to various needs. The Act was developed in response to the immediate crisis of lack of shelter for a growing population that included families with children, the elderly, the handicapped, Native Americans, and veterans. The Federal Government was aware that the causes of and solutions for homelessness were complex and that state and local government and private organizations were not able to meet the needs.

The purpose of the Act was to coordinate resources and programs to alleviate the homeless crisis and meet the most critical and urgent needs of the homeless. The Act provides for funding of programs to assist the homeless. Special emphasis is placed on families with children, the elderly, the handicapped, Native Americans, and veterans.

As originally enacted, the Act authorized expenditures of over \$1 billion for 1987 and 1988. However, the amounts appropriated were substantially less, around \$700 million. In subsequent years, McKinney Act programs expanded and authorization and appropriation levels increased. The Act was reauthorized for FY89 and FY90 (McKinney Act Amendments PL 100-628). This reauthorization allowed for the first time for federal funds to be used in preventing homelessness and gearing programs for those at-risk, such as rent and utility assistance. The Act was amended in 1990, 1992, and again in 1994. The amendments drastically changed the original programs authorized by the act. Some of these changes included increased funding, the expansion of eligible activities, and the creation of several new programs to assist the homeless. By 1995, appropriations for the Act reached \$1.4 billion. Current funding under the Act has remained steady but still remains inadequate to meet the needs of its intended beneficiaries (NCH, 1998).

Homeless Programs Funded Under the McKinney Act

The original McKinney Act contained nine titles under which each component of homeless assistance was categorized. Six of the nine are categorical grant programs, while the remainder focus on homeless definitions and other homeless activities.

Title I-General Provisions: This title includes a statement of six findings of Congress on the homeless crisis and provides a definition of homelessness. According to the national government, a homeless person is defined as,

1) an individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and 2) an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations, an institution that provides a temporary residence for

individual intended to be institutionalized, or a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (42 USC 5302, 101 STAT. 495).

Title II-Interagency Council on the Homeless: This title establishes the functions of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, which is an independent entity within the Executive Branch that is composed of the heads of fifteen federal agencies. The main purpose of the agency is to review all federal activities and programs to assist homeless individuals.

Title III-Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program: This title authorizes the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, which is administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This program is intended to supplement ongoing efforts by homeless service providers to provide shelter and food to the homeless and to assist in the transition from transitional to permanent housing. The FEMA funds for housing come as a one-time assistance to pay for rental and utility deposits and first month's rent for eligible clients.

Title IV-Housing Assistance: This title authorizes the emergency shelter and transitional housing programs administered by HUD. These programs include the Emergency Shelter Grants Program, the Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless, and Section 8 Single Room Occupancy Moderate Rehabilitation. In addition, the title requires submission to HUD of a comprehensive homeless assistance plan that is to be approved by the Secretary of HUD.

The plan must describe the need for assistance and contain a strategy to meet the described needs of the jurisdiction.

Title V-Identification and Use of Surplus Federal Property: This title requires federal agencies to identify and make available surplus federal property, such as buildings, for use by state and local governments and not-for-profit agencies to assist the homeless.

Title VI-Health Care for the Homeless: This title authorizes several programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services to provide health care services to homeless persons. The specific programs include the Health Care for the Homeless Program, which includes substance abuse care; a Community Mental Health Services block grant program for the chronically mentally ill; and two demonstration projects that provide mental health care and substance abuse treatment services to the homeless.

Title VII-Education, Training, and Community Services Programs: This title authorizes four educational programs. The first two are the Adult Education for the Homeless Program and the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program, which are both administered by the Department of Education. The Department of Labor administers the Job Training for the Homeless Program, which is a demonstration program.¹⁰ The last program is the Emergency Community Services Homeless Grant Program, which is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. This

¹⁰ This program was terminated in FY1995.

last program is intended to provide more comprehensive services to help individuals transition of homelessness.

Title VIII-Food Assistance for the Homeless: This title amends the Food Stamp program to facilitate participation in the program by person who are homeless. The title also expands the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program to include certain food products, which is administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Title IX-Veterans Provisions: This title authorizes the extension the Veterans Job Training Act for several fiscal years.

While inadequate funding clearly impedes the effectiveness of the McKinney Act programs, the Act's greatest weakness is its focus on emergency measures. The Act responds primarily to the symptoms of homelessness and not the root causes. Although the Act has been successful as a first step in the battle against homelessness, it is clear that after 12 years of responding to emergency situations, more needs to be done in tackling the causes of homelessness, such as inadequate housing and the need for living wages.

The next chapter focuses on one of the McKinney Act's programs: The Emergency Shelter Grant. This grant is described in the context of its administration through the State of Texas' Department of Housing and Community Affairs. In addition the conceptual framework for the research is described and developed.

Chapter Three

SETTING

Introducing the Conceptual Framework

This chapter introduces and develops the research purpose and the conceptual framework for the research. It also describes the setting in which the research is conducted.

The conceptual framework is a tool that gives the researcher the overall picture of the research, but also gives the researcher direction and allows the content of the research to be fine-tuned. Conceptual frameworks can be classified by the purpose of the research being conducted, and can be tied to certain types of research questions (Shields, 1998). The purpose of this particular research is understanding. In this research, the purpose is two-fold. The first purpose is to describe the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) issued by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. The second purpose is to assess grant proposals submitted for the ESGP using the RFP as a standard of comparison.

With Understanding research, the research question for this project asks how close something is to the ideal or standard. The type of conceptual framework that best applies to this type of research is the Practical Ideal Type. The practical ideal type is an abstract tool in which standards or guidelines are developed. The ideal type is organized by categories or elements that comprise the ideal. Once the practical ideal type has been developed, it can be used as a standard by which something can be measured. In this

study, the proposals are assessed through comparison with the standard provided by the RFP.

Before the Request for Proposal can be understood, it is important to familiarize oneself with the ESGP for which the RFPs have been created. The literature review provides an introduction to the issue of homelessness, which is the meta- or larger framework in the conceptual framework. This background information is necessary to understand ESGP as it is described and tied to the conceptual framework. ESGP provides the basis for the guidelines found in the RFP. (See Appendix B for the RFP)

The Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP)

As seen in chapter two, there are several grant programs established by the Stewart B. McKinney Act of 1987 to achieve the national policy objective of alleviating the incidence of homelessness. One particular grant is the Emergency Shelter Grants Program (Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987). It is for the ESGP grant program that the proposals under review in this research project have been submitted. It is important to understand the scope and intention of ESGP since it provides some of the basis for the categories of the practical ideal type.

ESGP is a categorical grant, since it is designed for a narrow purpose: helping the homeless. ESGP is also a closed-ended grant, which means that there is a fixed amount of funds allocated for the grant, but this fixed amount is allocated on an annual basis through appropriations. ESGP is funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The secretary of HUD is responsible for allocating funds to States, urban counties, and municipalities. The funds are provided on an annual basis (per fiscal year)

and are made available by HUD through appropriation Acts. Recipients must provide HUD with a comprehensive homeless assistance plan that demonstrates a need for the assistance funds, addresses how they will distribute the funds, and what outcomes they expect to achieve. The plan must be approved by HUD before the funds are allocated.

Activities under ESGP must be related to emergency shelter for homeless individuals. The following activities are eligible: renovation, rehabilitation, or conversion of buildings used as shelters; essential services, which include employment, health care, and education assistance; maintenance and operational costs which cover things like utilities, insurance, supplies, and equipment. Recipient organizations of ESGP funds under the Act must provide matching funds equal to 100 percent of the grant amount. Matching funds may be in the form of donations, volunteer hours, staff salaries, or the appraisal value of the shelter facility.

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

The Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) provided HUD with its most recent Comprehensive Plan in December 1997. The Comprehensive Plan is called the Texas Consolidated Plan, which includes the ESGP, CDBG, and HOPWA¹¹ grant plans, all of which are federal grants funded through HUD. The Plan generally consists of an identified need for assistance for homeless or low-income persons

¹¹ CDBG stands for Community Development Block Grant; HOPWA stands for Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS.

within the state of Texas. It also provides a detailed strategy for addressing the identified need.

HUD is required by law to approve the Plan within 45 days. TDHCA's operating year for these grants is February 1st, thus submission of the Plan in December is conducted with the expectation that the Plan will be approved by the beginning of the operating year. It is only until the State receives the official grant agreement document from HUD that it can begin to obligate funds to applicants. The first thing that TDHCA does while waiting for the Plan to be approved is to create the Request for Proposal for the ESGP Program and send it to prospective applicants.

Request for Proposals

Organizations that award grant funds, whether they be units of government or private foundations, must have some method of determining who will be the most worthy recipient of the grant. A good method for determining the worthiness of potential grant recipients is through the Request for Proposal. The Request for Proposal or RFP is a tool that is used by organizations to lay out precisely the standards by which a proposal for a grant will be accepted. The RFP is generally a published document that contains the elements that are desired in a proposal. Through the competitive RFP process, in which proposals all compete with one another for the grant, proposals are systematically weeded out by using review instruments to find such qualities as the best written, best organized, most cost efficient, and most practical. If, according to the review instrument, the elements of the RFP are not in the proposal, then an organization could deem the proposal

inadequate. Therefore, the RFP can be an important method by which grantor organizations can assure themselves of choosing the most worthy recipient of grant funds.

Conceptual Framework Summary

As stated earlier, the conceptual framework for this research is the practical ideal type. The practical ideal type is an abstract tool in which standards or guidelines are developed. Once the practical ideal type has been developed, it can be used as a standard by which something can be measured.

The ESGP, offered through the State of Texas, is a competitive grant that uses a state-developed RFP to solicit proposals from eligible organizations. The RFP for the ESGP is a published document that is provided to a prospective grant applicant. (See Appendix B for a copy of the RFP) It contains the *standards* or *guidelines* that applicants must follow when writing their grant proposals. The conceptual framework (practical ideal type) for this research is based on the standards contained within the RFP, and takes into account homeless policy and what an RFP should entail in general. There are also issues of accountability associated with administering homeless programs, which the RFP addresses. It is from these sources that the conceptual framework flows.

For the purpose of the research, the RFP is to be analyzed and descriptive categories and subcategories are developed to describe the primary elements of the RFP. There are four main categories and forty-five subcategories. The main categories that reflect the standards of the RFP are as follows: **Required Elements**, **Description of Organization**, **Unmet Needs**, and **Project Description**. Each of these major categories contain various subcategories that more clearly indicate the information solicited from the applicant.

