KING COUNTY

1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Signature Report

March 25, 2014

Motion 14096

Proposed No. 2014-0098.1   **Sponsors** Lambert

1   A MOTION acknowledging receipt of an implementation

2   report on the Safe Harbors Management Information

3   System as required by Ordinance 17619, Section 42,

4   Proviso P1.

5   WHEREAS, Ordinance 17619 is the 2013 first omnibus supplement amending the

6   2013 Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 17476, and the 2013/2014 Biennium Budget

7   Ordinance, Ordinance 17476, which appropriated the children and family services fund

8   2013/2014 Biennium Budget Ordinance in Section 42; and

9   WHEREAS, Ordinance 17619, Section 42, contained one proviso concerning

10    $250,000 that shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits an

11   implementation report on the Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System

12   and a motion that acknowledges receipt of the report, and the motion is passed by the

13   council;

14   NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

15   The council acknowledges receipt of the report, as described in this motion and is

16   Attachment A to this motion, and releases $250,000 for expenditure of the $250,000 that

17   is the subject of Section 42, Proviso P1.

18

Motion 14096 was introduced on 3/10/2014 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 3/24/2014, by the following vote:

Yes: 9 - Mr. Phillips, Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Dunn, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski and Mr. Upthegrove
No: 0
Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Larry Phillips, Chair

ATTEST:

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Attachments: A. Alternative Options for the Management of Safe Harbors

Attachment A
2014-098

Safe Harbors

Alternative Options for the Management of Safe Harbors

January 28, 2014

14096

Document Control Page

Document Status: Final Draft
Document Date: 1/28/2014

Document Purpose

This document presents the management options for Safe Harbors to the Temporary Advisory Group (TAG) subcommittee for review and discussion. Once accepted by the subcommittee, this document will be presented to the King County Council.

Version	Date	Description/Changes
0.9	10/22/13	Initial draft of the management options.
1.0	11/25/13	Initial draft of the pros and cons of the management options.
1.1	12/24/13	Initial draft of the Management Options report.
1.2	12/27/13	Revised draft of the Management Options report.
2.0	1/6/14	Updated with comments from the TAG subcommittee.
2.1	1/13/14	Final version for TAG review.
2.2	1/23/14	Final version incorporating comments from the TAG.
2.3	1/28/14	Updated with additional comments from 1/28 TAG meeting.

MTG
Management
Consultants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(MTG
Management
Consultants

I.   Executive Summary

MTG
Management
Consultants

I.   Executive Summary

This report focuses on questions raised by both routine City of Seattle internal review practices and a King County budget proviso enacted by Ordinance 17619 around Safe Harbors (SH) management options. This report presents nine options that satisfy the requirements of the proviso and is the work of the Temporary Advisory Group (TAG)[1] and its subcommittee, charged with defining management options for SH and producing a report to the King County Council.

A.   History

SH was originally implemented in 1999 in response to a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) directive to begin collecting data on homeless persons through a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). SH is funded by King County, the City of Seattle, and United Way of King County (UWKC), and is managed by the City of Seattle's Human Services Department (HSD). SH's earliest implementations were limited in scope, but transitioned to a new, off-the-shelf system approved by sponsoring partners[2] in 2007. In 2008, the State of Washington Department of Commerce (DoC), with the support of SH and the sponsoring partners, switched to Adsystech, a provider of software, database, and service solutions for governments and human services agencies. The Adsystech software is provided through a contract with the State of Washington DoC, which furnishes HMIS for the entire state.   In Seattle and King County, SH provides the services for the HMIS project management, help desk, user support, training, and data analysis and reporting.

Between summer 2012 and May 2013, a technical assistance team, composed of outside consultants, assessed SH's HMIS services for the Continuum of Care (CoC) and SH funders.[3] The assessment was funded by a HUD grant. The purpose of the assessment was to identify the root causes of perceived and/or real problems across a variety of HMIS functional areas and to make recommendations for corrective action. In addition, the Seattle HSD Director dedicated departmental funding to increase the scope of the technical assistance grant to identify what was working well and what could be improved within Safe Harbors.

The findings and recommendations in the technical assistance report, as well as continued community feedback about SH issues, created an elevated level of concern from the King

---

[1]   The SH HMIS TAG was created to support the development and implementation of an action plan in response to the "Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Final Report: Findings and Recommendations," as well as the budget proviso issued by the King County Council on July 8, 2013. A subcommittee of the TAG has been formed to identify alternative options for the management of SH.

[2]   The sponsoring partners are the City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD), King County, and United Way of King County.

[3]   The Cloudburst Group, Tony Gardner Consulting, Seattle/King County Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Final Report: Findings and Recommendations, May 24, 2013.   Prepared for: Seattle/King County Safe Harbors HMIS Funders Group

MTG
Management
Consultants

County Council, which, under the signature of Councilmember Lambert, issued a letter in June 2013 asking for measureable progress in the following areas:

- Improvement in vendor management of Adsystech.
- Enhancement of IT and system administration skills.
- Improvement in responsiveness to the needs of provider agencies.
- Improvement in Data Quality.

Each of these items is addressed in the TAG Action Plan, included as Appendix B. In addition to the letter, the King County Council included a proviso in Ordinance 17619 (included as Appendix A) calling for a review of SH management options, which has led to this report.

B.   Potential Management Options

The members of the TAG examined nine management options, which are discussed in this report. These options are derived from three major categories of organizations, with each category having three different and specific types of organizations.

Category A: New Association

This category includes three potential structures for a new organization that would run SH. In this model, the staff[4] would be employees of the new organization run by a board of directors comprised from stakeholder organizations.

> *Organization 1 – A.1 –* Not-for-profit.
> *Organization 2 – A.2 –* Consortium of providers.
> *Organization 3 – A.3 –* Interlocal agreement (ILA).[5]

Category B: Government Organization

This category would rely on a government organization to house and operate SH to the satisfaction of the key stakeholders. Under this option, SH would be managed through a committee structure with administrative support (e.g., human resources, financial, purchasing) from the government provider.

> *Organization 4 – B.1 –* City of Seattle.
> *Organization 5 – B.2 –* King County.
> *Organization 6 – B.3 –* Washington Department of Commerce.

---

[4] The subcommittee made no attempt to define whether new staff would be hired outside of existing staff, existing staff would transfer to other organizations, or some other hiring or screening process would be employed.

[5] The Interlocal Agreement (ILA) option creates a separate, formal organization with an executive director reporting to a defined Board of Directors. This differs from the other new associations in that it is a government organization established under Washington law.

MTG
Management
Consultants

Category C: Third Party HMIS User Organization

This category would contract with an existing HMIS user organization to perform SH functions with the goal of providing alignment between the business providers and SH objectives, in that an organization doing the work would be housing and operating SH.

Organization 7 – C.1 – SH run by HMIS user organization.
Organization 8 – C.2 – SH integrated into HMIS user organization.
Organization 9 – C.3 – United Way of King County (UWKC).

Each option was examined in detail, and implementation timelines and cost estimates were developed.

C. Highlights

The subcommittee meetings generated some keen insight on the strengths and weaknesses of the management options. The highlights are:

- Options that are in the same locality as the majority service area are best.
- Within the new organizations, only Option A.3 – the ILA – provides more benefits and strengths than weaknesses and will be responsive to the SH mission.
- Option A.3 – the ILA – provides a blend of a new organization and a government organization.
- The SH operation for Seattle – Option B.1 – is the least costly option, and is predominantly positive.
- Moving SH to King County – Option B.2 – is a positive option that also provides the depth of skills and support that would benefit the organization.
- Representatives from both DoC and UWKC – Options B.3 and C.3, respectively – express serious concerns about the viability of these organizations housing SH, due primarily to existing limitations internal to those organizations.
- The options that help restore confidence in SH within the community should be given primary consideration.
- The new organization options – A.1, A.2, and A.3 – provide the opportunity to build a SH organization that is solely focused on its mission.
- The ability of the organization to manage Adsystech is a key factor in the decision on any management option.

1. Option Suitability

The subcommittee developed a summary table indicating its overall assessment of the suitability of each option. The subcommittee's outlook on each option is listed below.

Option	Opinion
A.1 – Not-for-Profit	Neutral
A.2 – Association	Neutral
A.3 – ILA	Positive
B.1 – Seattle	Positive
B.2 – King County	Positive
B.3 – DoC	Unlikely
C.1 – SH *with* HMIS	Neutral
C.2 – SH *in* an HMIS	Neutral
C.3 – UWKC	Unlikely

The subcommittee was not asked to present a formal recommendation to the Council. As a result, the subcommittee focused its analysis on the three options identified as "positive."

2.   Cost Ranges

The following costs ranges were determined based on the lowest-cost option and the highest-cost option.

	Lowest Cost	Highest Cost
Implementation Cost	$68,800	$649,200
Annual Operating Cost	$1,028,561	$1,254,875

3.   Implementation Time

The following implementation time frames were determined based on the fastest option and slowest option.

	Shortest Estimate	Longest Estimate
Duration to Implement	13 Weeks	34 Weeks

4.   Other Key Notes

It is important to note that SH is dependent on the information coming from the HMIS user organizations and the existing Adsystech solution that is under contract through the State of Washington DoC until March 2016. Some agencies are entering data in both their own internal systems and in the SH Adsystech system due to the challenges of the SH data integration capabilities. These factors are the critical elements that must be addressed to improve information on homelessness in Seattle and King County.

MTG
Management
Consultants

Finally, there is a clear legislative issue in Washington State, because HMIS user organizations are required to obtain consent from clients to enter data regarding their service utilization into the HMIS system. The large number of individuals who refuse to provide consent result in an average of a 30 percent loss in data collected. Until this fundamental issue is solved, the SH program will be limited by this information gap.

MTG
Management
Consultants

II.   Introduction

MTG
Management
Consultants

II.   Introduction

In response to a letter dated June 20, 2013, from the King County Council, the three sponsoring partners of Safe Harbors (SH) – the City of Seattle, United Way of King County (UWKC), and King County – formed a Temporary Advisory Group (TAG) to ensure implementation of recommendations in the May 2013 HUD Technical Assistance Report and to respond to questions raised in the County Council's proviso to Ordinance 17619. As part of the TAG, King County Information Technology (KCIT) requested assistance facilitating the work of a TAG subcommittee charged with defining management options for SH and producing a report for the Council. This document is the outcome of the subcommittee's efforts.

A.   Safe Harbors and the Council Proviso

SH was originally implemented in 1999 in response to a HUD directive to begin collecting data on homeless persons through a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). SHs' earliest implementations were limited in scope, and as a result, system data quality was poor and unable to meet data collection requirements. A transition plan to move to a new off-the-shelf system was approved by the sponsoring partners in 2007. In 2008, the State of Washington Department of Commerce (DoC), with the support of SH and the sponsoring partners, switched to Adsystech, a provider of software, database, and service solutions for governments and human services agencies. In Seattle and King County, SH provides the services for the HMIS project management, help desk, user support, training, and data analysis and reporting. The Adsystech software is provided through a contract with the DoC, which furnishes HMIS for the entire state.

As a result of the switch to the Adsystech software, there was an increase in provider participation, bringing coverage from 170 programs in late 2008 to 340 programs in 2010. The Seattle-King County Continuum of Care (CoC) obtained a $1 million bonus award from HUD for homeless projects in 2010 in part as a result of improved data quality.

