**Preproposal Conference Questions received 9/2/2020**

What is the number of CoC member organizations?

OK504 consists of all of Cleveland County, not just Norman. There are 41 CoC organizations

About how many individual representatives across all CoC organizations should we plan to collect input from?

Definitely from the Executive CoC Board members representing 23 organizations/affiliations and then the CCM (Coordinated Case Management) Committee representing another 10+ organizations in addition to the 23 on the Executive Committee representing our Continuum.  The CCM can be in a group Zoom Meeting, there will be some overlap between agencies but the personnel are different representing on the committees.

How many states would you like to see represented in the comparison analysis?

We would like to see Oklahoma City and Tulsa included as well as peer communities similar in size; homeless populations and funding such as; Roanoke City and County/Salem, VA, Rockford, IL, and Lincoln, NE.

Are you open to alternative methods to gain input from CoC members?

Yes

Will in-person meetings be required during the course of this project?

Undetermined at this time. Zoom will be the primary method of contacting individuals & groups. We will require in person presentations to the City Council and CoC with the final results. We expect that these will be done as part of the same final trip.

Under the circumstances of the pandemic, is the City willing to conduct meetings and individual interviews through video conferencing if necessary?

Yes

Are there page limits for the RFP?

No, but we informally ask that you try to keep it under 50 pages.

The RFP provided reasons for the differences in the annual Point in Time Count. The City took over providing the temporary winter shelter this last fiscal year. However, if it was being operated prior to last year, I would expect the unsheltered numbers to be similar (as the sheltered number is). Can the City explain the substantial drop in unsheltered people during FY2020?

The winter of 19-20 the City of Norman operated the Warming Shelter for the first time. Previously the shelter had been operated by Food and Shelter, Inc., a local homeless service provider. They had operated the shelter since approximately 2010. In September 2019, FSI announced that they were not going to operate the shelter due to multiple reasons.

The previous shelter was also a low barrier shelter and was operated in the dining room of their facility with patrons sleeping on the floor. All belongings could be brought inside and the only staffing was the shelter monitor. Check –in was conducted sporadically and there was no attempt at case management and discussion of housing opportunities. No actual security was provided other than the monitor and the Norman Police Department was called regularly for disturbances.

While FSI indicated that all data was placed into HMIS, the data quality never met the standard for timeliness or accuracy. When partner agencies were attempting to locate a particular person confirmation of them staying at the warming shelter was difficult to obtain from FSI.

The shelter that the City of Norman operated, while still a low barrier shelter, focused on not only a safe place to stay but case management and housing opportunities. Over the course of the operation of the shelter 52 people staying at the shelter received permanent housing. This is partially the cause in the drop of unsheltered.

The day of the PIT, although there were multiple teams throughout the day visiting the known areas of congregation and the encampments, the count was low compared to the By Name List.

To date; 51 Chronic individuals have been housed, and 15 Veterans.  Because of the robust system we have built over the years, the BNL is the community’s pulse to ensuring everyone who touches our system as homeless is accurately assessed, counted, and tracked through the system. The BNL list is an ongoing carefully monitored list of the CoC’s partnering agencies contributing names and prioritizing the individuals / families according to many factors. This list is not just a one day/night snapshot of homelessness, it is an ongoing, active list that is worked/reviewed continuously. The current BNL include 133 persons who are Chronic and 217 that are at risk for being qualified as Chronic in the new future.

The BNL allows our CoC to understand how individuals move in and out of our system on an ongoing basis, recording accurate real-time data to measure how successful we are at ending homelessness throughout our CoC. Homelessness is a dynamic, person-specific problem that changes from night to night from person to person. A single point in time data is insufficient to help local partners in a community respond quickly to such as constantly shifting issue. A rapid feedback loop on who and how many people are experiencing homelessness in a community at any given time is a more vital and actionable resource than almost anything else local leaders could implement. It is the essential compass to every community needs in order to make decisions at the speed of homelessness. We believe this is the emerging lesson of tried and true lessons and research in the field, and it has proven to be the most successful form of maintaining a formalized, accurate list of who is homeless in a community.

How does the lack of a bond initiative of the four propositions from August 25 negative vote affect Norman Forward and the scope of this RFP?

The failure of all four GO Bond Proposals, including Proposal 2 ($5 million towards one or more built solutions to address homelessness) does not affect the scope of this RFP. As mentioned the $5 million figure was an arbitrary figure established by the City Council and in no way indicates what is expected to be proposed by this Study. It is staff’s opinion that the arbitrary nature of this GO Bond proposition was a primary reason for the failure. Additionally, of the 4 propositions on the ballot, the homeless funding vote was very close (approximately 200 votes out of 23,000 votes). We feel confident that a well-considered recommendation from this study will receive stronger support in the future.

Although the City included a budget, we did not see a specific request for cost. Does the City care if we include a cost estimate with our proposal? If we are to provide a project cost, is there a desired format?

As discussed, each proposal should be assessed that the work indicated can be completed within the established budget of $100,000. We expect to request additional budget information from those firms that short-listed for interviews in the next phase of consideration. Pricing structure will ultimately be negotiated after selection.

Please provide a title or person to whom we can address the Transmittal Letter.

Jane Hudson

Director of Planning and Community Development

What support can we expect from the City for existing data outside of the comprehensive plans already provided?

We fully intend to share anything that the selected consultant feels is relevant, but will need direction in the form of a Request for Information in the first phase of the project. In creating the RFP, staff has already identified a shortlist of additional information that they will be sharing with the selected consultant.