Although the RFP for the ESGP is geared toward the needs of the homeless, all RFPs have a set of **Required Elements**. The Required Elements are forms or documents that must be included in the proposal. These include such items as a Cover letter, Table of Contents, Proposed Use of Funds Form, Photographs, Description of Activities (budget), Matching Funds Form, Board list or policy-making entity, and an Approval of project form, to name but a few.

Organizations that provide services to the homeless must be able to clearly and concisely express how they will address the diverse needs of the homeless population they serve in their grant proposals. The RFP for the ESGP contains several sections that ask the applicant to provide information to address particular issues dealing with the homeless. The first section is under the heading of **Description of Organization**. This section asks the applicant to provide information on the organization, such as a description or History of the Organization, which provides information on when the organization was founded and why. Staff experience and education are important in determining if an organization's staff has the knowledge and experience to be capable of providing professional services to the homeless. A description of Current Services provided indicates the amount and type of services for the homeless the organization currently provides, while Transitional Housing efforts provides information on what the organization does to assist people out of homelessness and into more permanent housing; Coordination of Resources with other Service Providers is crucial because it shows that the organization maximizes its time and efforts by networking with other social service providers in order to provide information or refer clients to other social services they might need to assist them out of homelessness.

Unmet Need is a category where the applicant is asked to describe the socio-economic climate in their jurisdiction. The information requested in this section is important because it allows the organization to provide justification for the need for assistance. Estimates on the numbers of homeless and information on any previous homeless studies provide the basis for the homeless population in an organization's jurisdiction. Inventory of existing shelters, available bed space in the community, information on the number of housing vouchers issued, affordable housing, and local welfare and unemployment statistics provide information on what is available to the poor and the homeless as far as housing, social services, and jobs. When homeless figures are compared to services available to them, what usually results is a clear indication of where there is a gap in services to the homeless- this is the unmet need.

Project Description is the last category of the RFP. This section brings the entire RFP together because the organization has described itself as capable of administering services to the homeless and has justified the need for the assistance. The next task is to describe the project that the applicant intends to fund with the grant. In this section, the applicant is asked to identify the target group of homeless it intends to assist (the elderly? victims of abuse?), describe activities, cost estimates and the basis for those cost estimates, potential subcontractors for service provision (such as subcontracting for job training), outcomes expected, description of the required matching funds, and how the project will address the unmet need that was identified in the previous section. All of these categories comprise the RFP and are the elements that constitute the conceptual framework. The complete conceptual framework can be seen in Table 3.1.

The following chapter will describe the methodology used to conduct the research and will tie the conceptual framework to the research. In addition, the statistical techniques used in the research is illustrated.

Table 3.1: Summary of the Conceptual Framework

REQUIRED ELEMENTS
Cover Letter
Form 424
Table of Contents
Numbered Pages
Proposed Use of Funds Form
Project Narrative
Photographs
Description of Activities
Matching Funds Form
Board List or Policy-making Entity
Approval of Project Form
Tax-exempt Status
Applicant Certification E-1
Applicant Certification E-2
Financial Statements
DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATION
Staff Experience and Education
Type of Current Services
Number of Persons Served
Target Groups
Cities/counties Served
Bed Space of Shelter
Member of Coalition
Coordination of Services and Resources
Effectiveness of Transitional Programs
Organizational Outcomes
Previous ESGP Funding
UNMET NEED
Description of Extent of Unmet Need
Number of Homeless
Previous Homeless Studies
Inventory of Existing Shelters
Available Bed Space in Community
Number Shelters Serving Target Group
Housing Authority Information
Other Affordable Housing in Area
Welfare Statistics
Unemployment Data
PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Identify Target Group
Activities and Basis for Cost Estimates
Documentation of Increased Essential Services
Implementation Plan for Homelessness Prevention
Potential Subcontractors for Service Provision
Outcomes Expected
Description of Matching Funds
Describe Involvement of Homeless Families
Describe How Project Will Address Unmet Need

Chapter Four

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used to assess the RFPs for the State of Texas ESGP, submitted for Fiscal Year 1998. In addition, the sampling frame and technique are discussed.

Content Analysis

The methodology used for this research is content analysis. Content analysis is described by Babbie (1995, p. 307) as a method that can be applied to virtually any form of communication, such as magazines, letters, or paintings. Content analysis as a mode of observation answers “what is it?” or descriptive types of questions. In addition, Babbie (1995) tells us that analysis of the data collected through content analysis can assist in answering the “why” and “with what effect”; the exploratory or explanatory questions, by showing patterns or trends not readily seen by an observer.

Content analysis consists of creating a series of categories and subcategories, and then methodically counting the number of responses that fall into each category. (Zimmerman, 1995). In content analysis, the researcher must have a unit of analysis, or the “what is being studied.” The unit of analysis for this research are the proposals submitted for the 1998 Emergency Shelter Grants Program administered by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. In order to actually perform the

comparison of proposals to the RFP standards, the conceptual framework of ideal categories and their subcategories are operationalized into a table (Refer to Table 4.2).

Babbie (1995) describes the advantages and disadvantages of using content analysis. The biggest advantage of content analysis is that it is quite economical and less time-consuming than other research methodologies, such as field research, which requires a great deal of time to conduct observations. All that is required for content analysis is one person (the researcher) and the unit of analysis. In addition, the accuracy of the results can be safeguarded because if a portion of the research is affected by human error, for instance, the researcher can easily repeat the analysis without a great loss of time. Another advantage is the ability to use content analysis to “study processes occurring over long periods of time” (Babbie, 1995, p. 320). This ability can make for some quite interesting research. One last advantage is what Babbie calls “being unobtrusive” (Babbie, 1995, p. 320). This means that there is no effect on the subject that is being studied, unlike a live subject whose responses may be affected by the researcher in subtle ways.

As with any research methodology, there are disadvantages to using content analysis. First, Babbie (1995) tells us that using content analysis is limited to recorded communications (i.e. written material, audio tape, etc.). In addition to this, the coding procedure chosen by the researcher may not be the most appropriate to use for the research being conducted. For instance, a coding procedure that only allows for yes or no responses could limit the information revealed in the analysis. This presents problems of validity, because the most valid measure may have been overlooked in the coding process. However, this problem can be alleviated by simply re-coding the material that is being

analyzed. In a sense, content analysis allows the researcher great flexibility and increased reliability of the data, as long as the coding is consistent.

For the purpose of the research, a sample of fifty proposals submitted by organizations within the State of Texas for the Fiscal Year 1998 Emergency Shelter Grants Program will be randomly selected, analyzed, and compared with the descriptive categories to determine if they contain the elements described in the RFP. According to Babbie (1995), in order to have a fairly representative sample of the "population," a minimum of 30 subjects must be used. The sampling of 50 proposals ensures adequate representation of the population (i.e. the proposals); therefore, there is confidence in the statistics by using almost half of the sampling frame. The sample of 50 proposals is large enough to make statistical generalizations about the proposals.

One hundred seventeen (117) proposals were submitted to TDHCA for the FY1998 round of funding ESGP. However, the sampling frame consists of only 107 proposals received for ESGP FY1998. Ten proposals were eliminated from the sampling frame because they did not meet the criteria set forth by TDHCA, and therefore, were not eligible for review¹²

Eligible proposals shall first be placed into one of two groups: Proposals from units of government and proposals from non-profit organizations. A proportionate number of proposals will be randomly selected from each of the proposal groups so as to arrive at a total of fifty proposals.

¹² Criteria for being eligible for review consisted of the following:

- Applicant must be a city, county, or private non-profit
- If applicant is a non-profit, they must have provided their tax-exempt status documentation
- If applicant is a non-profit, they must have provided an approval form from a local public official
- If applicant is a non-profit, they must have provided for participation by a homeless or formerly homeless person on their board of directors or other policy-making entity.

The method used to determine appropriate proportions for sampling is as follows: Of the 107 eligible proposals submitted for review, 7 (6.5% of eligible proposals) were from units of local government, such as a city or county entity, while 100 were from private, non-profits (93.5%). Of the fifty proposals to be selected for review, the proportion of proposals selected will be as follows: 6.5% will be from units of local government and 93.5% will be from private, non-profits.

Units of local government: $6.5\% \times 50 \text{ proposals} = 3.25 \text{ proposals}$ chosen, rounded down to 3 proposals. Private Non-profits: $93.5\% \times 50 \text{ proposals} = 46.75 \text{ proposals}$ chosen, rounded up to 47 proposals.

Each selected proposal will be analyzed and compared to the categories of the practical ideal type to determine if it contains the elements of the ideal type. A number scheme will be used to identify each proposal during the review to avoid duplication in the analysis. An RFP will either contain all of the element, some of it, or none of it. Descriptive statistics to be used will be mean, median, mode, and percentages or frequency. Proposals will also be analyzed for length. To see a complete listing of the applicant organizations that submitted proposals used in the analysis, please refer to Appendix C.

Once all of the proposals have been analyzed, the statistics should provide results showing whether or not the proposals contained all of the elements of the RFP. Should the results show that a majority of proposals did not meet the criteria of the RFP, then suggestions will be offered as to how to improve the grant proposals.

Table 4.1
Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework

RFP Heading	Contains All	Contains Some	Contains None
<i>Required Elements</i>			
Cover Letter			
Form 424			
Table of Contents			
Numbered Pages			
Proposed Use of Funds Form			
Project Narrative			
Photographs			
Description of Activities			
Matching Funds Form			
Board List or Policy-making Entity			
Approval of Project Form			
Tax-exempt Status			
Applicant Certification E-1			
Applicant Certification E-2			
Financial Statements			
<i>Description of Organization</i>			
Staff Experience and Education			
Type of Current Services			
Number of Persons Served			
Target Groups			
Cities/counties Served			
Bed Space of Shelter			
Member of Coalition			
Coordination of Services and Resources			
Effectiveness of Transitional Programs			
Organizational Outcomes			
Previous ESGP Funding			
<i>Unmet Need</i>			
Description of Extent of Unmet Need			
Number of Homeless			
Previous Homeless Studies			
Inventory of Existing Shelters			
Available Bed Space in Community			
No. of Shelters Serving Target Group			
Housing Authority Information			
Other Affordable Housing in Area			
Welfare Statistics			
Unemployment Data			

Table 4.1 (continued)
Operationalization of the Conceptual Framework

RFP Heading	Contains All	Contains Some	Contains None
<i>Project Description</i>			
Identify Target Group			
Activities and Basis for Cost Estimates			
Documentation of Increased Essential Services			
Implementation Plan for Homelessness Prevention			
Potential Subcontractors for Service Provision			
Outcomes Expected			
Description of Matching Funds			
Describe Involvement of Homeless Families			
Describe How Project Will Address Unmet Need			

Chapter Five

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the findings from the analysis of the proposals submitted for the State of Texas Emergency Shelter Grants Program. The results were based on analysis of fifty proposals, selected from a larger sample, and compared to the practical ideal type through the use of a coding sheet taken directly from the State of Texas RFP for the ESG Program. Please refer to Appendix D for a summary of responses.