Between summer 2012 and May 2013, a technical assistance team, composed of outside consultants, carried out a detailed assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of SH, which furnishes HMIS services for the CoC. The purpose of the assessment was to identify the root causes of perceived and/or real problems across a variety of HMIS functional areas, and to make recommendations for corrective action. The assessment was a part of the technical assistance being provided to the Seattle/King County CoC by HUD under the HUD Priority Communities Initiative. The HUD Priority Communities Initiative is a joint effort of HUD and the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH), providing comprehensive technical assistance to nine selected priority communities across the country (including Seattle/King County) in an attempt to "move the needle" on homelessness in the selected communities, which together account for a significant part of the American homeless population.

In addition, former City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) Director Ms. Dannette Smith dedicated departmental funding to go above and beyond the scope of the HUD

technical assistance grant. She invested departmental funds to identify what was working well and what could be improved within SH. The technical assistance consultants interviewed SH users and committees, and reviewed the bugs and fixes needed for the Adsystech system. Based on the information collected, they provided a report entitled "Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Final Report: Findings and Recommendations." The report identified a number of problems with the Adsystech system, continuity in management, and many other ongoing concerns which the TAG is currently addressing.

One of the issues discussed in the report was the continuity of SH management. There have been six managers in eight years. (Since the assessment was conducted, a new Safe Harbors Technical Program Manager was hired and has led the team for nearly a year. The new structure, with the new Program Manager in place, has resulted in a significant decrease in complaints about the system and an increase in issue resolution.)

The technical assistance report created an elevated level of concern from the King County Council, which under the signature of Councilmember Lambert, issued a letter in June 2013 asking for measureable progress in the following areas:

- Improvement in vendor management of Adsystech.
- Enhancement of IT and system administration skills.
- Improvement in responsiveness to the needs of provider agencies.
- Improvement in Data Quality.

In addition to the letter, the King County Council included a proviso in Ordinance 17619[6] calling for a review of SH management options, which has led to this report. An excerpt from the Ordinance is included as Appendix A. In addition to this report, the TAG has drafted an action plan and is actively working through the plan with several actions aimed to improve SH operations. While it is a work in progress, the current version of the action plan is included as Appendix B.

B.   Facilitated Process

MTG Management Consultants, LLC (MTG) was selected as the successful bidder to provide facilitation services for the TAG subcommittee. The subcommittee consists of the following members:

- Ms. Patrice Frank, City of Seattle, MPA, SH Program Manager
- Ms. Diep Nguyen, King County, Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS), IT Service Delivery Manager
- Mr. Bill Kehoe, King County, Chief Information Officer

---

[6]   In Section 42, beginning at line 750 of Ordinance 17619, $250,000 would be allocated to SH upon a motion accepting this report.

MTG
Management
Consultants

- Mr. Greg Ferland, King County, Community Services Division (CSD) Director
- Ms. Hedda McLendon, MPH, YouthCare Director of Programs
- Dr. Tracy Hilliard, Ph.D., MPH, City of Seattle Human Services Department
- Ms. Mary Schwartz, Washington DoC

MTG worked with the subcommittee over a 10-week period to facilitate discussion and agreement on management options, criteria for evaluation options, strengths and weaknesses, implementation timelines, and costs for each option. The information presented in this report is the end product of the 10 weeks of work completed by the TAG subcommittee.

C.   TAG Subcommittee Results

This report is the result of the efforts of the TAG subcommittee. It is organized in the following sections:

- *Executive Summary.* Provides a brief summary of needs, process, and options.
- *Introduction.* Provides the background of concerns leading to this report, a summary of the process, and an explanation of the SH organization.
- *Management Options.* Outlines each of the management options evaluated, the pros and cons of each option, a timeline for implementing the options, and cost estimates.

The proviso did not request a defined recommendation for a particular option. Thus, while the TAG subcommittee did weigh the merits of each option, they did not provide a specific recommendation, but rather focused around three that were identified as "positive." The remaining section discusses the nine management options.

MTG
Management
Consultants

III. Management Options

MTG
Management
Consultants

III. Management Options

SH is examining the following management options for the operations and control of the program. There are three categories of organizations presented below, each in their own subsections. Within each subsection there are three different organizations, representing different types of organizations. This creates nine organizations that were reviewed:

Organization 1 – A.1 – New Association – Not-for-profit.
Organization 2 – A.2 – New Association – Consortium of providers.
Organization 3 – A.3 – New Association – ILA.
Organization 4 – B.1 – Government Organization – City of Seattle.
Organization 5 – B.2 – Government Organization – King County.
Organization 6 – B.3 – Government Organization – Washington DoC.
Organization 7 – C.1 – Third Party HMIS User Organization – SH run by HMIS user organization.
Organization 8 – C.2 – Third Party HMIS User Organization – SH integrated into HMIS user organization.
Organization 9 – C.3 – Third Party HMIS User Organization – UWKC.

Each category and type of organization may have assumptions with the option or type of organization. Structural or unique cost assumptions will be included in the introduction of the option. All cost assumptions that apply to all of the options are described in Appendix A. The pros and cons for each organization are listed below.

A. New Association

This category of three options contemplates forming a new organization to run SH. In the options evaluated in this category, SH staff would be employees of a new organization, run by a board of directors composed of stakeholder organizations. The following assumptions apply to all three types of new associations:

- This organization would hold the contracts and process funds associated with SH.
- Staff costs would be 10 percent higher in two of three organizations to compete with private organization salaries.

A potential risk with a new organization would be the organization's management of cash flow. The subcommittee evaluated three organization types within this category:

1. [A.1] Not-For-Profit

This option contemplates forming a separate 501c(3) not-for-profit organization to focus only on the SH mission. It would be formed by filing bylaws and/or articles of incorporation in the State. Incorporating would create a legal entity enabling the organization to be treated as a corporation by law and to enter into business dealings, form contracts, and own property as any other individual or for-profit corporation may do. It would be run by a board structured in

MTG Management Consultants

the bylaws, and would have regular meetings and power to amend the bylaws. The board would provide direction to SH, and would hire an executive director to lead SH. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- Staff would be employees of the 501c(3).[7]
- The 501c(3) board would be established by the stakeholders from any qualified individuals.

This option would require changes to reporting, committee structures, and, potentially, objectives.

Pro:

- This organization would be governed by HUD and would most likely participate in its financial systems – i.e., aligned with HUD funding structure and understanding HUD guidelines.
- It would operate within Continuum of Care (CoC) user organizations.
- The existence of a peer entity running HMIS could make provider agencies more likely to report.
- A new organization could target hiring for specific skills to increase technical excellence.
- A sole-focus organization could be more nimble and responsive to customer needs, and focused on customer communication and satisfaction.
- All organization personnel would focus on the skills necessary for SH success.
- Leadership would be focused on only the SH agenda.
- Sponsors would focus on SH mission.
- The organization could hire specific staff to handle the requirements effort.
- The organization could focus on the HMIS solution vendor and the associated management tasks necessary for that vendor.
- A single organization would be directly accountable for the SH program and could provide a strong governance model for SH.
- A single organization would potentially be the most nimble and responsive to SH program concerns.
- The organization would have the potential to hold the contracts for HMIS user organizations[8], and could hold the organizations accountable for services.

---

[7] As noted in the executive summary, the subcommittee made no attempt to define whether new staff would be hired outside of existing staff, or existing staff would transfer to other organizations, or some other hiring or screening process would be employed.

[8] As a legal organization, funders could contract with the 501c(3), which would in turn contract with HMIS user organizations. This might simplify programs with multiple funders. While not a current function of SH, this is a potential benefit that could result from this type of organization.

MTG
Management
Consultants

Con:

- The organization would be somewhat removed from the immediate funding stream for CoC services.

- Due to its size and limited focus on SH, the organization may not have leverage on its vendor.

- Not all elements would be able to be managed under one roof, e.g., the 501c(3) is not a funding agency that specifies where funds will be directed.

- With its limited size and staffing, the organization might not be able to leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.

- Having focused resources, the organization might not have the ability to leverage alternative resources.

- The solitary focus of this organization (i.e., lack of diversification) could place its sustainability at risk.

- The organization could be vulnerable to outside influences that could affect viability – e.g., federal program changes, changes in political direction related to homelessness.

- The organization is not the current Adsystech contract holder.

- The organization would need additional resources to complete RFP processes.

- The organization does not have staff and resources to deal with liability concerns, or would have to build the capacity to do so.[9]

- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Draft Charter/Bylaws**	Notice to Proceed (NTP)	3 weeks
2	**Organize Board of Directors**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
3	**Form Organization**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	5 weeks
4	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	3 weeks
5	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 9 weeks (Tasks 2 and 4 Complete)	2 weeks
6	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	8 weeks

---

[9] The organization is not big enough to have legal staff, but will likely have a few liability concerns and legal issues that will require legal advice. Other options have organizations with that capability, so this point is raised to show the need to potentially resolve the issue if this option were selected.

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
7	**Establish Office**	NTP + 19 weeks (Tasks 5-6 Complete)	2 weeks
8	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	8 weeks
9	**Hire Executive Director (ED)**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 2 Started)	10 weeks
10	**Contract Project Manager (PM)**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
11	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 9 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
12	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 15 weeks (Tasks 9 and 11 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 13 weeks (Task 9 Complete)	6 weeks
14	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	6 weeks
15	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	6 weeks
16	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 11 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	4 weeks
17	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	3 weeks
18	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 21 weeks (Tasks 1-17 Complete)	Milestone
19	**Train Staff**	NTP + 21 weeks (Task 18 Complete)	3 weeks
20	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 21 weeks (Task 18 Complete)	1 week
21	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 22 weeks (Tasks 8 and 20 Complete)	1 week
22	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 23 weeks (Tasks 18 and 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 24 weeks (Task 22 Complete)	1 week
24	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 25 weeks (Task 23 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 26 weeks (6 months), and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT I.

Cost:

The cost of implementation is estimated to be $638,200. The cost is based on the following elements:

MTG
Management
Consultants

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Assistance creating the charter and bylaws of the 501C.	$15,000
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as filing files, business license, recording fees, etc.	$2,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.	$12,000
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.	$45,000
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.	$30,000
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.	$100,000
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[10]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.	$4,000
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[11]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization	$5,000
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.	$10,000
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.	$8,000
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.	$3,000
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$21,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000

The ongoing annual costs, including salaries, are estimated to be $1,254,875. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease.	$72,000
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED salary.	$177,775
Staff salaries.	$891,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection.	$6,600
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$60,000

---

[10]   160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.
[11]   3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months. See Appendix C, Cost Assumptions.

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option A.1 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Duration	Gantt Bar / Label
1	Draft Charter/Bylaws	3 wks	Draft Charter/Bylaws
2	Organize Board of Directors	6 wks	Organize Board of Directors
3	Form Organization	5 wks	Form Organization
4	Locate Office Space	3 wks	Locate Office Space
5	Complete Lease	2 wks	Complete Lease
6	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	8 wks	Purchase Furnishing and F...
7	Establish Office	2 wks	Establish Office
8	Implement IT Infrastructure	8 wks	Implement IT Infrastructu...
9	Hire ED	10 wks	Hire ED
10	Contract PM	6 wks	Contract PM
11	Search for Staff	6 wks	Search for Staff
12	Hire Staff	6 wks	Hire Staff
13	Contract Temp Staff	6 wks	Contract Temp Staff
14	Establish Benefits	6 wks	Establish Benefits
15	Establish Policies and Procedures	6 wks	Establish Policies and Procedures
16	Establish Accounting	4 wks	Establish Accounting
17	Implement Communications	3 wks	Implement Communications
18	Begin Operations		◆ 7/25
19	Train Staff	3 wks	Train...
20	Transfer SH Equipment	1 wk	Transfer SH E...
21	Transfer Data	1 wk	Transfer D...
22	Adjust Data Feeds	1 wk	Adjus...
23	Verify Information Flows	1 wk	V...
24	Confirm All Operations	1 wk	

Timeline header: March (2/16, 3/9), April (3/30, 4/20), May (5/11), June (6/1, 6/22), July (7/13), August (8/3)

MTG
Management
Consultants

The 501c(3) organization would present an annual budget and be audited annually.