Content analysis of the proposals revealed some descriptive information. The longest proposal was 102 pages, while the shortest proposal was 14 pages. The average number of pages for the proposals was 37 pages. The median number of pages in a proposal was 58, while the mode was 33 pages. The analysis did not take into consideration any explicit organizational information on each ESGP applicant. The only consideration was whether or not a description of the organization had been provided in the proposal. The research did not intend to solicit specific information from applicant organizations such as size of the organization, total operating budget, or total staff. In addition, the analysis did not include any information as to whether the proposal was from a rural or urban area or if a proposal was actually funded by ESGP for FY1998. The analysis concentrated almost entirely on a basic description of the proposals and not of the organizations that prepared the proposals. If any of the above information had been

solicited from these organizations, it might have revealed more insight as to the results of the analysis.

The results of the analysis are shown in summary tables for each descriptive category and its subcategories. The findings for each subcategory are identified as a percentage of the responses for that subcategory. The findings are based on whether or not a proposal provided either ALL, SOME, or NONE of the information requested. As described in Chapter Four, ALL indicates that the proposal contained all of the necessary information required by a particular category; SOME indicates that a proposal contained only partial information required by a category; and NONE indicates that a proposal contained no information addressing a category.

Required Elements

It appeared that a large majority of the proposals submitted for ESGP contained all of the necessary information requested by each subcategory under *Required Elements*. This category contained the most compliance with the information requested, most likely because a few of the required elements had to be submitted in order to be eligible for review. However, the eligibility information applied only to the non-profits (47 proposals) and not to the units of local government (3 proposals). The required elements necessary for a proposal to be eligible for review are: Approval of Project Form, Tax-exempt Status documentation, and a Board of Directors list that clearly identified a homeless or formerly homeless person on that Board. An important point to make here is that under the subcategory of Tax-exempt Status, although the findings indicate 100% compliance with the information requested, three (3) proposals were not applicable for review under this

particular subcategory. The reason for this is that the 3 proposals were from the units of local government, which are not required by the RFP to submit tax-exempt information.

Another point to be made is that many of the Required Elements were forms that were actually provided in the RFP, which only asked for minimal amounts of information and perhaps an authorized signature. The RFP itself made it very easy for the applicant to provide the information requested under the category of Required Elements, which may have contributed to the large percentage of ALL responses. A single document may sometimes be easier to supply than having to actually create something, such as a project narrative. Please refer to Table 5.1 for a summary of findings.

Table 5.1
REQUIRED ELEMENTS: Summary of Findings

<i>Required Elements</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>SOME</i>	<i>NONE</i>
Cover Letter	96%	-----	4%
Form 424	100%	-----	-----
Table of Contents	98%	-----	2%
Numbered Pages	100%	-----	-----
Proposed Use of Funds Form	100%	-----	-----
Project Narrative	100%	-----	-----
Photographs	100%	-----	-----
Description of Activities	100%	-----	-----
Matching Funds Form	100%	-----	-----
Board List or Policy-making Entity	100%	-----	-----
Approval of Project Form	98%	-----	2%
Tax-exempt Status	100%	-----	-----
Applicant Certification E-1	100%	-----	-----
Applicant Certification E-2	98%	-----	2%
Financial Statements	100%	-----	-----

N=50

Description of Organization

The findings under the category of Description of Organization begin to indicate more varied responses than in the previous category. This category covers the narrative portion of the proposal where applicants are asked to provide general information about their agencies, who their clients are, and what services they provide.

Although a majority of the proposals addressed the requirements of the subcategories included in this section, it can be seen below in Table 5.2 that several proposals simply did not provide the information requested. Most interesting was the percentage of proposals that did not fully address “Staff Education and Experience” (30%). This particular subcategory seemed to be glossed over in the narrative of some of the proposals. Either staff education was stressed or experience was discussed, but not both.

It is important to note that for the subcategory of “Bed Space of Shelter,” a few agencies did not have an actual shelter facility with bed space, which may explain the percentage of “NONE” respondents for this subcategory (34%). These facilities may provide only day shelter or direct services, but may not include a dormitory or sleeping facilities for their clients. In addition, under the category of Previous ESGP Funding, several proposals came from agencies that never received ESGP funds before (28%). Therefore, the percentage of proposals that did not contain any information on bed space of shelter or previous ESGP funding overstates the number of agencies that should have but failed to address these issues in their proposal.

Another subcategory that contained a fairly high percentage of “NONE” respondents was “Organizational Outcomes” (40%). This subcategory was included in the

RFP because several grant programs currently use programmatic outcomes as a built in assessment tool or evaluation criteria for the grant program. This means that service providers must show not only how many people have been served (output), but in what way (outcome). An example might be, "Seven clients obtained employment after receiving job training." The results for this subcategory indicate an obvious lack of addressing the issue. It does not, however, reveal whether or not an agency is actually tracking client outcomes.

Table 5.2
DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATION: Summary of Findings

<i>Description of Organization</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>SOME</i>	<i>NONE</i>
Staff Experience and Education	66%	30%	4%
Type of Current Services	92%	8%	-----
Number of Persons Served	90%	4%	6%
Target Groups	86%	10%	4%
Cities/counties Served	86%	6%	8%
Bed Space of Shelter	62%	4%	34%
Member of Coalition	76%	10%	14%
Coordination of Services and Resources	84%	10%	6%
Effectiveness of Transitional Programs	60%	24%	16%
Organizational Outcomes	54%	6%	40%
Previous ESGP Funding	66%	6%	28%

N=50

Unmet Need

This category is also part of the proposal narrative and requests information that is pertinent to the community in which the proposal applicant resides. This information provides the proposal reviewer with an idea of what other resources are available in the community for homeless clients, what the general economic conditions are, and where

there is a gap between services needed and services provided. In this part of the RFP, the applicant must justify the need for ESGP grant funds.

Again, a majority of the proposals addressed the requirements of the subcategories included in this section. However, there are a few subcategories that were not addressed fully or at all. “Description of the Unmet Need” is a vital part of this section of the proposal. The applicant must be able to clearly indicate what the need is for their specific client or “target” population. There must be a well-defined unmet need in order to justify a request for grant funds. The results indicate that several proposals were unable to fully describe the unmet need in their community (28%).

The category of Previous Homeless Studies reflected a low percentage of proposals addressing ALL of this subcategory. It is important, however, to keep in mind that many smaller and rural communities may not have adequate resources to conduct a valid homeless population study. Much of the previous homeless study information obtained by these agencies may actually come from national or state-wide publications that are often based on estimates that use 1990 census figures to determine current homeless numbers. Therefore, there may be some applicants who chose to not respond to this issue because there are few, if any, relevant, region-specific homeless studies available. Please refer to Table 5.3 for an overall summary of responses to Unmet Need.

Table 5.3
UNMET NEED: Summary of Findings

<i>Unmet Need</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>SOME</i>	<i>NONE</i>
Description of Extent of Unmet Need	70%	28%	2%
Number of Homeless	76%	8%	16%
Previous Homeless Studies	56%	26%	18%
Inventory of Existing Shelters	80%	10%	10%
Available Bed Space in Community	82%	6%	12%
Number Shelters Serving Target Group	68%	12%	20%
Housing Authority Information	76%	12%	12%
Other Affordable Housing in Area	62%	16%	22%
Welfare Statistics	68%	14%	18%
Unemployment Data	80%	2%	18%

N=50

Project Description

This category is the final part of the proposal narrative. This section of the narrative presents the details of the proposed project. Although there are several different types of shelters/homeless service providers that serve different homeless populations, there are still several issues that must be addressed by all proposal applicants. The results in Table 5.4 indicate a higher percentage of SOME and NONE responses-more so than in previous sections.

“Documentation of Increased Essential Service” applies to all applicants, whether they be new or previously funded. The results indicate that a majority of proposals either did not address this issue (40%) or only partially addressed it (14%). Unlike other seemingly problematic categories, there are no underlying reasons or special conditions that the research uncovered that explains the lack of response.

The subcategory of “Implementation Plan for Homelessness Prevention” revealed a high number of NONE responses (52%), but the proposed project may not have

included a homelessness prevention component at all. In addition, the “Potential Subcontractors for Service Provision” may also have not been applicable to a majority of the proposals if those agencies indicated that they were to provide client services on their own and not use subcontractors for the provision of services. The RFP simply asks the applicant to describe the possible use of any subcontractors.

The subcategory of “Outcomes Expected” is important because it provides the proposal reviewer with an idea of how many clients/services the applicant intends to provide for with their proposed project. As stated above, the results do not reveal any information as to whether or not an agency is actually tracking client outcomes. They also do not indicate if the applicant understands exactly what is being asked of them as far as outcomes are concerned.

Table 5.4
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Summary of Findings

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>ALL</i>	<i>SOME</i>	<i>NONE</i>
Identify Target Group	76%	8%	16%
Activities and Basis for Cost Estimates	82%	12%	6%
Documentation of Increased Essential Services	46%	14%	40%
Implementation Plan for Homelessness Prevention	38%	10%	52%
Potential Subcontractors for Service Provision	14%	6%	80%
Outcomes Expected	52%	6%	42%
Description of Matching Funds	70%	14%	16%
Describe Involvement of Homeless Families	74%	8%	18%
Describe How Project Will Address Unmet Need	86%	10%	4%

N=50

As can be seen by the results, there are a few subcategories that consistently reflected higher numbers in the SOME or NONE categories, but as discussed above there may be several underlying reasons for this. The following chapter provides a summary of the results, conclusions from the findings, and recommendations for overall proposal improvement.

Chapter Six

CONCLUSION

This chapter is intended to summarize the findings of the research and to present recommendations that address the findings. The purpose of this research was to: 1) describe the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program issued by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs and use the RFP to create a practical ideal type; and 2) assess grant proposals submitted for ESGP using the RFP as a standard of comparison.