2. [A.2] Consortium of Providers

The consortium option would represent a "membership organization" and would most likely be formed in the same manner as a 501c(3) not-for-profit. The difference would be that the board would be elected by the providers. The board would provide direction to SH, and would hire an executive director to lead SH. This option would require changes to reporting, committee structures, and, potentially, objectives. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- HMIS user organizations would join the consortium and become "members".
- Board membership would most likely be drawn from the consortium's members.
- Staff would be employees of the consortium.

It is also important to note there are other mechanisms to form the new consortium, as explored in the "existing providers" section below. However, this is believed to be the most neutral.

Pro:

- The new consortium would be comprised of member CoC user organizations.
- The existence of a peer entity running HMIS could make provider agencies more likely to report.
- The new consortium could be nimble and responsive to customer needs and focused on customer communication and satisfaction.
- It would have the full support of the HMIS user organizations.
- It would have resources available to set standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- The member HMIS user organizations may provide a pool of resources available to draw upon, e.g., specific expertise, knowledge, or staff skills not available in the SH team.
- Leadership would be focused on only the SH agenda.
- The new consortium could hire specific staff to handle the requirements effort.
- This option is potentially the most nimble and responsive to SH program concerns.

Con:

- The new consortium might not be able to manage all elements under one roof.
- With its limited size and staffing, the consortium might not be able to leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.

- Having focused resources, the organization might not have the ability to leverage alternative resources.

- The consortium could be vulnerable to outside influences that could affect viability – e.g., federal program changes, changes in political direction related to homelessness.

- Not all skills, including technical skills, may be available, and may not be focused on SH.

- The consortium might have divided interests other than SH.

- The organizations that would form the consortium are not current Adsystech contract holders.

- The consortium would need additional resources to complete RFP processes.

- Participating HMIS user organizations may have competing efforts underway that would conflict with the anticipated requirements effort.

- The consortium does not currently have staff and resources to deal with liability concerns, or would have to build the capacity to do so.[12]

- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organizations related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Draft Charter/Bylaws**	NTP	4 weeks
2	**Organize Board of Directors**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
3	**Seek Interested Parties**	Notice to Proceed (NTP)	4 weeks
4	**Form Organization**	NTP + 4 weeks (Tasks 1 and 3 Complete)	5 weeks
5	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	3 weeks
6	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 10 weeks (Tasks 2 and 5 Complete)	2 weeks
7	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 12 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	8 weeks
8	**Establish Office**	NTP + 20 weeks (Tasks 6-7 Complete)	2 weeks
9	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 12 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	8 weeks

---

[12] The organization is not big enough to have legal staff but will likely have a few liability concerns and legal issues that will require legal advice. Other options have organizations with that capability, so this point is raised to show the need to potentially resolve the issue if this option were selected.

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
10	**Hire ED**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 2 Started)	10 weeks
11	**Contract PM**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
12	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 10 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 16 weeks (Tasks 10 and 12 Complete)	6 weeks
14	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 14 weeks (Task 10 Complete)	6 weeks
15	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 10 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	6 weeks
16	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 10 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	6 weeks
17	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 12 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	4 weeks
18	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 12 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	3 weeks
19	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 22 weeks (Tasks 1-18 Complete)	Milestone
20	**Train Staff**	NTP + 22 weeks (Task 18 Complete)	3 weeks
21	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 22 weeks (Task 19 Complete)	1 week
22	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 23 weeks (Tasks 9 and 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 24 weeks (Tasks 19 and 22 Complete)	1 week
24	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 25 weeks (Task 23 Complete)	1 week
25	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 26 weeks (Tasks 20 and 24 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 27 weeks (just over 6 months), and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT II.

Cost:

Similar to A.1, above, the cost of implementation is estimated to be $638,200. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Assistance creating the charter and bylaws of the 501C	$15,000
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as filing files, business license, recording fees, etc.	$2,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit	$12,000
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.	$45,000
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.	$30,000

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option A.2 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	February 1/26	2/16	March 3/9	April 3/30	May 4/20	5/11	June 6/1	July 6/22	7/13	August 8/3
1	Draft Charter/Bylaws	4 wks		Draft Charter/Bylaws							
2	Organize Board of Directors		6 wks		Organize Board of Directors						
3	Seek Interested Parties	4 wks		Seek Interested Parties							
4	Form Organization		5 wks		Form Organization						
5	Locate Office Space		3 wks	Locate Office Space							
6	Complete Lease				2 wks	Complete Lease					
7	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures					8 wks			Purchase Furnishi		
8	Establish Office							2 wks	Establish C		
9	Implement IT Infrastructure					8 wks			Implement IT Infr		
10	Hire ED		10 wks			Hire ED					
11	Contract PM		6 wks		Contract PM						
12	Search for Staff				6 wks		Search for Staff				
13	Hire Staff					6 wks		Hire Staff			
14	Contract Temp Staff					6 wks		Contract Temp Sta			
15	Establish Benefits				6 wks		Establish Benefits				
16	Establish Policies and Procedures				6 wks		Establish Policies and Procedures				
17	Establish Accounting				4 wks	Establish Accounting					
18	Implement Communications				3 wks	Implement Communications					
19	Begin Operations								◆ 8/1		
20	Train Staff								3 wks		
21	Transfer SH Equipment								1 wk	Transfe	
22	Transfer Data								1 wk	Tra	
23	Adjust Data Feeds								1 wk		
24	Verify Information Flows									1 wk	
25	Confirm All Operations									1	

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.	$100,000
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[13]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.	$4,000
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[14]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization	$5,000
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.	$10,000
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.	$8,000
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.	$3,000
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$21,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000

Similar to A.1, above, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to be $1,254,875. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease.	$72,000
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED salary.	$177,775
Staff salaries.	$891,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection.	$6,600
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$60,000

The association organization would present an annual budget and be audited annually.

3. [A.3] Interlocal Agreement

This option would create a separate government organization through Washington law allowing Interlocal Agreements (ILAs) that would operate at the direction of a board defined

---

[13]   160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.
[14]   3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

MTG
Management
Consultants

in the ILA. The ILA is formed by formal legislative action of the subject government agencies for the purposes of providing a defined set of services to multiple units of government without being a specific part of any of the specific government agencies that form the ILA.[15] The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- The ILA most likely would not face competition from the private sector, and therefore would not have the 10 percent addition on staff costs.

- When the organization is formed, the ILA would have to evaluate the interest for supporting the organization from King County and the City of Seattle. This adds some time to early tasks in the timeline when compared to other options.

- The ILA might achieve cost savings if supported by either the City of Seattle or King County. However, the savings are dependent on services offered by supporting organizations and accepted by the ILA.

- The ILA option assumes equivalent administrative support is available to the ILA as is currently available to SH. The cost of this option increases without this or equivalent support.

The board would provide direction to SH, and would hire an executive director to lead SH. In addition, staff could be employees of the organization or provided through a support agreement from other organizations, such as the City of Seattle. The ILA is a small government organization that has a specific purpose and is built to fulfill that purpose. They are typically very efficient and economical. ILAs generally rely on one of the constituent government organizations for administrative support but has its own decision and approval process.

Pro:

- An ILA would be aligned with the funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).

- This organization could participate in HUD financial systems implementing HMIS services – i.e , aligned with HUD funding structure and understanding HUD guidelines.

- It would be within CoC user organizations.

- It would be able to manage all elements to support funding, technical support, governance, and vendor.

- It would be able to target hiring for specific skills to increase technical excellence.

---

15 An example of an ILA existed in Pierce County. The Law Enforcement Support Agency (LESA) was an ILA formed by Pierce County and the City of Tacoma to provide E911 services to the region. The LESA Board consisted of the Mayor of Tacoma, Tacoma Police Chief, County Executive, County Sheriff, and a member of the community selected by the City and County. This organization served the community for 38 years until last year, when it was expanded to become South Sound 911.

MTG
Management
Consultants

- It would have the ability, by virtue of its association with a government agency, to contract out/acquire specific, focused IT skills.
- Dedicated technical resources would be focused on support of SH only (e.g., data analysis and understanding of the data). This is a true strength for the option.
- It would be able to leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.
- It would be able to be nimble and responsive to customer needs and focused on customer communication and satisfaction.
- It would have the strongest sponsorship due to board organization and participation.
- It would have strong financial backing and additional resources when necessary in order to dedicate resources to SH.
- It would have funding and resources that could be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- The ILA would have to be formally dissolved to terminate the organization, providing formal longevity.
- Resources would be available to set the standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- All organization personnel would be focused on the skills necessary for SH success. Leadership would be focused on only the SH agenda.
- Sponsors would focus on SH mission.
- The ILA would be able to go to governance and stakeholders to get enhanced support and have broader discussions for SH.
- The ILA would have good vendor management skills and be able to manage large vendors like those likely to provide SH services.
- The ILA could rely on B.1, B.2, or B.3 for skills to create, proffer, and contract in support of the RFP and selection process.
- It could hire the specific staff to handle the requirements effort.
- It could also draw on the B.1, B.2, and B.3 to handle the requirements effort.
- The ILA would be directly accountable for the SH program and under a strong governance for SH.
- The ILA would potentially be the most nimble and responsive to SH program concerns.
- It would have the potential to hold the contracts for HMIS user organizations[16], and to hold the organizations accountable for the services.

---

[16] As a legal organization, funders could contract with the ILA, which would in turn contract with HMIS user organizations. This might simplify programs with multiple funders. While not a current function of SH, this is a potential benefit that could result from this type of organization.

MTG
Management
Consultants

- It would be a focused organization (only does SH business), and would help instill confidence by having a non-biased agenda (not easily influenced by parent or member agendas).

Con:

- The ILA is not the current Adsystech contract holder.
- The ILA does not have the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns, or would have to build the capacity.[17]
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organizations related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	Draft Charter/Bylaws	NTP	3 weeks
2	Approve Charter	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	4 weeks
3	Organize Board of Directors	NTP + 7 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
4	Form Organization	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	8 weeks
5	Locate Office Space	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	7 weeks
6	Complete Lease	NTP + 13 weeks (Tasks 3 and 5 Complete)	2 weeks
7	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	NTP + 15 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	8 weeks
8	Establish Office	NTP + 23 weeks (Tasks 6-7 Complete)	2 weeks
9	Implement IT Infrastructure	NTP + 15 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	8 weeks
10	Hire ED	NTP + 7 weeks (Task 3 Started)	10 weeks
11	Contract PM	NTP + 7 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
12	Search for Staff	NTP + 13 weeks (Task 3 Complete)	6 weeks
13	Hire Staff	NTP + 19 weeks (Tasks 10 and 12 Complete)	6 weeks
14	Contract Temporary Staff	NTP + 17 weeks (Task 10 Complete)	6 weeks

---

[17] The organization is not big enough to have legal staff but will likely have a few liability concerns and legal issues that will require legal advice. Other options have organizations with that capability, so this point is raised to show the need to potentially resolve the issue if this option were selected.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
15	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 13 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	6 weeks
16	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 13 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	6 weeks
17	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 15 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 10)	4 weeks
18	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 15 weeks (Task 6 Complete)	3 weeks
19	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 25 weeks (Tasks 1-18 Complete)	Milestone
20	**Train Staff**	NTP + 25 weeks (Task 19 Complete)	3 weeks
21	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 25 weeks (Task 19 Complete)	1 week
22	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 26 weeks (Tasks 9 and 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 27 weeks (Tasks 19 and 22 Complete)	1 week
24	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 23 Complete)	1 week
25	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 29 weeks (Tasks 20 and 24 Complete)	1 week

Note some of the ILA tasks are longer than previous options, such as the 9 weeks involved in finding an office (7 weeks) and completing the lease (2 weeks). The overall timeline is 30 weeks (7 months) and is planned for implementation at a *moderate* pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT III.

Cost:

Similar to A.1, above, the cost of implementation is estimated to range from $505,200 to $638,200. There are potential reductions if agreements can be made between the ILA and a government agency to provide the services at a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Assistance creating the charter and agreements for the ILA	$15,000
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as filing files, business license, recording fees, etc.	$2,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[18]	*No Charge to $12,000*
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[18]	*$20,000 to $45,000*

---

[18] This cost may be reduced to the lower end of the range indicated if space or resources are available in the City of Seattle or King County.

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option A.3 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Duration	Timeline label
1	Draft Charter/Bylaws	3 wks	Draft Charter/Bylaws
2	Approve Charter	4 wks	Approve Charter
3	Organize Board of Directors	6 wks	Organize Board of Directors
4	Form Organization	8 wks	Form Organization
5	Locate Office Space	7 wks	Locate Office Space
6	Complete Lease	2 wks	Complete Lease
7	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	8 wks	Purchase Furni...
8	Establish Office	2 wks	Establish...
9	Implement IT Infrastructure	8 wks	Implement IT I...
10	Hire ED	10 wks	Hire ED
11	Contract PM	6 wks	Contract PM
12	Search for Staff	6 wks	Search for Staff
13	Hire Staff	6 wks	Hire Staff
14	Contract Temp Staff	6 wks	Contract Temp...
15	Establish Benefits	6 wks	Establish Benefits
16	Establish Policies and Procedures	6 wks	Establish Policies and Proc...
17	Establish Accounting	4 wks	Establish Accounting
18	Implement Communications	3 wks	Implement Communications
19	Begin Operations		◆ 8/22
20	Train Staff	3 wks	T...
21	Transfer SH Equipment	1 wk	Transf...
22	Transfer Data	1 wk	Tra...
23	Adjust Data Feeds	1 wk	A...
24	Verify Information Flows	1 wk	
25	Confirm All Operations	1 wk	

Timeline headers: January 1/5 | February 1/26 | 2/16 | March 3/9 | April 3/30 | 4/20 | May 5/11 | June 6/1 | July 6/22 | 7/13 | August 8/3 | September 8/24

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.	$30,000
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.	*$50,000 to $100,000*
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[19]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.	$4,000
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[20]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[18]	*No Charge to $5,000*
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[18]	*No Charge to $10,000*
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[18]	*No Charge to $8,000*
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[18]	*No Charge to $3,000*
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$21,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.	*$20,000 to $40,000*

Similar to A.1, above, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to range from $1,136,350 to $1,158,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease.	*$50,000 to $72,000*
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$810,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection.	$6,600
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$60,000

The ILA would present an annual budget and be audited annually.

---

[19]   160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.
[20]   3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

MTG
Management
Consultants

B.   Government Organization

This category of options relies on a government organization to house and operate SH to the satisfaction of the key stakeholders.   Under these three options, SH would be managed through a committee structure, with administrative support from the government provider.   The following assumption applies to all three types of new organizational options:

The SH management structure would be blended into any government organization supporting the operation.

The subcommittee evaluated three possible organization types within this category:

1.   [B.1] City of Seattle

This option represents the current model.   There may be adjustments in the committee structure, objectives, and reporting processes with this option that will be determined as the options are refined.   The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- The City does not face competition from private-sector salary ranges and therefore does not have the 10 percent addition to staff costs. For this option, the actual numbers are based on current salaries.
- The ED salary would be approximately $20,000 less for this organization, and the actual numbers are based on current salaries.
- There would be very little change from a structural or cost perspective with this option.

This contemplates implementation of the remaining items on the SH action plan developed by the TAG.

Pro:

- This structure would be aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- This structure would be governed by HUD and would most likely participate in its financial systems – i.e., aligned with HUD funding structure and understanding HUD guidelines.
- Because this structure currently exists, it has current relationships with user organizations.
- This structure is within CoC user organizations.
- It has the ability to manage all elements to support funding, technical support, governance, and vendor.
- It can target hiring for specific skills to increase technical excellence.
- It can provide dedicated technical resources focused on support of SH only (e.g., data analysis and understanding of the data).   This is a true strength for the option.

- It can leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.
- It has resources to meet customer needs and focus on customer communication and satisfaction.
- It is embedded with funders and currently has the attention of the financial and management controls.
- It has strong financial backing and additional resources when necessary in order to dedicate resources to SH.
- It has funding and resources that can be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- Resources are available to set standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- All organization personnel are focused on the skills necessary for SH success.
- Leadership will be focused on only the SH agenda.
- Support is strong for this type of organization as it is a logical part of a funding agency.
- This structure can go to governance and stakeholders to get enhanced support and have broader discussions for SH.
- It has good vendor management skills and is able to manage large vendors like those likely to provide SH services.
- It has the IT skills for vendor management.
- It has the resources available, including legal team availability, to create, proffer, and contract in support of the RFP and selection process.
- It has the staff available to handle the requirements effort.
- It is highly sensitive to issues as a public organization facing wide scrutiny.
- This organization holds the contracts for HMIS user organizations and can hold the organizations accountable for services.
- This organization has the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns.
- The City of Seattle is already running SH.

Con:

- The City of Seattle is not the current Adsystech contract holder.

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP	4 weeks
2	**Review and Verify Data**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks

	Task	Start Date	Duration
3	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 4 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	2 weeks
4	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 10 weeks (Tasks 2 and 3 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 13 weeks (3 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT IV.

Cost:

The cost of implementation is estimated to be $68,800. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[21]	$28,800
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer, TAG action plan improvements, and other unanticipated improvement costs.	$40,000

The ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to be $1,028,561. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Annual audits.	$8,000
Annual budget based on the 2013 SH annual budget.[22]	$970,561
Unexpected costs (these contingency costs are estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget).	$50,000

The organization would continue to be part of the City of Seattle budget process, but would be audited annually by an outside firm.

2.   [B.2] King County

Under this option, SH would move from the City of Seattle to King County. The committee structure and objectives might be revised; however, reporting processes would likely have to change to align with the new organization. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

---

[21] 2 people at 40 hours per week at $60/hour for 6 weeks. See Appendix C for cost assumptions.

[22] This cost may not include other support that is provided by Seattle's HSD, which houses SH. In fact, MTG believes it is likely that another $50,000 to $100,000 of cost may not be attributed to SH within the narrowly defined City budget structures.

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option B.1 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	February 1/26	2/16	March 3/9	April 3/30	May 4/20	5/11	June 6/1	July 6/22	7
1	Contract Temp Staff	4 wks		Contract Temp Staff						
2	Review and Verify Data			6 wks	Review and Verify Data					
3	Verify Information Flows			2 wks	Verify Information Flows					
4	Confirm All Operations				1 wk	Confirm All Operations				

5054.024/**303338**

Page 1

- Staff would be moved to King County.
- The county does not face competition from private-sector salary ranges and therefore does not have the 10 percent addition to staff costs.
- The ED salary would be approximately $20,000 less than private rates for this organization.
- Some activities to organize and establish the new SH organization in King County may take longer than other options to ensure existing County processes are followed.

In addition to these assumptions, many of the costs are listed as a range of costs due to variances in chargeback methods, possible effort savings, and potential costs that have to be accounted for in a form comparable to other options.

Pro:

- A King County SH structure would be aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- This organization would be governed by HUD and would most likely participate in its financial systems – i.e., aligned with HUD funding structure and understanding HUD guidelines.
- It has current relationships with the user organizations.
- It is within the CoC user organizations.
- It could manage all elements to support funding, technical support, governance, and vendor.
- It could target hiring for specific skills to increase technical excellence.
- King County could provide dedicated technical resources that are focused on support of SH only (e.g., data analysis and understanding of the data). This is a true strength for the option.
- It could leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.
- It has resources to meet customer needs and focus on customer communication and satisfaction.
- It is embedded with funders and currently has the attention of the financial and management controls.
- It has strong financial backing and additional resources when necessary in order to dedicate resources to SH.
- It has funding and resources that can be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- Resources are available to set the standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality. All organization personnel are focused on the skills necessary for SH success.
- Leadership could be focused on only the SH agenda.

- Support is strong for this type of organization as it is a logical part of a funding agency.
- King County could go to governance and stakeholders to get enhanced support and have broader discussions for SH.
- The County has good vendor management skills and is able to manage large vendors like those likely to provide SH services.
- It has the IT skills for vendor management.
- It has the resources available, including legal team availability, to create, proffer, and contract in support of the RFP and selection process.
- It has the staff available to handle the requirements effort.
- It is highly sensitive to issues as a public organization facing wide scrutiny.
- It holds the contracts for HMIS user organizations and can hold the organizations accountable for the services.
- It has the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns.
- King County currently manages similar services and has existing customers with confidence in those services.

Con:

- King County is not the current Adsystech contract holder.
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Define Organization and Reporting**	NTP	3 weeks
2	**Form Organization**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
3	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	5 weeks
4	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 8 weeks (Tasks 1 and 3 Complete)	6 weeks
5	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 13 weeks (Two weeks before Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
6	**Establish Office**	NTP + 20 weeks (Tasks 4-5 Complete)	4 weeks
7	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 14 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
8	**Hire ED**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 2 Started)	10 weeks

	Task	Start Date	Duration
9	**Contract PM**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
10	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 9 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	10 weeks
11	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 8 Complete and 3 weeks before Task 10 Complete)	8 weeks
12	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 13 weeks (Task 8 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
14	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
15	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
16	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 14 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	6 weeks
17	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 24 weeks (Tasks 1-16 Complete)	Milestone
18	**Train Staff**	NTP + 24 weeks (Task 17 Complete)	3 weeks
19	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 24 weeks (Task 17 Complete)	1 week
20	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 25 weeks (Tasks 7 and 19 Complete)	1 week
21	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 26 weeks (Tasks 17 and 20 Complete)	2 week
22	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 29 weeks (Tasks 18 and 22 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 30 weeks (7 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT V.