Summary of Findings

The research was intended to understand or gauge the state of the proposals when compared to the practical ideal type. The results of the research seemed to indicate that a majority of the proposals fully addressed the issues in the categories of *Required Elements* and *Description of Organization*. However, there were several exceptions to that majority, especially within the categories of *Unmet Need* and *Project Description* (See Table 6.1). Some of the “NONE” responses within those categories could be explained due to an issue not applying to a particular organization; however, no method was used to discern between “not applicable” responses and proposals that failed to respond to that issue in their proposal.

The category of *Project Description* is a vital one in regards to assessing a proposal. An organization that cannot provide a suitable plan to address a proposed

Table 6.1

Summary of Findings

RFP Heading	Overall Compliance	Strength	Weakness
<i>Required Elements</i>	High	All	None
<i>Description of Organization</i>	Average	-Current Services	-Staff experience/education -Organizational outcomes
<i>Unmet Need</i>	Below Average	-Inventory of existing shelters -Available bed space of shelter -Unemployment data	-20-40% of proposals failed to adequately address the issues on <i>all</i> the elements
<i>Project Description</i>	Poor	-Identify target group -Basis for cost estimates -Matching funds -Involving homeless families -Project addresses unmet need	-High level of non-compliance on four elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of increased essential services • Implementation plan for homelessness prevention • Potential subcontractors for service provision • Outcomes expected

project will not be deemed adequate for funding by an awarding agency. Teague (1984, p. 217) describes what a successful proposal must have in order to be considered for funding. The "Scope of Work" is the term he uses in place of *Project Description*. In the Scope of Work, the tasks to be performed or service to be provided is explained. Detail about the project is very important because it demonstrates that the applicant has, "thought through the entire process, anticipated potential barriers, and planned for alternatives" (Teague, 1984, p. 219). The specific scope of the State of Texas Emergency Shelter Grant Program and its emphasis on homeless services demands a clear and precise description of a project in order to determine if it is eligible under the federal regulations that govern the grant. Therefore, considering the importance of presenting a proposed project, it is surprising that the results indicated so many proposals responding as either SOME or NONE under the *Project Description* category.

Recommendations

Improvements can be made to increase the quality of proposals. Currently, the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs offers an annual technical assistance workshop for ESGP. Potential applicant organizations are each provided with an RFP. The workshop walks through each section of the RFP and answers applicant's questions in regards to the material presented in the RFP. This workshop was conducted for the FY1998 ESGP funding cycle. Based on the findings of the research, it could be concluded that the technical assistance workshops for ESGP may not provide the kind of assistance necessary to improve the overall quality and responsiveness of a proposal.

Perhaps a better recommendation is to improve the quality of the proposals for the ESG Program with the development of grant-writing workshops, sponsored by TDHCA. There are two reasons for the development of a grant-writing training class at TDHCA. First, employment turnover within non-profits tends to be rather high. This means that the person who wrote last year's grant application may no longer work there, and someone new must inherit the responsibility of writing a new proposal. Many times, that 'someone new' is a person who may not have any writing experience, much less any grant-writing experience. Proper training of grant-writing personnel would allow an organization to have a fair chance at competing for the grant because they would not be debilitated by an inexperienced proposal-writer. Second, providing grant-writing training strengthens and sharpens an organization's writing abilities, which provides for more coherent and consistent proposals. As certain grant sources dry up, non-profits and other organizations find that they must solicit funds from a variety of sources, and many times they must apply for such funds in writing. By strengthening these organizations' writing skills, they are able to confidently apply for other sources of funding that they may have been reluctant to access before. In a small way, a grant-writing workshop may have the ability to empower non-profit organizations to seek new avenues in funding.

Another practical recommendation for improving the quality of proposals submitted for ESGP could be the simple task of providing feedback regarding proposal performance to the applicant. Currently, TDHCA does not readily provide applicants with criticisms of their proposals. If an applicant requests a critique of their proposal, only then is one provided. Whether a proposal was funded or not, by providing input regarding strengths or weaknesses of a proposal, applicants have a chance to view their mistakes and

avoid them in the future. Theoretically, the quality of the proposals should improve over time through the provision of critiques to proposal writers.

Recommendations for future research on the responsiveness of proposals to the RFP should consider some of the factors addressed in Chapter Five. For instance, certain categories within the ideal type were not applicable to several organizations. The percentage of responses to select categories, such as “Potential Subcontractors” may actually be the result of non-applicability, which does not provide a true representation of non-responses. The conceptual framework of the Practical Ideal Type should address those categories that are “not applicable” to certain organizations.

As stated in Chapter Five, the analysis concentrated almost entirely on a description of the proposals and not of the organizations that prepared the proposals. More information about the nature of each organization might be useful in finding reasons for poor proposal performance. Future research could look more closely at the composition of the applicant organizations and see if perhaps there is a relationship between the applicants’ organizational structure and proposal performance. Another relationship to inquire on could be the relationship between the conformity to the Ideal Type and the ultimate acceptance or funding of the proposals.

Another area of future research could concentrate on the ‘intergovernmental relations’ aspect of grantsmanship and the politics involved in administering federal grants within a state system. This might involve looking at the RFP that provided a basis for the Practical Ideal Type. The RFP was originally created from state agency specifications, but where did these specifications come from? Are they a good set of standards to begin with? Do the standards in the RFP provide for an objective review of the proposal? The

standards of the RFP in this research may not be suitable or applicable for this analysis. It is questions like these that provide a basis for additional research.

Conclusion

The research provided a picture of how closely proposals for the ESG Program were to the Practical Ideal Type. What was revealed is that for the most part, the proposals were able to meet most of the requirements of the RFP, with the exception of the Project Description, ironically, the most vital part of the proposal. A recommendation for grant-writing training would certainly improve overall writing skills to a degree and perhaps stress the importance of providing clear and competent information on project activities. In addition, feedback from the grantor organization can only improve the quality of proposals by providing the applicants with the information they need to write solid grant proposals and better their chances for funding.

The research conducted in this paper should be considered by the reader to be preliminary in nature. The Practical Ideal Type is concerned with describing “what is it?” or “what does it look like?” This research project attempted to answer that question in regards to the proposals submitted for the ESGP. However, recommendations for future research should look more closely at applicant organizations themselves and the grant application process in general. Further research can reveal interesting insight as to what makes a successful proposal; it can also uncover and provide understanding of the relationship between the grant system and its players.

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. (1995). The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Blasi, G. & Preis, J. (1987). Litigation on Behalf of the Homeless: Systematic Approaches. Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law. 31, 137-142.
- Burt, M. (1996). Homelessness: Counts and Definitions. In J. Baumohl (Ed.), Homeless In America (pp. 15-23). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (1998, March 9). *Press Release: Government Benefit Programs Cut Poverty Nearly In Half, Analysis Finds*. [Press release posted on World Wide Web]. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved December 1, 1998 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cbpp.org/snd98.html>.
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (1998, June 15). *Press Release: In Search of Shelter: The Growing Shortage of Affordable Rental Housing*. [Press release posted on World Wide Web]. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved December 1, 1998 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cbpp.org/615hous.html>.
- Foster, C.D., Landes, A. & Jacobs, N.R. (1993). Homeless in America: How Could it Happen Here? Wylie, Texas: Information Plus.
- Gelatt, J. (1992). Managing Non-Profit Organizations in the 21st Century. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Hale, G.E., & Palley, M.L. (1981). The Politics of Federal Grants. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Homes for the Homeless. (1998). *Ten Cities: A Snapshot of Family Homelessness Across America, 1997-1998*. New York, NY: Author.
- House the Homeless. (1998). *Universal Living Wage Formula*. Austin, Texas: Author.

REFERENCES

- Koegel, P.M., Burnam, A., & Baumohl, J. (1996). The Causes of Homelessness. In J. Baumohl (Ed.), Homeless In America (pp. 24-33). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Lamb, H.R. & Lamb, D.M. 1990. Factors Contributing to Homelessness Among the Chronically Mentally Ill. Hospital and Community Psychiatry. 41(3), 301-305.
- Lehman, A.F. & Cordray, D.S. (1983, Fall). Prevalence of Alcohol, Drug, and Mental Disorders Among the Homeless: One More Time. Contemporary Drug Problems. pp. 355-383.
- Liebow, E. (1996). A Lack of Affordable Housing Causes Homelessness. In T. L. Roleff. (Ed.), The Homeless: Opposing Viewpoints. (pp. 61-67). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Mihaly, L. (1996). Homelessness Increasingly Affects Families. In T. L. Roleff. (Ed.), The Homeless: Opposing Viewpoints. (pp. 39-45). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Nice, D. C. & Fredericksen, P. (1995). The Politics of Intergovernmental Relations. (2nd edition) Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishers.
- National Coalition for the Homeless. (1998, May). NCH Fact Sheets. Retrieved November 17, 1998 from World Wide Web: <http://nch.ari.net/html>.
- National Law Center On Homelessness and Poverty (1998, November). Causes of Homelessness in America. Retrieved November 17, 1998 from World Wide Web: <http://www.nlchp.org/causes.html>.
- National Law Center On Homelessness and Poverty (1998, November). Selected Rights of Homeless Persons. Retrieved November 17, 1998 from World Wide Web: <http://www.nlchp.org/rights2.html>.
- Nunez, R. (1994). The New Poverty: Homeless Families in America. New York: Plenum Press.

REFERENCES

- Rich, M.J. (1993). Federal Policymaking and the Poor. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenheck, R., Leda, C.A., Frisman, L.K., Lam, J., & Chung, A. (1996). Homeless Veterans. In J. Baumohl (Ed.), Homeless In America (pp. 97-108). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Shields, P.M. (1989, Jan/Feb). Freud, Efficiency, and Pragmatism. Society, 67-72.
- Shields, P.M. (1998). Pragmatism as Philosophy of Science. Research in Public Administration, 4, 195-225.
- Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. (1996). Homelessness Is Sometimes a Legitimate Choice. In T. L. Roleff. (Ed.), The Homeless: Opposing Viewpoints. (pp. 105-110). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, 42 U.S.C. § 3535(d) and 11376 (1989).
- Teague, G. (1984). Request for a Proposal: Solicitation for a Federal Grant. In V. White (Ed.), Grant Proposals That Succeeded. (pp. 215-227). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Texas Council on Family Violence. (1998, October). "Battered Women and Economics." Domestic Violence Fact Sheets. Presented at the annual Texas Homeless Network Conference, Austin, Texas.
- Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, Community Services Section. (1997) 1998 ESGP Request for Proposal. Austin, Texas: Author.
- Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs, Local Government Section. (1981). How to Compete for Grant Funding. Austin, Texas: Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs.