Cost:

The estimated cost of implementation ranges between $452,200 and $623,200, with the most likely estimate near the low end of the range. There are potential reductions if King County provides the services at no cost or a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as filing files, business license, recording fees, etc.	$2,000

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option B.2 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name		March 2/16 3/9	April 3/30 4/20	May 5/11	June 6/1 6/22	July 7/13	August 8/3	Septer 8/24
1	Define Organization and Report	3 wks	Define Organization and Report						
2	Form Organization		6 wks Form Organization						
3	Locate Office Space		5 wks Locate Office Space						
4	Complete Lease			6 wks Complete Lease					
5	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures				8 wks Purchase Furnishing and Fi				
6	Establish Office					4 wks Establish Off			
7	Implement IT Infrastructure				8 wks Implement IT Infras				
8	Hire ED		10 wks Hire ED						
9	Contract PM		6 wks Contract PM						
10	Search for Staff			10 wks Search for Staff					
11	Hire Staff				8 wks Hire Staff				
12	Contract Temp Staff				6 wks Contract Temp Staff				
13	Establish Benefits			6 wks Establish Benefits					
14	Establish Policies and Procedures			6 wks Establish Policies and Procedures					
15	Establish Accounting			6 wks Establish Accounting					
16	Implement Communications				6 wks Implement Communicatio				
17	Begin Operations						◆ 8/15		
18	Train Staff						3 wks Tr		
19	Transfer SH Equipment						1 wk Transfer		
20	Transfer Data						1 wk Trans		
21	Adjust Data Feeds						2 wks		
22	Verify Information Flows						1 wk		
23	Confirm All Operations						1		

MTG
Management
Consultants

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[23]	*No Charge to $12,000*
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[23]	*$20,000 to $45,000*
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.	$30,000
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.	*$75,000 to $100,000*
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization. [24]	*$135,000 to $180,000*
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.[23]	*No Charge to $4,000*
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[25]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[23]	*No Charge to $5,000*
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[23]	*No Charge to $10,000*
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[23]	*No Charge to $8,000*
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[23]	*No Charge to $3,000*
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$21,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	*$26,000 to $40,000*
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.	*$20,000 to $40,000*

Somewhat similar to A.3, above, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to range from $1,071,750 to $1,140,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease, assuming County rates of $6,000 per month for 2,800 rentable square feet on the high end.[23]	*$50,000 to $72,000*
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement. [23]	*No Charge to $40,000*
ED salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$810,000

---

[23] This cost may be reduced to the lower end of the range indicated if space or resources are available in the City of Seattle or King County.

[24] Calculated at 160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months for a contractor, however, this may be reduced if KC IT provides the project manager at $15,000 per month (Anticipated Rate).

[25] 3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Phone service and Internet connection.[23]	*No Charge to $6,600*
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$50,000

SH would present an annual budget as part of the County budget process and be audited by the County Auditor.

3.   [B.3] Washington Department of Commerce

Under this option, SH would move from the City of Seattle to the DoC. While this is an unlikely option, it would realign operation of SH to DoC. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- Staff would be moved to DoC.
- The State does not face competition from private-sector salary ranges and therefore does not have the 10 percent addition to staff costs.
- The ED salary would be approximately $20,000 less than private rates for this organization.
- Other chargeback costs would be roughly equivalent to King County.

As with the above options, alignment changes could be made with the committee structure, objectives, and processes.

Pro:

- DoC could leverage size to bring other expertise to bear on issues and needs.
- It has strong financial backing and could provide additional resources when necessary in order to dedicate resources to SH.
- It has funding and resources that could be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- DoC has resources available to set the standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- Relevant skills are available in the organization.
- DoC has good vendor management skills and is able to manage large vendors like those likely to provide SH services.
- DoC is the current contract holder for Adsystech, the SH service provider.
- It has the IT skills for vendor management.
- It has the resources available, including legal team availability, to create, proffer, and contract in support of the RFP and selection process.
- It has the staff available to handle the requirements effort.

- It has the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns.

Con:

- DoC is not aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- Distance from HMIS user organizations and the community they serve might impact the agencies significantly.
- DoC would not be able to manage all elements of SH under one roof.
- Under DoC, SH could be lost in the "clutter" of the other, similar programs.
- Not all of the skills may be focused on SH: DoC may hire or assign individuals with skills not related to or focused on SH operations.
- DoC might have divided interests other than SH: the leadership of the SH organization within DoC may be distracted by other DoC-related initiatives or issues, thereby dividing attention or interest in SH.
- DoC is currently focused on back-end data; would have to also focus on front-end services.
- The DoC mission is much broader than SH and from a line-of-business standpoint is removed from community being serviced.
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organizations related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	Define Organization and Reporting	NTP	3 weeks
2	Form Organization	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
3	Locate Office Space	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	7 weeks
4	Complete Lease	NTP + 10 weeks (Tasks 1 and 3 Complete)	6 weeks
5	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	NTP + 14 weeks (Two weeks before Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
6	Establish Office	NTP + 22 weeks (Tasks 4-5 Complete)	4 weeks
7	Implement IT Infrastructure	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
8	Hire ED	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 2 Started)	10 weeks
9	Contract PM	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
10	Search for Staff	NTP + 9 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	10 weeks

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
11	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 8 Complete and 3 weeks before Task 10 Complete)	8 weeks
12	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 13 weeks (Task 8 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
14	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
15	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 9 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	6 weeks
16	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	6 weeks
17	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 26 weeks (Tasks 1-16 Complete)	Milestone
18	**Train Staff**	NTP + 26 weeks (Task 17 Complete)	3 weeks
19	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 26 weeks (Task 17 Complete)	1 week
20	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 27 weeks (Tasks 7 and 19 Complete)	1 week
21	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 28 weeks (Tasks 17 and 20 Complete)	2 week
22	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 30 weeks (Task 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 31 weeks (Tasks 18 and 22 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 32 weeks (over 7 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project GANTT view is shown in EXHIBIT VI.

Cost:

The estimated cost of implementation ranges between $511,200 and $623,200, with the most likely estimate near the low end of the range. There are potential reductions if DoC provides the services at no cost or a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as filing files, business license, recording fees, etc.	$2,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[26]	*No Charge to $12,000*

---

[26]   This cost may be reduced by DoC chargeback procedures and actual costs.

14096

ID	Task Name	February 1/26	2/16	March 3/9	April 3/30	May 4/20	5/11	June 6/1	July 6/22	7/13	August 8/3	8/24	September 9
1	Define Organization and Report	3 wks	Define Organization and Report										
2	Form Organization		6 wks	Form Organization									
3	Locate Office Space		7 wks	Locate Office Space									
4	Complete Lease				6 wks	Complete Lease							
5	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures					8 wks	Purchase Furnishing						
6	Establish Office							4 wks	Establish				
7	Implement IT Infrastructure						8 wks	Implement IT i					
8	Hire ED		10 wks	Hire ED									
9	Contract PM		6 wks	Contract PM									
10	Search for Staff				10 wks	Search for Staff							
11	Hire Staff					8 wks	Hire Staff						
12	Contract Temp Staff					6 wks	Contract Temp Staff						
13	Establish Benefits				6 wks	Establish Benefits							
14	Establish Policies and Procedures				6 wks	Establish Policies and Procedures							
15	Establish Accounting				6 wks	Establish Accounting							
16	Implement Communications						6 wks	Implement Commun					
17	Begin Operations									◆ 8/29			
18	Train Staff									3 wks			
19	Transfer SH Equipment									1 wk	Trans		
20	Transfer Data									1 wk	Tra		
21	Adjust Data Feeds									2 wks			
22	Verify Information Flows									1 w			
23	Confirm All Operations												

MTG
Management
Consultants

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[26]	_$20,000 to $45,000_
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.	$30,000
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.[26]	_$75,000 to $100,000_
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[27]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.[26]	_No Charge to $4,000_
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[28]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[26]	_No Charge to $5,000_
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[26]	_No Charge to $10,000_
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[26]	_No Charge to $8,000_
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[26]	_No Charge to $3,000_
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$21,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.[26]	_$20,000 to $40,000_

As with B.2, above, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to range from $1,071,750 to $1,140,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease, assuming $6,000 per month for 2,800 rentable square feet.[26]	_$50,000 to $72,000_
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.[26]	_No Charge to $40,000_
ED salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$810,000
Phone service and Internet connection.[26]	_No Charge to $6,600_
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$50,000

---

[27]   160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.
[28]   3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

SH would present an annual budget as part of the DoC budget process and be audited by the State Auditor.

C. Third Party HMIS User Organization

This third category of options examines the possibility of using an existing organization to perform SH functions. The options evaluated in this category could provide alignment between the business providers and SH objectives in that an organization doing the work would be housing and operating SH. The following assumptions apply to all three types of new associations that were evaluated:

- The need to identify an interested organization would add four to six weeks to Options C.1 and C.2.
- The options presented here require additional IT training, and would have slightly higher costs of setting up SH organization due to limited existing IT resources.
- There are slightly higher costs required to form the organization and ensure all existing organization bylaws and charters are aligned with the new structure.

The subcommittee evaluated three possible organization types within this category:

1. [C.1] SH Run by HMIS User Organization

This option provides a combination in which an existing provider would support the SH operation as a unique sub-organization within the provider's organization. The existing SH organization would move to the existing HMIS provider and would be operated under the structure of the provider. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- The SH staff would become employees of the provider, dedicated to SH.
- The Third Party HMIS User Organization, in conjunction with the ED, would make the staffing and hiring decisions for the SH organization.

The direction of the SH program would continue to operate in a similar fashion as it does today, with modifications to committee structure, processes, and objectives as necessary.

Pro:

- The provider, as an HMIS user organization, would be focused on the front-end work.
- It would understand HMIS data standards and compliance.
- This organization would be governed by HUD and would most likely participate in its financial systems – i.e., aligned with HUD funding structure and understanding HUD guidelines.
- It has current relationships with the user organizations.

MTG
Management
Consultants

- It is within the CoC user organizations.
- With a peer entity running HMIS, other provider agencies may be more likely to report.
- It would have funding and resources that can be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- Resources would be available to set the standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- Relevant skills would be available in the organization.
- Current HMIS user organizations understand the leadership focus for SH across the community.
- HMIS user organizations are focused on SH activities.
- The organization could hire the specific staff to handle the requirements effort.

Con:

- The provider would not be directly aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- There could be an appearance of conflict of interest, such as being in the position to have the best information to align services.
- The provider may lack the depth of resources and/or experience to solve issues and meet demands placed on SH.
- It might have divided interests other than SH.
- It is not the current Adsystech contract holder.
- It would need additional resources to complete RFP processes.
- Due to limited resources, the provider might have competing efforts to the SH requirements effort.
- It does not currently have the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns, or would have to build the capacity.[29]
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

---

[29] The organization may not be big enough to have legal staff but will likely have a few liability concerns and legal issues that will require legal advice. Other options have organizations with that capability, so this point is raised to show the need to potentially resolve the issue if this option were selected

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Define Organization and Reporting**	NTP	3 weeks
2	**Seek Interested Parties**	NTP	6 weeks
3	**Form Organization**	NTP + 6 weeks (Tasks 1 and 2 Complete)	5 weeks
4	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 3 Complete)	5 weeks
5	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 16 weeks (Tasks 1 and 4 Complete)	3 weeks
6	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 19 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	6 weeks
7	**Establish Office**	NTP + 25 weeks (Tasks 5-6 Complete)	3 weeks
8	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
9	**Hire ED**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 3 Started)	10 weeks
10	**Contract PM**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
11	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
12	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 16 weeks (Tasks 9 and 11 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 9 Complete)	6 weeks
14	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 12 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	6 weeks
15	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 10 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	8 weeks
16	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 14 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	4 weeks
17	Implement **Communications**	NTP + 19 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	3 weeks
18	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 28 weeks (Tasks 1-17 Complete)	Milestone
19	**Train Staff**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 12 Complete and Complete 3 weeks after Task 18)	7 weeks
20	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 18 Complete)	1 week
21	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 29 weeks (Tasks 8 and 20 Complete)	1 week
22	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 31 weeks (Tasks 19 and 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 32 weeks (Task 22 Complete)	1 week
24	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 33 weeks (Task 23 Complete)	1 week

MTG
Management
Consultants

The overall timeline is 34 weeks (8 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT VII.

Cost:

The estimated cost of implementation ranges between $502,200 and $649,200, with the most likely estimate near the high end of the range. There are potential reductions if the hosting organization provides the services at no cost or a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as adjusting documentation and funding, letterhead, etc.	$3,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[30]	*No Charge to $12,000*
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[30]	*$5,000 to $45,000*
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.[30]	*No Charge to $30,000*
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.[30]	*$75,000 to $100,000*
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[31]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.[30]	*No Charge to $4,000*
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[32]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[30]	*No Charge to $5,000*
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[30]	*No Charge to $10,000*
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[30]	*No Charge to $8,000*
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[30]	*No Charge to $3,000*
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$36,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.[30]	*$40,000 to $50,000*

---

[30]   This cost may be reduced by HMIS User Organization's ability to provide the service and absorb the cost and actual cost to the organization.

[31]   160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.

[32]   3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option C.1 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Duration	Label
1	Define Organization and Report	3 wks	Define Organization and Report
2	Seek Interested Parties	6 wks	Seek Interested Parties
3	Form Organization	5 wks	Form Organization
4	Locate Office Space	5 wks	Locate Office Space
5	Complete Lease	3 wks	Complete Lease
6	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	6 wks	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures
7	Establish Office	3 wks	Establish Office
8	Implement IT Infrastructure	8 wks	Implement IT Infrastructure
9	Hire ED	10 wks	Hire ED
10	Contract PM	6 wks	Contract PM
11	Search for Staff	6 wks	Search for Staff
12	Hire Staff	6 wks	Hire Staff
13	Contract Temp Staff	6 wks	Contract Temp Staff
14	Establish Benefits	6 wks	Establish Benefits
15	Establish Policies and Procedures	8 wks	Establish Policies and Procedures
16	Establish Accounting	4 wks	Establish Accounting
17	Implement Communications	3 wks	Implement Communications
18	Begin Operations		◆ 9/12
19	Train Staff	7 wks	Train Staff
20	Transfer SH Equipment	1 wk	Transfer SH Equipment
21	Transfer Data	1 wk	Transfer Data
22	Adjust Data Feeds	1 wk	Adjust Data Feeds
23	Verify Information Flows	1 wk	Verify Information Flows
24	Confirm All Operations	1 wk	

Timeline headers: February 1/26 | 2/16 | March 3/9 | April 3/30 | 4/20 | May 5/11 | June 6/1 | 6/22 | July 7/13 | August 8/3 | 8/24 | September 9/14 | October 10/5

MTG
Management
Consultants

Similar to the new organization options, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to range between $1,225,750 and $1,229,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease.	$72,000
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED (Manager) salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$891,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection. [30]	_$3,000 to $6,600_
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$50,000

SH would present an annual budget as part of the parent organization's budget process and have an independent audit.

2. [C.2] SH Integrated Into HMIS User Organization

Under this option, an existing HMIS organization would absorb the SH functions and any needed staff. The SH staff would become employees of the provider; however, the HMIS provider would have the latitude to align responsibilities with their organization. The direction of the SH program would continue to operate in a similar fashion as it does today, with modifications to committee structure, processes, and objectives as necessary. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- The SH staff would become employees of the provider, dedicated to SH.
- Unlike other options, the leader of the SH organization would be a Director that reports to the third-party HMIS user organization's ED.

The SH program would be part of that provider's mission.

Pro:
- The provider would be an HMIS user organization and focused on the front-end work.
- It would understand HMIS data standards and compliance.
- It would be aligned with HUD funding.
- It is within CoC user organizations.

- It would have funding and resources that could be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- It would have resources available to set the standards for measures and ensure consistent service quality.
- It would have relevant skills available in the organization.
- Current HMIS user organizations understand the leadership focus for SH across the community.
- HMIS user organizations are focused on SH activities.
- It could hire specific staff to handle the requirements effort.

Con:

- The provider would not be aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- It could create the potential for HMIS user organization to pressure SH directions or bias SH information.
- There could be an appearance of conflict of interest, such as being in the position to have the best information to align services.
- It may lack the depth of resources and/or experience to solve issues and meet demands placed on SH.
- If SH is embedded with existing organization, there may not be consistent support and sponsorship over time.
- Not all skills may be focused on SH.
- The provider might have divided interests other than SH.
- The organization is not the current Adsystech contract holder.
- It would need additional resources to complete RFP processes.
- Due to limited resources, the organization might have competing efforts to the SH requirements effort.
- The organization does not have the staff and resources to deal with liability concerns, or would have to build the capacity.[33]
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps, which are the same as Option C.1.

---

[33] The organization may not be big enough to have legal staff but will likely have a few liability concerns and legal issues that will require legal advice. Other options have organizations with that capability, so this point is raised to show the need to potentially resolve the issue if this option were selected

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Define Organization and Reporting**	NTP	3 weeks
2	**Seek Interested Parties**	NTP	6 weeks
3	**Form Organization**	NTP + 6 weeks (Tasks 1 and 2 Complete)	5 weeks
4	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 3 Complete)	5 weeks
5	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 16 weeks (Tasks 1 and 4 Complete)	3 weeks
6	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 19 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	6 weeks
7	**Establish Office**	NTP + 25 weeks (Tasks 5-6 Complete)	3 weeks
8	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 16 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
9	**Hire Director**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 3 Started)	8 weeks
10	**Contract PM**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
11	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 6 weeks (Task 2 Complete)	6 weeks
12	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 14 weeks (Tasks 9 and 11 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 14 weeks (Task 9 Complete)	6 weeks
14	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 12 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	4 weeks
15	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 10 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	6 weeks
16	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 12 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 9)	4 weeks
17	Implement **Communications**	NTP + 19 weeks (Task 5 Complete)	3 weeks
18	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 28 weeks (Tasks 1-17 Complete)	Milestone
19	**Train Staff**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 12 Complete and Complete 3 weeks after Task 18)	7 weeks
20	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 28 weeks (Task 18 Complete)	1 week
21	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 29 weeks (Tasks 8 and 20 Complete)	1 week
22	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 31 weeks (Tasks 19 and 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 32 weeks (Task 22 Complete)	1 week
24	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 33 weeks (Task 23 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 34 weeks (8 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT VIII.

Cost:

The estimated cost of implementation ranges between $502,200 and $643,200, with the most likely estimate near the middle of the range. There are potential reductions if the hosting organization provides the services at no cost or a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as adjusting documentation and funding, letterhead, etc.	$3,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[34]	_No Charge to $12,000_
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[34]	_$5,000 to $45,000_
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.[34]	_No Charge to $30,000_
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.[34]	_$75,000 to $100,000_
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[35]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.[34]	_No Charge to $4,000_
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization. [36]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[34]	_No Charge to $3,000_
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[34]	_No Charge to $5,000_
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[34]	_No Charge to $8,000_
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[34]	_No Charge to $4,000_
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$36,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.[34]	_$40,000 to $50,000_

---

[34] This cost may be reduced by HMIS User Organization's ability to provide the service and absorb the cost and actual cost to the organization.

[35] 160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.

[36] 3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option C.2 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name	Duration	Timeline
1	Define Organization and Report	3 wks	Define Organization and Report
2	Seek Interested Parties	6 wks	Seek Interested Parties
3	Form Organization	5 wks	Form Organization
4	Locate Office Space	5 wks	Locate Office Space
5	Complete Lease	3 wks	Complete Lease
6	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures	6 wks	Purchase Furnishing and...
7	Establish Office	3 wks	Establish Office
8	Implement IT Infrastructure	8 wks	Implement IT Infrastructure
9	Hire Director	10 wks	Hire Director
10	Contract PM	6 wks	Contract PM
11	Search for Staff	6 wks	Search for Staff
12	Hire Staff	6 wks	Hire Staff
13	Contract Temp Staff	6 wks	Contract Temp Staff
14	Establish Benefits	6 wks	Establish Benefits
15	Establish Policies and Procedures	8 wks	Establish Policies and Procedures
16	Establish Accounting	4 wks	Establish Accounting
17	Implement Communications	3 wks	Implement Communications
18	Begin Operations		◆ 9/12
19	Train Staff	7 wks	Train Sta...
20	Transfer SH Equipment	1 wk	Transfer SH E...
21	Transfer Data	1 wk	Transfer Da...
22	Adjust Data Feeds	1 wk	Adjus...
23	Verify Information Flows	1 wk	Ver...
24	Confirm All Operations	1 wk	...

Timeline header: February 1/26 | 2/16 | March 3/9 | April 3/30 | 4/20 | May 5/11 | June 6/1 | 6/22 | July 7/13 | August 8/3 | 8/24 | September 9/14 | October 10/5

Similar to the C.1 above, the ongoing annual costs, including salaries is estimated to range between $1,153,750 and $1,229,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease. [34]	*No Charge to $72,000*
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED (Manager) salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$891,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection. [34]	*$3,000 to $6,600*
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$50,000

SH would present an annual budget as part of the parent organization's budget process and have an independent audit.

3. [C.3] United Way of King County

Under the final option that was evaluated, SH would move from the City of Seattle to UWKC, a major stakeholder in SH. While this is an unlikely option, it would realign operation of SH to UWKC. The following assumptions apply to this specific option:

- Staff would be moved to UWKC.
- The third-party HMIS user organization, in conjunction with the ED, would make the staffing and hiring decisions for the SH organization.
- In this option, the existing organization would be able to move somewhat faster in several of the implementation tasks.
- UWKC may have existing rented space that SH could occupy.

As with the above options, alignment changes could be made with the committee structure, objectives, and processes.

Pro:

- UWKC is an HMIS user and would be focused on the front-end work.
- It understands the HMIS data standards and compliance.
- It is aligned with funding agencies (Seattle, King County, and UWKC).
- It has current relationships with the user organizations.
- It is within the CoC user organizations.

- It has resources to meet customer needs and be focused on customer communication and satisfaction.
- It is embedded with the funders and has the attention of the financial and management controls.
- It has funding and resources that could be leveraged to ensure long-term viability.
- It could hire the specific staff to handle the requirements effort.
- UWKC holds the contracts for HMIS user organizations and could hold the organizations accountable for the services.

Con:

- If a non-governmental funder takes on the management of SH, there could be an appearance of conflict of interest, such as being in the position to have the best information to align services.
- UWKC does not currently have the staff capability to provide technical excellence in terms of the SH operation or for supporting SH.
- It may lack the depth of resources and/or experience to solve issues and meet demands placed on SH
- At UWKC, SH would be embedded within the existing organization, which may not allow for consistent support and sponsorship over time.
- Since UWKC does not staff the same type of SH line of business, the technical skills may not be available to operate SH effectively.
- SH is not fully aligned with UWKC's core business; UWKC is not primarily a data or technical support organization, but a fundraiser and grantmaker.
- UWKC is not the current Adsystech contract holder.
- Vendor management is not the primary line of business for UWKC and it is not staffed for vendor management.
- UWKC does not have the IT skills for the type of vendor management required by the current SH provider.
- Due to limited resources, UWKC might have competing efforts to the requirements effort.
- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. (See Appendix C, cost assumptions.)

Implementation:

The tasks presented in the table below represent significant implementation steps.