REFERENCES

US Bureau of the Census. (1990) 1990 Census of Population: Count of Persons in Selected Locations Where Homeless Persons Are Found. Washington, DC: US Bureau of the Census.

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1998). 1998 Final Fair Market Rents- Date and Federal Register Preamble 10/3/97. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved December 1, 1998 from the World Wide Web:

http://www.huduser.org/publications/publicassist/assisted/98f_fmr.text.

Zawisza, K. (1991, December). Rural Homelessness: The National Picture. The World and I, pp. 52-57.

Zimmerman, D.E. and Muraski, M.L. (1995). The Elements of Information Gathering. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Count of Persons in Selected Locations Where Homeless Persons are Found: 1990 Census of Population

State	Selected Locations																	
	Shelter and Street Enumeration (8-Night) 1/								Special Place Enumeration for Persons with No Usual Home Elsewhere 2/									
	Emergency shelters		Shelters for runaway, neglected and homeless youth		Visible in street locations		Shelters for abused women		Homes for unwed mothers		Drug/alcohol centers, group homes		Agricultural workers' dorms on farms		Group homes for the mentally ill		Other non-household living situations	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
United States	168,308	100.0	10,320	100.0	48,734	100.0	11,788	100.0	1,882	100.0	62,038	100.0	36,288	100.0	32,348	100.0	87,727	100.0
Alabama	1,367	0.8	183	1.8	384	0.7	127	1.1	29	1.7	548	1.0	16	0.0	191	0.6	743	0.8
Alaska	408	0.2	48	0.4	79	0.2	167	1.3	27	1.8	237	0.5	0	0.0	111	0.3	43	0.0
Arizona	2,000	1.5	136	1.3	1,887	3.8	279	2.4	4	0.2	885	1.7	678	1.9	640	1.7	4,308	4.4
Arkansas	308	0.2	91	0.9	82	0.1	195	0.9	29	1.7	473	0.9	29	0.1	306	0.9	1,777	1.9
California	29,880	17.7	978	9.4	18,081	36.4	1,267	10.7	160	8.9	8,960	17.2	7,542	21.4	8,372	19.8	17,983	18.4
Colorado	2,444	1.5	110	1.1	383	0.8	197	1.4	0	0.0	748	1.4	181	0.5	640	1.7	470	0.5
Connecticut	3,868	2.4	229	2.2	221	0.4	156	1.3	14	0.8	889	1.7	81	0.2	171	0.5	1,988	1.1
Delaware	302	0.2	11	0.1	19	0.0	38	0.3	0	0.0	76	0.1	47	0.1	357	1.1	261	0.2
District of Columbia	4,418	2.6	269	2.6	131	0.3	49	0.4	7	0.4	447	0.9	0	0.0	190	0.6	182	0.2
Florida	6,278	3.7	835	8.1	3,189	6.4	601	5.1	46	2.7	3,819	8.4	10,477	29.7	1,481	4.8	22,812	23.0
Georgia	3,887	2.2	238	2.3	460	0.9	192	1.9	0	0.0	824	1.8	3,868	10.8	288	0.9	1,798	1.8
Hawaii	773	0.5	81	0.8	1,071	2.2	73	0.6	0	0.0	349	0.7	248	0.7	14	0.0	633	0.6
Idaho	380	0.2	71	0.7	19	0.0	78	0.7	0	0.0	120	0.2	733	2.1	103	0.3	622	0.6
Illinois	7,002	4.2	479	4.6	1,786	3.5	838	7.1	120	7.1	1,226	2.4	880	2.4	2,792	8.4	8,107	8.2
Indiana	1,902	1.1	349	3.4	268	0.5	279	2.4	28	1.6	448	0.9	43	0.1	143	0.4	418	0.4
Iowa	780	0.5	209	2.0	148	0.3	184	1.4	12	0.7	320	0.6	79	0.2	614	1.8	817	0.8
Kansas	797	0.5	143	1.4	168	0.3	80	0.6	16	0.9	488	0.9	4	0.0	210	0.6	121	0.1
Kentucky	1,127	0.7	157	1.5	116	0.2	190	1.6	18	1.1	203	0.4	8	0.0	18	0.1	581	0.6
Louisiana	1,321	0.8	238	2.3	184	0.4	244	2.1	101	6.0	441	0.8	0	0.0	110	0.3	1,238	1.3
Maine	380	0.2	30	0.3	7	0.0	43	0.4	10	0.6	167	0.3	0	0.0	182	0.6	202	0.2
Maryland	2,385	1.4	142	1.4	823	1.1	180	1.7	0	0.0	685	1.3	209	0.6	176	0.5	1,824	1.9
Massachusetts	8,948	5.3	259	2.5	874	1.4	289	2.3	57	3.4	2,154	4.1	53	0.2	802	2.5	1,317	1.3
Michigan	3,442	2.0	342	3.3	262	0.5	600	4.3	67	4.0	2,048	3.9	575	1.6	1,464	4.6	1,138	1.2
Minnesota	2,152	1.3	101	1.0	128	0.3	230	2.0	27	1.6	1,785	3.4	9	0.0	1,861	5.2	224	0.2
Mississippi	223	0.1	160	1.6	93	0.2	126	1.1	0	0.0	401	0.8	0	0.0	327	1.0	672	0.7
Missouri	2,164	1.3	122	1.2	216	0.4	117	1.0	100	6.0	1,079	2.1	3	0.0	890	2.8	886	0.9
Montana	419	0.2	26	0.3	17	0.0	48	0.4	14	0.8	61	0.1	9	0.0	8	0.0	82	0.1

1/ Includes persons counted the evening of March 20th in sites listed as shelters for the homeless; women and children counted the evening of March 20th in shelters and safe houses for abused women; persons counted during the early morning hours of March 21st at pre-identified street sites, abandoned buildings and open public locations where homeless persons were likely to congregate.

2/ A separate count of persons who reported they had "no usual home elsewhere" during the standard enumeration of special places and group quarters. Also includes persons who reported they had a usual home elsewhere but did not provide enough address information to locate the usual home elsewhere. When this happened, the persons were counted at the group quarters.

Revised 7/1/92

(Continued)

Persons in Selected Locations Where Homeless Persons are Found: 1990 Census of Population

State	Selected Locations																	
	Shelter and Street Enumeration (S-Night) 1/								Special Place Enumeration for Persons with No Usual Home Elsewhere 2/									
	Emergency shelters		Shelters for runaway, neglected and homeless youth		Visible in street locations		Shelters for abused women		Homes for unwed mothers		Drug/alcohol centers, group homes		Agricultural workers' dorms on farms		Group homes for the mentally ill		Other non-household living situations	
									Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Nebraska	719	0.4	45	0.4	20	0.0	41	0.3	67	3.4	279	0.8	0	0.0	119	0.4	164	0.2
Nevada	878	0.0	35	0.3	436	0.9	48	0.4	0	0.0	185	0.4	0	0.0	91	0.3	2,842	2.0
New Hampshire	334	0.2	43	0.4	8	0.0	27	0.2	0	0.0	207	0.4	15	0.0	211	0.7	79	0.1
New Jersey	7,299	4.3	171	1.7	1,839	3.3	266	2.2	8	0.5	1,474	2.8	639	1.8	899	2.7	1,806	1.8
New Mexico	642	0.4	25	0.2	164	0.3	108	0.9	0	0.0	298	0.6	0	0.0	81	0.3	788	0.6
New York	31,438	18.7	1,038	10.0	10,732	21.6	768	6.4	242	14.4	6,903	13.4	850	1.8	6,388	16.7	8,985	9.2
North Carolina	2,463	1.5	184	1.8	259	0.5	318	2.7	66	3.3	937	1.8	878	2.8	112	0.3	1,932	2.0
North Dakota	279	0.2	0	0.0	30	0.1	36	0.3	0	0.0	49	0.1	0	0.0	8	0.0	36	0.0
Ohio	2,814	2.3	463	4.6	188	0.4	498	4.2	31	1.8	1,083	2.1	88	0.2	391	1.2	1,193	1.1
Oklahoma	2,028	1.2	197	1.9	340	0.7	113	1.0	12	0.7	589	1.1	29	0.1	404	1.2	1,901	1.8
Oregon	3,179	1.9	84	0.8	894	1.1	281	2.1	3	0.2	616	1.0	2,114	8.0	329	1.0	2,322	2.4
Pennsylvania	7,818	4.6	422	4.1	1,312	2.6	803	6.1	78	4.6	2,068	3.9	1,464	4.1	1,027	3.2	1,479	1.5
Rhode Island	433	0.3	36	0.3	44	0.1	33	0.3	0	0.0	432	0.8	0	0.0	118	0.4	11	0.0
South Carolina	814	0.6	169	1.8	102	0.2	87	0.7	24	1.4	173	0.3	547	1.8	138	0.4	1,313	1.2
South Dakota	329	0.2	67	0.6	71	0.1	41	0.3	4	0.2	88	0.2	0	0.0	70	0.2	0	0.0
Tennessee	1,844	1.0	229	2.1	257	0.7	236	2.0	12	0.7	848	1.0	28	0.1	426	1.3	948	1.0
Texas	7,082	4.2	734	7.1	1,442	2.8	1,048	8.9	213	12.7	3,113	6.0	416	1.2	1,346	4.2	7,892	8.1
Utah	894	0.5	31	0.3	278	0.6	49	0.4	8	0.5	340	0.7	75	0.2	108	0.5	638	0.6
Vermont	232	0.1	0	0.0	16	0.0	29	0.2	0	0.0	48	0.1	8	0.0	168	0.6	12	0.0
Virginia	2,544	1.5	113	1.1	318	0.6	186	1.6	23	1.4	1,089	2.1	321	0.9	408	1.3	868	1.0
Washington	4,483	7.7	72	0.7	772	1.8	297	2.5	0	0.0	1,015	2.0	2,142	8.1	636	2.8	2,237	2.3
West Virginia	404	0.2	47	0.5	33	0.1	129	1.1	36	2.1	74	0.1	12	0.0	14	0.0	29	0.0
Wisconsin	1,464	0.9	91	0.9	71	0.1	268	2.2	4	0.2	1,028	2.0	190	0.6	695	2.1	288	0.3
Wyoming	129	0.1	64	0.6	13	0.0	45	0.4	0	0.0	36	0.1	11	0.0	0	0.0	86	0.1

1/ Includes persons counted the evening of March 20th in sites listed as shelters for the homeless; women and children counted the evening of March 20th in shelters and safe houses for abused women; persons counted during the early morning hours of March 21st at pre-identified street sites, abandoned buildings and open public locations where homeless persons were likely to congregate.