	Task	Start Date	Duration
1	**Define Organization and Reporting**	NTP	3 weeks

MTG
Management
Consultants

	Task	Start Date	Duration
2	**Form Organization**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	3 weeks
3	**Locate Office Space**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	5 weeks
4	**Complete Lease**	NTP + 8 weeks (Tasks 1 and 3 Complete)	3 weeks
5	**Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
6	**Establish Office**	NTP + 19 weeks (Tasks 4-5 Complete)	3 weeks
7	**Implement IT Infrastructure**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	8 weeks
8	**Hire ED**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 2 Started)	10 weeks
9	**Contract PM**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
10	**Search for Staff**	NTP + 3 weeks (Task 1 Complete)	6 weeks
11	**Hire Staff**	NTP + 13 weeks (Tasks 8 and 10 Complete)	4 weeks
12	**Contract Temporary Staff**	NTP + 13 weeks (Task 8 Complete)	6 weeks
13	**Establish Benefits**	NTP + 11 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	4 weeks
14	**Establish Policies and Procedures**	NTP + 11 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	4 weeks
15	**Establish Accounting**	NTP + 11 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 8)	4 weeks
16	**Implement Communications**	NTP + 11 weeks (Task 4 Complete)	3 weeks
17	**Begin Operations**	NTP + 22 weeks (Tasks 1-16 Complete)	Milestone
18	**Train Staff**	NTP + 17 weeks (Complete 2 weeks after Task 17)	7 weeks
19	**Transfer SH Equipment**	NTP + 22 weeks (Task 17 Complete)	1 week
20	**Transfer Data**	NTP + 23 weeks (Tasks 7 and 19 Complete)	1 week
21	**Adjust Data Feeds**	NTP + 24 weeks (Tasks 18 and 20 Complete)	1 week
22	**Verify Information Flows**	NTP + 25 weeks (Task 21 Complete)	1 week
23	**Confirm All Operations**	NTP + 26 weeks (Task 22 Complete)	1 week

The overall timeline is 27 weeks (just over 6 months) and is planned for implementation at a moderate pace. A project Gantt view is shown in EXHIBIT IX.

14096

Safe Harbors
Management Alternatives Facilitation
Management Options
Option C.3 Implementation Plan

ID	Task Name		March 2/16	3/9	April 3/30	4/20	May 5/11	June 6/1	July 6/22	7/13	August 8/3
1	Define Organization and Report	3 wks			Define Organization and Report						
2	Form Organization		3 wks		Form Organization						
3	Locate Office Space		5 wks		Locate Office Space						
4	Complete Lease				3 wks	Complete Lease					
5	Purchase Furnishing and Fixtures					8 wks			Purchase Furnishing an		
6	Establish Office							3 wks	Establish Of		
7	Implement IT Infrastructure					8 wks			Implement IT Infrastru		
8	Hire ED		10 wks				Hire ED				
9	Contract PM		6 wks			Contract PM					
10	Search for Staff		6 wks			Search for Staff					
11	Hire Staff						4 wks	Hire Staff			
12	Contract Temp Staff						6 wks	Contract Temp Staff			
13	Establish Benefits						4 wks	Establish Benefits			
14	Establish Policies and Procedures						4 wks	Establish Policies and Procedures			
15	Establish Accounting						4 wks	Establish Accounting			
16	Implement Communications						3 wks	Implement Communications			
17	Begin Operations								◆ 8/1		
18	Train Staff							7 wks	Train		
19	Transfer SH Equipment								1 wk	Transfer	
20	Transfer Data								1 wk	Trans	
21	Adjust Data Feeds								1 wk	A	
22	Verify Information Flows								1 wk		
23	Confirm All Operations								1 wk		

5054.024/**303343**   Page 1

MTG
Management
Consultants

Cost:

The estimated cost of implementation ranges between $502,200 and $643,200, with the most likely estimate near the lower end of the range. There are potential reductions if UWKC provides the services at no cost or a lower cost. The variable costs are indicated in underlined italics. The cost is based on the following elements:

Implementation Cost Information	Cost
Costs associated with forming the organization, such as adjusting documentation and funding, letterhead, etc.	$3,000
Complete the lease, consisting of broker fees and initial deposit.[37]	_No Charge to $12,000_
Furnishings, office equipment, and supplies.[37]	_$5,000 to $45,000_
Tenant improvements associated with the lease.[37]	_No Charge to $30,000_
IT infrastructure for the office and staff.[37]	_$75,000 to $100,000_
Assistance and costs in searching for and hiring the ED.	$8,000
Contract with a PM to manage and coordinate the transition to the new organization.[38]	$180,000
Assistance and costs in searching for SH staff.[37]	_No Charge to $4,000_
Contract with temporary staff to augment staffing during the transition to the new organization.[39]	$115,200
Assistance with establishing the benefits programs for the organization.[37]	_No Charge to $3,000_
Assistance with establishing the policies and procedures for the organization.[37]	_No Charge to $5,000_
Assistance establishing the accounting programs for the organization.[37]	_No Charge to $8,000_
Costs associated with implementing phones and Internet for the organization.[37]	_No Charge to $4,000_
Training new staff on systems and technologies used by SH.	$36,000
Contract services to assist with transferring the data and costs associated with the transfer.	$40,000
Contract services to assist with transferring SH equipment and costs associated with the transfer.[37]	_$40,000 to $50,000_

Similar to Options C.1 and C.2 above, the ongoing annual cost, including salaries, is estimated to range between $1,153,750 and $1,229,350. The cost is based on the following elements:

---

[37] This cost may be reduced by UWKC's ability to provide the service and absorb the cost and actual cost to the organization.

[38] 160 hours per month at $125/hour for 9 months.

[39] 3 people at 160 hours per month at $60/hour for 4 months.

Annual Cost Information	Cost
Office lease. [37]	No Charge to $72,000
Furnishing and office equipment programmed replacement.	$4,500
Supplies.	$2,000
IT infrastructure licensing and programmed replacement.	$40,000
ED (Manager) salary.	$155,250
Staff salaries.	$891,000
Annual audits.	$8,000
Phone service and Internet connection. [37]	$3,000 to $6,600
Normal operating costs, estimated from 5 percent of the annual budget.	$50,000

SH would present an annual budget as part of the UWKC's budget process and have an independent audit.

MTG
Management
Consultants

IV. Options Summary

MTG
Management
Consultants

IV. Options Summary

A significant amount of information was presented for each option in the previous section. The three short subsections below summarize the key elements of cost, implementation time, and the subcommittee's overall opinion on the viability of the options.

A. Cost Comparison

The table below lists all nine options and both the implementation and annual cost.

Option	Implementation Cost	Annual Operating Cost
A.1 – Not-for-Profit	$638,200	$1,254,875
A.2 – Association	$638,200	$1,254,875
A.3 – ILA	$505,200 to $638,200	$1,136,350 to $1,158,350
B.1 – Seattle	$68,800	$1,028,561[40]
B.2 – King County	$452,200 to $623,200	$1,071,750 to $1,140,350
B.3 – DoC	$511,200 to $623,200	$1,071,750 to $1,140,350
C.1 – SH with HMIS	$502,200 to $649,200	$1,225,750 to $1,229,350
C.2 – SH in an HMIS	$502,200 to $643,200	$1,153,750 to $1,229,350
C.3 – UWKC	$502,200 to $643,200	$1,153,750 to $1,229,350

The dramatically lower cost of Option B.1, leaving SH with the City of Seattle, is due to the fact that it is already implemented and only needs minor improvements under the current action plan.

B. Timeline Comparison

The table below lists all nine options and the total implementation timeline of each portrayed in weeks of overall duration of the work effort.

Option	Duration
A.1 – Not-for-Profit	26 weeks
A.2 – Association	27 weeks
A.3 – ILA	30 weeks
B.1 – Seattle	13 weeks
B.2 – King County	30 weeks
B.3 – DoC	32 weeks
C.1 – SH with HMIS	34 weeks
C.2 – SH in an HMIS	34 weeks
C.3 – UWKC	27 weeks

---

[40] This cost may not include other support that is provided by Seattle's HSD. MTG believes it is likely that another $50,000 to $100,000 of costs may not be attributed to SH due the budget structures.

Implementation time does not appear to be a discriminator between the options. The similar tasks necessary to complete each effort contribute to the fairly close range of 26-= to 34-week durations. The only deviation in the range is the B.1 Seattle option.

C.   Advantage Comparison

The effort to create detail for each of the options led to significant discussion within the subcommittee on the suitability for each option. The subcommittee's outlook on each option is listed below.

Option	Opinion
A.1 – Not-for-Profit	Neutral
A.2 – Association	Neutral
A.3 – ILA	Positive
B.1 – Seattle	Positive
B.2 – King County	Positive
B.3 – DoC	Unlikely
C.1 – SH with HMIS	Neutral
C.2 – SH in an HMIS	Neutral
C.3 – UWKC	Unlikely

MTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix A: Excerpt from Ordinance 17619

MTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix A: Excerpt from Ordinance 17619

The two pages in this appendix are an excerpt from King County Ordinance 17619. Lines 750 through 785 contain the proviso that applies to Safe Harbors funding. This report addresses the items in lines 772 through 780.

744	Unemployment Law Project	$28,000
745	YWCA	$42,592

746   ER 3 EXPENDITURE RESTRICTION:

747   Of this appropriation, $35,000 is to be spent solely to contract with YouthCare,

748   and $15,000 is to be spent solely to contract with Lambert House, to provide services for

749   at-risk youth.

750   P1 PROVIDED THAT:

751   Of this appropriation, $250,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the

752   executive transmits an implementation report on the Safe Harbors Homeless Management

753   Information System ("HMIS") and a motion that acknowledges receipt of the report and

754   the motion is passed by the council. The motion shall reference the proviso's ordinance,

755   ordinance section, proviso number and subject matter in both the title and body of the

756   motion.

757   The executive must file the implementation report and motion required by this

758   proviso by March 3, 2014, in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the

759   clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all

760   councilmembers, the council chief of staff and the lead staff for the law, justice, health

761   and human services committee or its successor.

762   Making improvements to the Safe Harbors HMIS is crucial to ensure that Safe

763   Harbors is able to provide cost-effective, accurate and comprehensive data about the

764   people who rely on local homeless services, satisfy state and federal requirements, and

765   meet the needs of local provider agencies. The Seattle/King County Safe Harbors HMIS

766   Assessment Report prepared for the Seattle/King County Safe Harbors HMIS Funders

767   Group contains findings and recommendations that should be implemented to improve

768   the program.

769   The executive shall work with the city of Seattle, Washington state Department of

770   Commerce and the department of information technology to prepare a Safe Harbors

771   implementation report. The implementation report shall, at a minimum, include:

772   A. Alternative options for the management of Safe Harbors, including but not

773   limited to, moving the administration and management of the program to King County,

774   and the impacts of those management changes;

775   B. How each recommendation from the report and alternative management

776   option will be achieved;

777   C. A timeline for implementation of each recommendation and alternative

778   management option; and

779   D. A cost summary for each item recommended for implementation of

780   recommendations and alternative management options.

781   SECTION 43. Ordinance 17476, Section 102, as amended, is hereby amended by

782   adding thereto and inserting therein the following:

783   KING COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL CONTRACT - From the King County

784   flood control contract fund there is hereby appropriated to:

785   King County flood control contract $59,396,102

786   SECTION 44. Ordinance 17476, Section 103, as amended, is hereby amended by

787   adding thereto and inserting therein the following:

788   MARINE DIVISION - From the King County marine operations fund there is

789   hereby appropriated to:

MTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix B: Safe Harbors TAG Action Plan

CMTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix B: Safe Harbors TAG Action Plan

The action plan is a work in progress, and is updated with current status on the key actions items for each TAG committee meeting. The information presented was current as of December 20, 2013.