2/ A special count of persons who reported they had "no usual home elsewhere" during the standard enumeration of special places and group quarters. Also includes persons who reported they had a usual home elsewhere but did not provide enough address information to locate the usual home elsewhere. When this happened, the persons were counted at the group quarters.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Revised 7/1/92

APPENDIX B

Request for Proposals for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program

(Partial copy)

(To view a copy of the complete Request for Proposals, see:
Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. [1997].
1998 ESGP Request for Proposal.)

TEXAS EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) PACKET

PART A. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - REQUIREMENTS

I. BACKGROUND

The Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) is authorized by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 as amended, (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11371 et seq.). The Governor has designated the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (TDHCA) as the administering agency for this program. Funds will be made available to eligible applicants, based on this statewide competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, to carry out the purpose of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has not announced the amount of the FY 1998 ESGP award to the State of Texas .

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Texas Emergency Shelter Grants Program (ESGP) is to:

- a. help improve the quality of existing emergency shelters for the homeless;
- b. help make available additional emergency shelters; and,
- c. help meet the costs of operating emergency shelters and of providing certain essential services to homeless persons, so that these persons have access not only to safe and sanitary shelter, but also to the supportive services and other kinds of assistance they need to improve their situations.

Definition of Homeless

The term "homeless" or "homeless individual" includes:

- (1) An individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, or
- (2) An individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is
 - (a) a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing for the mentally ill);
 - (b) an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or,
 - (c) a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings. (Exclusion: The term "homeless" or "homeless individual" does not include any individual imprisoned or otherwise detained pursuant to an Act of Congress or a State law.)

III. SUBMISSION INFORMATION

The deadline for receipt and consideration of a proposal is the close of business, 5:00 p.m., **Monday, February 16, 1998**. Proposals must arrive at TDHCA on or before the deadline. Proposals received after the deadline will not be considered. An **original and two copies of each proposal must be submitted** and may be mailed or delivered in person or by special delivery to:

Mailing Address

E. E. Fariss, Assistant Manager
Planning & Contracts Management
Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs
Post Office Box 13941
Austin, Texas 78711-3941

Street Address

507 Sabine, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701

Proposals must be typed--double spaced-- on standard 8½" by 11" paper and have consecutively numbered pages. Proposals must be bound using binder clips. **DO NOT USE FOLDERS OR NOTEBOOKS OF ANY TYPE.** The original must contain original signatures and original pictures. Questions pertaining to the content of this RFP packet may be directed to Eddie Fariss at (512) 475-3897, Dyna Cole at (512) 475-3905, or Stephanie Bond at (512) 475-4618.

IV. ELIGIBLE APPLICANT ENTITIES

Eligible applicant entities are: (1) units of general local government; and (2) private nonprofit organizations, if the unit of local government in which assisted projects are to be located certifies that it approves of the private nonprofit organization's proposed project. TDHCA will accept certification of approval of a private nonprofit organization's project from the chief elected official (or an official designated to act on behalf of the CEO) for either the city or county in which the project will be located. This includes the county judge, mayor, city manager, assistant city manager, city or county community development or human services director. All private non-profits and units of general local government must document the participation of homeless or formerly homeless individuals on its board of directors or other policymaking entity in order to be eligible to receive these funds

V. IMPORTANT POINTS

1. Each unit of local government or nonprofit applicant for ESGP funds must provide for the participation of homeless or formerly homeless individuals on its board of directors or other policymaking entity in order to be eligible to receive these funds.
2. The provision of food to ESGP participants is now considered an operational expense and should be included under the Maintenance and Operations category. Previously, food was defined as an essential service.
3. **Projects that request funding for renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion MUST:**
 - A. Include plans for lead-based paint abatement if the shelter facility contains this hazardous material, and/or if it was constructed prior to 1978. Refer to Narrative Outline, Part III. Project Description.
 - B. Include the completed Preliminary Environmental Review Checklist contained in the RFP. The authorized signatory for your organization may sign this checklist. However, if the Chief Elected Official of the city or county in which project will be located has agreed to assist with the environmental review requirements, they may complete and/or review and sign the checklist instead. Refer to Section XI for more information on environmental requirements.
4. If your organization has applied for or has received other funds that are or will be dependent on receiving an ESGP grant award, please discuss this in the narrative section of the Project Description.
5. Public Law 101-645 of 1990 revised the limits on the amount of ESGP funds that the state can provide for essential services and homelessness prevention activities. The total aggregate amount allowed under the state's ESGP allocation may not exceed 30% on essential services and 30% on homelessness prevention activities. These limits do not strictly apply to individual grant amounts, but are taken into account when funds are initially obligated and must be considered throughout the year when amending contracts.
6. The narrative must not exceed 10 pages for proposals involving one or two organizations, or 15 pages for proposals involving three or more organizations (see Narrative Outline instructions).

VI. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Eligible activities under the Emergency Shelter Grants Program are described in 24 CFR 576.21 (54 Fed. Reg.; 46801; November 7, 1989). A copy of this rule is included in the RFP Packet. **ESGP GRANT AMOUNTS MAY BE USED FOR ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES RELATING TO EMERGENCY SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS:**

- A. Renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion of buildings for use as emergency shelters** (any facility whose primary purpose is to provide temporary or transitional shelter for the homeless). TDHCA encourages proposals designed to provide innovative approaches for providing emergency and transitional housing for homeless persons in addition to proposals that include the provision of temporary emergency shelter. Transitional housing means a project that is designed to provide housing and appropriate essential services to homeless persons in order to facilitate the movement of homeless individuals or families to independent living within 24 months. Any renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion activities must comply with local government safety and sanitation requirements of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, as provided in 24 CFR 8.23 (a) or (b). (See Federal Register Vol. 53; No. 106; June 2, 1988; p. 20233.)
- B. Provision of essential services to the homeless.** Essential services include services concerned with employment, health, drug abuse, and education and may include (but are not limited to):
- (a) Assistance in obtaining permanent housing;
 - (b) Medical and psychological counseling and supervision;
 - (c) Employment counseling;
 - (d) Nutritional counseling;
 - (e) Substance abuse treatment and counseling;
 - (f) Assistance in obtaining other Federal, State, and local assistance including mental health benefits; employment counseling; medical assistance; Veteran's benefits; and income support assistance such as SSI, AFDC, and Food Stamps;
 - (g) Other services such as child care, transportation, job placement, and job training; and,
 - (h) Staff salaries necessary to provide the above services.
("staff salaries" are defined as wages and fringe benefits, as described by applicant's personnel policies.)

Salary of staff whose sole duty is the provision of essential services is an eligible ESGP expense. The proposal must include a job description for any position to be paid in full or in part with ESGP funds under this category.

The applicant must document that each proposed essential service represents a **new service or a quantifiable increase in the level of service** above that which was provided during the previous 12 months using *local funds provided by the unit of general government in which the proposed activities are to be located.
**local funds are defined as any locally generated tax revenue.*

- C. Payment of maintenance, operation [food, rent, repair, security, fuels and equipment, insurance, utilities], and furnishings. Note:** Not more than 10% of each grant may be used for *operation staff costs*. This limit on operation staff costs does not affect the allowability of essential services staff salaries.
- D. Developing and implementing homelessness prevention activities.**

1. If grant funds are used to provide homelessness prevention assistance, the following conditions must be met:
 - a. the inability of the *family to make the required payments is due to a sudden reduction in income (or a sudden increase in expenses);
 - b. the assistance is necessary to avoid the foreclosure, eviction, or termination of utility services;
 - c. there is reasonable prospect that the family will be able to resume the payments within a ** reasonable period of time; and,
 - d. the assistance does not supplant funding for pre-existing homelessness prevention activities from any other sources.

*(A group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption who reside together. Family also may include a one person family.)

**("Reasonable period of time" means a period of time determined by the recipient and applied consistently to all clients receiving homelessness prevention services.)

2. homelessness prevention activities may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Short-term subsidies to help defray rent and utility arrearages for families that have received a notice of foreclosure, eviction, or termination of utility services;
 - b. Security deposits or first month's rent to enable a homeless family to move into its own apartment;
 - c. Mediation programs for landlord/tenant disputes;
 - d. Programs to provide legal services for the representation of indigent tenants in eviction proceedings;
 - e. Payments to prevent foreclosure on a home; and
 - f. Other innovative programs and activities designed to prevent the incidence of homelessness.
3. TDHCA will accept proposals which include homelessness prevention as a part of the project or as the sole activity of a project.
4. Any proposal containing homelessness prevention activities must describe the type(s) of activities to be undertaken and must contain a specific and detailed implementation plan (i.e., who will provide the homelessness prevention activities; what criteria will be used to determine who will receive assistance; method for determining if the homelessness prevention assistance applicant meets the guidelines set forth under #D.1. of the eligible activities list in this section; etc.) .
5. Homelessness prevention services may be offered to a family only if its annual income is at or below the poverty line for their family size as established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Poverty Income Guidelines (see Attachment I), in addition to the restrictions set forth in 576.21 (a)(4)(ii).

VII. INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Emergency shelter grants may not be used for activities other than those described in Sec. VI above. Grant amounts may not be used for new construction. Grant amounts may not be used to renovate, rehabilitate, or convert buildings owned by primarily religious organizations or entities unless the conditions of 24 CFR 576.22(b) are met. (Also, see Attachment G.) **The requirements of 24 CFR 576.22(b)(2) do not apply to projects limited to essential services, maintenance/operations, and homelessness prevention.** However, 576.22(b)(1) does apply to all project activities undertaken by a primarily religious organization.

VIII. CONTRACT AMOUNTS

TDHCA has established a minimum of \$30,000 and a maximum of \$100,000 per project for ESGP grants. A city or county may apply for up to \$100,000 for each project included in the city's or county's proposal. Cities or counties receiving an ESGP contract will receive administrative assistance in an amount of up to 5% of the ESGP funds obligated by TDHCA. ESGP entitlement cities and counties (those receiving ESGP funds directly from HUD) that are awarded an ESGP grant from TDHCA will receive the amount represented by the difference between the applicable TDHCA maximum less their HUD allocation. This restriction does not apply to private nonprofit organizations located in ESGP entitlement cities or counties.

If two or more nonprofit organizations are submitting a combined application, each nonprofit may apply for up to the maximum \$100,000 per project. One of the nonprofit organizations or a nonprofit coalition must take the lead role as contractor.

All projects should be planned for a maximum of 12 months. TDHCA reserves the right to negotiate the final grant amounts and local match with all applicants to ensure judicious use of these funds. **All grant amounts must be obligated no later than 180 days after the grant award from TDHCA.**

IX. LOCAL MATCH REQUIREMENT

As per 24 CFR 576.71, each grantee must supplement its ESGP grant amount with an equal or greater amount of match funds from sources other than ESGP funds. These match funds must be provided after the date of the grant award. Federal funds may not be used to match ESGP funds with the exception of Community Services Block Grant, Community Development Block Grant, and HOME funds. **Matching funds used for this ESGP project may not be used to match any other project or grant.**

The required match may include:

1. **the value of any donated material or building.** The fair market value of the building may be used as match only if the building was donated for the activities in your ESGP proposal and is not currently being used for the activities included in the proposal. If you are using the fair market value of donated property as match, submit documentation from the appraisal district, an appraiser, or Realtor and information relating to the donation of the building, including when the building was donated and for what purpose, current use of building, whether it is used to serve homeless persons, and for how long has it been used for its current purpose.
2. **the value of any rent or lease on a building.** The fair market rental or lease value of the building, based on 12 months or the proposed length of the project, may be used as match. (If you are using the fair market lease or rent value as match, please submit a letter from the appraisal district, an appraiser, or Realtor that specifies location of building, square footage, amount it would lease or rent for per square foot, and the total lease or rent value).
3. **any salary paid to staff of the recipient in carrying out the emergency shelter program.** (If you are using any staff salaries as match, submit information stating the position/title, their annual salary, the percentage of their time dedicated to ESGP grant activities, and the amount of their salary that will be used as match).
4. **the time and services contributed by volunteers to carry out the emergency shelter program, determined at the rate of \$5 per hour.**

X. REQUIRED USE OF BUILDINGS AS A SHELTER

Major rehabilitation or conversion activities, where rehabilitation or conversion involves costs in excess of 75% of the value of the building prior to rehabilitation or conversion, requires that the facility be maintained as a shelter for the homeless for not less than a 10 year period.

Renovation, defined as rehabilitation that involves costs of 75% or less of the value of the building before rehabilitation, requires that the facility be maintained as a shelter for the homeless for not less than a 3 year period.

An ESGP recipient using program funds to provide **essential services, maintenance and operating costs, or homelessness prevention activities** must carry out the assisted activities for the period during which ESGP assistance is provided.

XI. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The 1988 McKinney Amendment Act revised the environmental review procedures for assistance under Title IV of the Act, including ESGP, by making applicable the provisions of, and regulations and procedures under section 104(g) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 5304 (f)). The regulations are codified at 24 CFR Part 58. (Also, see 24 CFR 576.52, included in this RFP.)

Funds may not be obligated or expended for rehabilitation activities (see definition in 576.3) in projects that have not been environmentally cleared. For ESGP funds distributed by the State to units of general local government, the unit of general local government must assume the environmental responsibilities specified in section 5304(f)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The State will be responsible for providing a release of funds in accordance with the requirements of 24 CFR Part 58. For funds distributed by the State to nonprofit organizations, the State must assume the environmental responsibilities specified in section 5304(f)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. HUD will provide the release of funds in this instance. In either case, funds may be obligated or expended only after the Request for Release of Funds and Certification of Compliance with Environmental Regulations at 24 CFR Part 58 have been approved in writing.

The ESGP RFP packet includes a **Preliminary Environmental Review Checklist (Attachment F)** which is designed to assist TDHCA in determining the level of assessment necessary to meet the requirements of 24 CFR Part 58. Projects will be determined as: (1) exempt; (2) categorically excluded; (3) environmental assessment required; or, (4) projects requiring environmental impact statements.

If the project contains renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion, the authorized signatory for the organization may complete and sign this checklist. (If the Chief Elected Official of the city or county in which the activities will occur has agreed to assist with the environmental review requirements, they may complete and/or review and sign the checklist.). **If your organization receives an ESGP grant award containing funds for rehabilitation, and the Chief Elected Official of the city or county in which the activities will occur has agreed to assist with the environmental review requirements, a final environmental review checklist must be completed and signed by the CEO or their designee (mayor, city manager, assistant city manager, city or county community development or human services director, or county judge).** This final environmental checklist, along with additional material necessary to release rehabilitation funds, then must be submitted to TDHCA.

A previous environmental review may be adopted if TDHCA determines that no environmentally significant changes occurred since the review was done. Please specify this intent in the narrative of your proposal and, if possible, submit a copy of the prior environmental review.

All proposals from private nonprofit organizations that contain renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion projects must contain documentation that the private nonprofit organization has requested the Chief Elected Official (or their designee) of the city or county in which the project will be located to assist the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs with the environmental review requirements. As per 24 CFR 576.52(b)(3), the cooperating local government may conduct the environmental review and TDHCA would independently evaluate the information submitted and subsequently assume all responsibilities of 24 CFR Part 58.

Bonus points will be given to any proposal submitted by a private nonprofit organization documenting that the city or county in which the proposed activities will occur has agreed to assist TDHCA with the environmental review responsibilities on behalf of that private nonprofit organization.

XII.REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Each recipient will be required to submit monthly Financial Status and Performance Reports, plus any other reports deemed necessary by TDHCA. Specific information on the format and due dates of required reports will be provided to grant recipients.

XIII. SELECTION PROCESS

TDHCA utilizes a statewide competitive Request For Proposal (RFP) process to obligate its ESGP allocation. TDHCA has distributed the RFP packets to organizations requesting it, including cities, counties, and private nonprofit organizations.

In FY 1998, ESGP funds will be distributed based on 11 TDHCA service regions (See Attachment K). A portion of the total funds available will be reserved for each of the 11 service regions based on the poverty population of each region (i.e. Region 1, with 4.55% of the State's poverty population, gets 4.55% of the available funds, etc.). Poverty population will be used due to the absence of a comprehensive homeless census.

Proposals will be grouped, reviewed, and evaluated according to region. The review instrument, which is based on the RFP, will allow each reviewer to determine if the proposal contains all the required items, and to score each question based on consistent criteria. Proposal scores will be averaged, and applicable bonus points will be added to the averaged scores. The proposals then will be ranked by score within each region.

TDHCA will determine the number of proposals that can be funded within each region based on the amount of funds available for distribution within each region, and the amount of funds requested by the top-ranking proposals within that region. The funding recommendations will be reviewed and approved by the Director of Administration and Community Affairs and the Executive Director of TDHCA.

Factors to be considered in the review of each proposal include, but are not limited to:

- A. Documentation of the nature and extent of the unmet needs of homeless persons in the area to be served;
- B. Applicant's experience in providing services to meet the emergency needs of homeless persons (including documentation of fiscal accountability);
- C. The extent to which proposed activities meet the identified needs;
- D. Applicant's ability to carry out proposed activities.
- E. Participation in local homeless coalitions, social service coordinating councils, continuum of care plans, or HUD consolidated plans;
- F. The documentation of outcomes that measure the effectiveness of programs; (See Attachment M, ESGP Memorandum #98-12.2).

The criteria for awarding **bonus points** in the FY 1998 obligation process include:

- A. Proposals received from non-entitlement areas;
- B. Proposals received from cities or counties;
- C. Proposals from private nonprofit organizations that include documentation that officials of the city or county in which the assisted project will be located have agreed to perform the environmental review responsibilities on behalf of that private nonprofit organization.

PART B. RFP DEVELOPMENT INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMS

I. PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT

Each proposal must contain the items listed below in the following order:

- A. **Cover letter** on agency/organization letterhead, including contact person(s) and telephone number, and fax number. The cover letter must include the following statement: "We certify that this organization provides for the participation of homeless or formerly homeless individuals on its board of directors or other policymaking entity as documented on page _____ of this ESGP application."
- B. **Standard Form 424** (Attachment A). Complete only the following sections: 2,5,6-12,14,15a & g, 17, and 18a-e. **NOTE: The person signing this form must be the authorized signatory for ESGP contract, if awarded.**
- C. **Table of Contents** (must include page numbers).
- D. **Numbered pages** for the narrative and required documents of the proposal (excluding the audit).
- E. **Proposed Use of Funds Form** (Attachment C).
- F. **Project Narrative** (10 page limit if project involves 1-2 entities, 15 page limit if project involves 3 or more organizations)
- G. **Photographs** - Include required photographs at the end of project narrative. Provide photographs of at least two sides of the facility from which assistance is provided. Include at least one set of original photos. If requesting funds for renovation or rehabilitation, submit photographs of the areas to be rehabilitated.
- H. **Table 1 - Description of Activities** (Attachment D-1).
- I. **Table 2 - Match Funds** (Attachment D-2).
- J. **If proposal includes renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion activities, the following items must be included:**
 - 1. **Preliminary Environmental Review Checklist** (Attachment F).

2. A copy of **appraisal of property** to be affected. Any reasonable method for determining property value is acceptable. Examples of no cost or low cost appraisals include city or county tax appraisal or a broker's price opinion based on sales of comparable properties in the area.
 3. A copy of the **flood plain map**. Include the panel number and indicate the location of the project.
 4. A **letter from the Texas Historical Commission** regarding the historical significance of the facility or a copy of a letter to the THC requesting clearance. A copy of the letter requesting clearance is acceptable to meet the deadline requirement. If your organization is awarded ESGP funds, please forward THC response to our Department. When requesting clearance from the Texas Historical Commission, include any written information regarding the structure and pictures of at least two sides of the structure. Address your letter to: Curtis J. Tunnell, Executive Director, Texas Historical Commission, Post Office Box 12276, Austin, Texas 78711, 512/463-6100.
- K. List of Board members (nonprofit organizations) or other policymaking entity (units of general local government). Include information on length of term, frequency of Board meetings, and attendance figures for previous 12 months. It is optional for your organization to provide information on profession, gender, ethnicity, and age of Board members. However, each unit of local government and nonprofit organizations applying for ESGP funds must identify the homeless or formerly homeless person on the membership list. This will document how the organization provides for the participation of homeless or formerly homeless individuals on its board of directors or other policymaking entity, as required. (Refer to Applicant Certifications, Attachment E-1).
- L. If you are a **Private Nonprofit organization**, you must submit:
1. **Certification of city or county approval of project**. (Attachment B);
 2. Currently effective Internal Revenue Service (IRS) ruling providing **tax-exempt status** under SEC. 501(c)(3) of the IRS Code. (Letters from the State Comptrollers Office will not be accepted in lieu of an IRS ruling; and,
 3. If the proposal contains renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion activities, **documentation that the private nonprofit organization has requested the CEO of the city or county in which assisted project will be located to assist TDHCA with the environmental review requirements as per 24 CFR 576.52(b)(3).** (See Part A. Section XI.)
- M. **ESGP Applicant Certifications** (Attachment E-1 and E-2).
- N. If applicable, **Contractual Agreement Between Recipient and Religious Organizations** - (Attachment G).

- O. **Previous ESGP Funding Form (Attachment J)** Please identify any ESGP funds previously received either directly from TDHCA or through subcontract with a city or county that has received an ESGP grant from TDHCA.
- P. **Documentation of fiscal accountability** - (1) one copy of the most recent audit conducted; and, (2) either documentation of a current Fidelity Bond or a letter of commitment to obtain the same prior to execution of a contract. If your organization has never had an audit conducted, include a letter of explanation and a statement of income and expenses and balance sheet for the past year of operation. All organizations submitting an ESGP proposal that have been audited in the past must submit a copy of the most recent audit (**including management letter**) with the ESGP proposal, even if a copy of that audit currently is on file at TDHCA.

II. PROJECT NARRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS

The following outline must be used when developing the narrative portion of your proposal. The proposal narrative must provide all the information requested, when applicable, and follow the order of the outline. The narrative should be formatted with one inch margins and double spaced on 8 1/2"X 11" paper. Font size may be no smaller than 10. ***The narrative must not exceed 10 pages for proposals involving one or two organizations, or 15 pages for proposals involving three or more organizations.***

I. DESCRIPTION OF APPLICANT ORGANIZATION

A. Description of Organization and Services Provided

1. Provide a general description of your organization.
2. Describe staff experience and education.
3. Describe current services:
 - a. Type of services provided.
 - b. Number of persons served.
 - c. Target group(s) currently served.
 - d. Cities and/or counties served by your organization.
 - e. Bed space of your organization's shelter, if applicable.
4. Describe any restrictions (formal or informal policy or procedures) imposed by your organization on the provision of services and the basis for these restrictions.
5. Provide any other pertinent organizational information.

B. Continuum of Care and Transitional Services

1. Describe your organization's participation in any local homeless coalition, social services coordinating council, development of the HUD-required Consolidated Plan or similar document, and/or development of a "continuum

of care" plan for the community in which your services will be delivered through this ESGP project.

2. Describe how your organization coordinates services and resources with other service providers in the area.
3. If applicable, describe and document the effectiveness of your organization's transitional programs/services which assist homeless persons achieve self-sufficiency.
4. Describe other outcomes your organization has achieved; (Refer to Attachment M, ESGP Memorandum #98-12.2).

C. Previous ESGP Funding

1. Describe the services provided with previous ESGP funds from TDHCA (or TDCA).
2. Describe how previous ESGP funds have improved or increased your services.
3. Describe new sources of funds accessed or developed during previous ESGP funding period(s) and efforts made to access or develop funding sources in the absence of future ESGP funding.

II. UNMET NEED

- A. Describe the nature and the extent of the unmet need for services for homeless persons in the area to be served.
- B. Please complete the following list of information. This will assist TDHCA in assessing the nature and the extent of the unmet need for services for homeless persons in the area to be served. Provide the most current and available information that is applicable and state your sources.
 1. Estimates on the number of homeless persons:
 2. Previous homeless studies:
 3. Inventory of existing shelters:
 4. Available bed space in your community:
 5. Number of shelters serving the target group(s) served by your organization:
 6. Housing authority information: (# of Section 8 certificates and or vouchers, housing authority units, number of persons on waiting list, etc.):
 7. Other affordable housing available in the community:

8. Local welfare statistics:

9. Local unemployment data:

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Proposed Use of ESGP Funds)

A. Provide a summary description of your proposed project.

1. Identify any target group(s) to be served.

2. Describe activities and cost estimates and basis for cost estimates for each activity. If requesting funds for renovation, major rehabilitation, or conversion, project description must include current appraised value of facility. This figure must be consistent with the documentation provided in Part B - I. J. 2.

3. If requesting funds for rehabilitation, include discussion of abatement of lead-based paint and/or asbestos, if applicable. Specify if the proposal contains a certification from a city or county that they will assist with any required environmental review. Also, include documentation on when the facility was constructed and note the construction date in your narrative.

4. If requesting essential service funds, document that the service is a new service or a quantifiable increase in the level of service that was provided locally during the previous 12 months.

5. For homelessness prevention requests, describe in detail the implementation plan.

6. Specify any potential subcontractors that you are planning to use to deliver services to homeless persons, and their proposed activities.

7. Describe outcomes your organization plans to achieve as a result of this project; (Refer to Attachment M, ESGP Memorandum #98-12.2).

B. Narrative must include a description of source(s) of match funds consistent with table D2. Note - Only the following federal funds are allowable match for ESGP: Community Services Block Grant, Community Development Block Grant, and HOME funds.

C. Describe how your organization will involve homeless families and individuals in renovating, maintaining, operating, and providing services to shelter residents.

D. Describe how and to what extent the proposed activities will enable your organization to meet the unmet need for adequate services for homeless persons in the area to be served.

APPENDIX C

Sample of Applicant Organizations for the State of Texas FY98 ESGP

1. City of Wichita Falls- Wichita Falls, Texas
2. City of Amarillo- Amarillo, Texas
3. Kleberg County- Kingsville, Texas (county seat)
4. SEARCH- Houston, Texas
5. Salvation Army- Tyler, Texas
6. El Paso Coalition for the Homeless- El Paso, Texas
7. Women's Resource and Crisis Center- Galveston, Texas
8. YMCA Casa Shelter- Dallas, Texas
9. Hays-Caldwell Women's Center- San Marcos, Texas
10. Dallas Jewish Coalition- Dallas, Texas
11. Women In Need- Greenville, Texas
12. San Angelo AIDS Foundation- San Angelo, Texas
13. Southside Community Center- San Marcos, Texas
14. Sanctuary: A Place for the Displaced- Austin, Texas
15. Port Cities Rescue Mission- Port Arthur, Texas
16. Respite Care- San Antonio, Texas
17. Bay Area Sheltering Arms- Baytown, Texas
18. Permian Basin Center- Midland, Texas
19. Panhandle Community Services- Amarillo, Texas
20. Sabine Valley Center- Longview, Texas
21. Montgomery County Women's Center- The Woodlands, Texas
22. Caprock Community Action Association- Crosbyton, Texas
23. Antioch Project Reach- Houston, Texas
24. Bread of Life- Houston, Texas
25. Salvation Army- Fort Worth, Texas
26. Amistad Family Center- Del Rio, Texas
27. Child Crisis Center- El Paso, Texas
28. Community Action Council of South Texas- Rio Grande City, Texas
29. Coastal Bend Rehab- Corpus Christi, Texas
30. New Beginning- Garland, Texas
31. Abilene Hope Haven- Abilene, Texas
32. Foundation for the Homeless- Austin, Texas
33. LifeNet- Dallas, Texas
34. Victoria Christian Assistance Ministry- Victoria, Texas
35. Home and Hope Shelter- Killeen, Texas
36. The Bellows- Houston, Texas
37. Corpus Christi Metro Ministries- Corpus Christi, Texas
38. Legal Services of North Texas- Dallas, Texas
39. Brighter Tomorrows- Grand Prairie, Texas
40. Hope, Inc.- Denton, Texas
41. Matagorda County Crisis Center- Bay City, Texas
42. Westside Homeless Partnership- Houston, Texas
43. Family Violence & Sexual Assault Prevention- Corpus Christi, Texas
44. House of Praise- Beaumont, Texas
45. Women's Shelter of East Texas- Nacogdoches, Texas
46. The Family Place- Dallas, Texas
47. Star of Hope- Houston, Texas
48. Women's Protective Services- Lubbock, Texas
49. East Texas Crisis Center- Tyler, Texas
50. Housing Crisis Center- Dallas, Texas

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY SHEET for ESGP PROPOSALS

RFP Heading	Contains All	Contains Some	Contains None
<i>Required Elements</i>	<i>(# of responses)</i>		
Cover letter	48	-----	2
Form 424	50	-----	-----
Table of Contents	49	-----	1
Numbered Pages	50	-----	-----
Proposed Use of Funds Form	50	-----	-----
Project Narrative	50	-----	-----
Photographs	50	-----	-----
Description of Activities	50	-----	-----
Matching Funds Form	50	-----	-----
Board list or policy-making entity	50	-----	-----
Approval of project form	49	-----	1
Tax-exempt status	47	-----	-----
Applicant certification E-1	50	-----	-----
Applicant certification E-2	49	-----	1
Financial Statements	50	-----	-----
<i>Description of Organization</i>			
Staff experience and education	33	15	2
Type of current services	46	4	-----
Number of persons served	45	2	3
Target Groups	43	5	2
Cities/counties served	43	3	4
Bed space of shelter	31	2	17
Member of coalition	38	5	7
Coordination of services and resources	42	5	3
Effectiveness of transitional programs	30	12	8
Organizational outcomes	27	3	20
Previous ESGP funding	33	3	14
<i>Unmet Need</i>			
Description of extent of Unmet Need	35	14	1
Number of homeless	38	4	8
Previous homeless studies	28	13	9
Inventory of existing shelters	40	5	5
Available bed space in community	41	3	6
Number shelters serving target group	34	6	10
Housing Authority information	38	6	6
Other affordable housing in area	31	8	11
Welfare statistics	34	7	9
Unemployment data	40	1	9
<i>Project Description</i>			
Identify target group	38	4	8
Activities and basis for cost estimates	41	6	3
Documentation of increased essential services	23	7	20
Implementation plan for homelessness prevention	19	5	26
Potential subcontractors for service provision	7	3	40
Outcomes expected	26	3	21
Description of Matching Funds	35	7	8
Describe involvement of homeless families	37	4	9
Describe how project will address unmet need	43	5	2

N=50