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

Section 1: Safe Harbors Governance and Structure Recommendations		
Recommendation	**Current Activities**	**Proposed Plan**

1.R.1: The CoC and Sponsoring Partners should clarify and unify the HMIS governance structure.	• Temporary Advisory Group (TAG) formed to provide oversight of HUD TA implementation and King County Proviso through the end of 2013.
	• TAG charter developed
	• TAG convened 7 meetings from August 27th – December 2nd, 2013.
	• TAG recommends unified Safe Harbors governance structure:
	   o Sunset Sponsors, Executive Committee, Contract Monitor groups.
	   o Unify Sponsors and Executive Committee with Steering Committee
	   o Unify Contract Monitors with Users Group
	• TAG recommends Steering Committee structure and membership
		Transition from current model to steering committee
		
		• Establish a single SH Steering Committee

1.R.2: The proposed Steering Committee and Safe Harbors should engage users by re-starting and re-naming the Safe Harbors Users Group (SHUG)	• Volunteer group of agencies was created to assist Safe Harbors with Version 5 testing and roll-out, June 2013. • Users volunteered for the Safe Harbors User's Group at August 22, 2013 Quarterly Partner's Meeting. • Safe Harbors conducted its first and second Users Group meetings on September 27th and November 14th, 2013. 17 and 30 users were in attendance respectively. • Differences between Users Group and Quarterly Partners meeting clarified. TAG recommends to retain quarterly Partners meeting.	Proposed implementation of users group by end of summer. • Create and re-name a new user group • Establish charter (purpose, frequency, objectives) • Clarify differences between Quarterly Partners group and new user group – if any • Include Steering Committee Members in the Users Group • Ensure good representation from across the continuum including shelters and immigrant / refugee agencies • Utilize Users group to help prioritize system bugs • Review Mental Health Users Group charter as a model

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

1.R.3: The CoC and Safe Harbors should update their governance charter and take the steps needed to bring Safe Harbors into line with HUD expectations and regulations.	• HUD expectations and regulations are pending. Updates to governance charter will follow regulation updates.	Work overlaps with CoC Governance TA • Identify Governance Charter • Identify HMIS HUD expectations and regulations
1.R.4: The City of Seattle should ensure Safe Harbors has the IT resources and support it needs to fully succeed as comprehensive homelessness data collection and management system.	Hiring of Patrice Frank for Program Manager Position Adding and filling Data Integrity position, which supervises both Safe Harbors and HSD IT Increased collaboration with HSD IT • Safe Harbors currently utilizes HSD IT resources for advanced report development, website management training, and software procurement advice	Part of considerations for position being filled • Identify where IT resources are most needed for Safe Harbors • Leverage HSD IT resources • Ensure IT resources are dedicated or not competing with other projects

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

Section 2: Software Recommendations

Recommendation	Current Activities	Proposed Plan

2.R.1: Adsystech, the Safe Harbors HMIS vendor, should improve the user's experience by enhancing the look, feel, functionality, and usability of the software	Version 5 roll-out
	• Users received software upgrade information at May Partner's Meeting
	• Improved electronic communications to users (Safe Harbor News, e-mail notifications)
	• Safe Harbors team and agency users tested new version of software, June 2013
	• Version 5. Users convert to version 5 from Aug 26 – November 26, 2013.
	• Conversion complete – December 2, 2013
	• User survey in development to measure improvements in user experience.
		• Upgrading the HMIS software to the next version will improve the user experience
		• Safe Harbors will upgrade to the next version of Adsystech, Summer - Fall 2013. Upgrade Plan involves:
		  ○ User testing – June, 2013
		  ○ User self-installment –June – September, 2013
		  ○ User Training – August – November, 2013
		  ○ Stabilization & Support – Beginning August - ongoing
		• Monitor system functionality and work with vendor on system bugs and necessary enhancements (ongoing)
		• Develop and deploy Version 5 user survey. Target December 2013.

2.R.2: Safe Harbors should build on its existing vendor relationship, clarify roles and responsibilities, and reach out to other Adsystech implementations in Los Angeles, Orange County (CA), Denver Metro (CO),and Colorado Balance of State.	• Aug 2012 MOU developed with State Dept of COM to clarify roles and expectations with Adsystech • Monthly meetings occur with WA State Dept of Commerce (COM) & Adsystech to manage the resolution of technical issues logged in the vendor's ticket system • Safe Harbors and COM re-prioritize issue tickets in the queue to escalate the highest priority issues for resolution	• Build and improve vendor relationship with Adsystech • Begin to build relationships with other Adsystech HMIS implementations

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

Section 3: Support, Operations, and Staffing Recommendations

Recommendation	Current Activities	Proposed Plan
3.R.1: Safe Harbors should take steps to increase its access to IT expertise.	• Hiring of new Safe Harbors manager with background managing IT projects / vendor relationships • Addition and filling of Data Integrity position which supervises both Safe Harbors and HSD IT • Safe Harbors currently utilizes HSD IT resources for advanced report development, website management training, and software procurement advice • 100% of Safe Harbors team completed Adsystech certification training and testing August, 2013.	• Certification training and testing for vendor by Adsystech (all staff) • Leverage HSD IT resources
3.R.2: Safe Harbors should make its staffing pattern and job descriptions less fixed and rigid.	Increasing sharing of responsibilities across SH team • MSA Retirement, April 2013. Staff temporarily filled through 6-month Out of Class Assignment • Research and Evaluation Assistant promoted to Management Systems Analyst (MSA) position, May 2013. Promotion due to expansion of reporting capacity and leadership to Safe Harbors and the CoC. • Staff assessment underway • Back-up staffing plans underway	IT skills strong consideration for new hire • Assess current staffing • Leverage Out of Class MSA assignment • Work with HSD HR on flexibility of assignments within job title to include redistributing labor across the current team and identifying potential gaps • Create back-up staffing plans, to minimize vulnerabilities.

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

3.R.3: Safe Harbors should incorporate new HUD requirements into the existing staffing pattern and job descriptions.	• Data quality officer identified and data quality process developed since 2011. Data quality process intensified over past year to include more frequent checks for the following data areas:
	  o Annual AHAR
	  o Contract Monitor Reporting
	  o CoC Reporting Requests
	  o HEARTH performance measures development
	• <u>HUD expectations and regulations are pending. Updates to staffing pattern will follow regulation updates</u>
		• Review and identify gaps in meeting new requirements under HEARTH and update policies / procedures to meet requirements
		• Identify gaps between Safe Harbors and HUD requirements for staffing:
		  o Data Quality officer
		  o Security officer
		  o Confidentiality officer
		  o Agency Compliance officer
		• Explore the option to leverage Security Officer role and resources at the City level

3.R.4: Safe Harbors should continue improving customer service.	Increased communication; changing help-desk approach • Safe Harbors has increased its use of the Help Desk ticket system (ExtraView) • Safe Harbors manager tracks tickets and response times • Safe Harbors manager has incorporated user feedback to improve customer service • Safe Harbors began a Safe Harbors newsletter in May 2013 as an ongoing communication vehicle • Safe Harbors has developed communications templates for system-related messages • Safe Harbors has increased its messages to keep users informed of system bugs and fixes	• Assess Help Desk tickets with the goal to reduce response time • Assess feedback from users on customer service • Identify pertinent messages for users and publish in a monthly Safe Harbors newsletter as a communication vehicle • Identify real-time system-related messages regarding system bugs and fixes to keep Safe Harbors users informed
3.R.5: Safe Harbors should add to and update the standard operating procedures.	Begun in late 2012; pending • Updates to SOP are underway. • Some updates occurred during period of waiting for HUD TA	• Identify SOP updates needed • Finalize SOP and publish to website

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

| 3.R.6: Safe Harbors should increase the depth of its training program and use new technologies to increase learning opportunities. | • Safe Harbors partners with HSD IT on technology strategy <u>Safe Harbors procured and implemented Web technologies to deploy software and provide webinar software training in relation to Version 5 Adsystech software, starting August 2013</u>. | Acquire software to implement video webinars to be implemented with version 5 roll-out

• Identify new technologies to enhance training experience for users
• Procure new training technology |

Section 4: Reporting Recommendations

Recommendation	Current Activities	Proposed Plan
4.R.1: Safe Harbors should enhance its capacity for data analysis and reporting.	• The Safe Harbors Technical Program Manager and team now are under the leadership of the Human Services Department Director of Data Integrity • The Safe Harbors Research and Evaluation Assistant has been promoted to Management Systems Analyst and her job description has been expanded to increase her capacity for data analysis and reporting • The Human Services Department Epidemiologist will actively serve Safe Harbors to increase staff capacity available for data analysis and reporting • Safe Harbors Manager and staff attended Spring NHSDC conference to increase capacity. • SPSS Software upgraded to provide expanded reporting capabilities. • <u>User's Group designated as the group to generate ideas for process improvements in reporting</u>	• Consider skill set when looking at new hire • Identify additional resources where needed • Increase technical knowledge of existing staff • Identify areas of opportunity to improve the accuracy of management report from funders • See opportunities for the users to run reports to verify data • Develop subcommittee to generate ideas for process improvements in reporting

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

4.R.2: Safe Harbors should reinforce its system and process for improving HMIS data quality.	Contract monitors group Monthly review of agency performance by SH staff Customer service records • Safe Harbors Data Quality Officer creates a data quality process involving agency notifications, education and clean-up • AHAR table shells accepted by HUD for 2011 and 2012. HUD TA assisted by suggesting targeted data quality improvements and methods. Data Quality Officer provides ongoing data quality checks. Agency Support Reps on Safe Harbors team coached agency staff to improve data quality. There was a marked improvement of data quality from 2011 to 2012 reflected in the AHAR data.	• Develop data quality plan • Include a variety of audiences to give input into an improved data quality plan (e.g. Steering Committee, Users Group, CEH, etc)
4.R.3: Safe Harbors should review and revise its HMIS client consent forms and procedures to be as encouraging of consent as possible within existing law.	• Safe Harbors Client Consent forms have been updated for consistency of language • <u>Consent Sub-committee created and convened in 3rd and 4th quarter, 2013. The group discussed ways to improve ways to improve consent across the system and has drafted a new consent form that is easier to understand while including the necessary information.</u>	Training (peer training through partners and / or users group) Review current form for tone /invitation • Identify gaps and propose updates to client consent forms in relation to being encouraging within existing law. • Create a subcommittee with partner agencies and governance • Identify ways to communicate consent as encouraging (e.g. training to agency staff)

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

| 4.R.4: Safe Harbors should continue improving its reporting procedures and formats to better meet the information needs of the CoC, funders, and programs. | Current initiative involvement

 • Single adult shelter TF
 • HEARTH PM
 • CM report
 • Safe Harbors has improved access to reports and formats by making them web-based (Contract Monitor & Data Quality reports)
 • Safe Harbors has presented AHAR and other data sets to better meet information needs of the CoC, funders, and programs
 • Safe Harbors plays an integral role on the development of the HEARTH performance measures.
 • Safe Harbors staff attends an increased amount of meetings to plan for CoC, funder, and program-related reports. | Combine Seattle and KC AHAR in 2014 to use as SH report

 • Improve report accessibility and format on the web
 • Work collaboratively with CoC to improve HEARTH performance measure reporting
 • Improve Ad-hoc report training for user |

Section 5: Data Integration Recommendations

Recommendation	Current Activities	Proposed Plan
5.R.1: Safe Harbors should continue to improve the data integration process. Alternatively, Safe Harbors could outsource data integration to the Washington State Department of Commerce.	Reduced data integration to 2; DI success has improved • Safe Harbors initiated conversations with all data replication agencies for consistency in the process • Safe Harbors requested Adsystech to provide documentation outlining their data replication process	• Identify and document current data integration process – agency-driven • Identify and document data replication process – vendor-driven (this began after TA assessment) • Identify areas of improvement for the Data Integration process • Work with Steering Committee to decide future direction of data integration

Safe Harbors
Measuring the Extent of Homelessness in Seattle and King County

Safe Harbors HMIS Assessment Report Action Plan

Section 6: Messaging Recommendations

Recommendation	Current Activities	Proposed Plan
6.R.1: The Sponsoring Partners and CoC should communicate support for Safe Harbors, its vision, goals, and future direction.	• CEH Planner Funder group began using Safe Harbors data for data dives to drive investment decisions and policies • TAG updates have been presented at the IAC and Governing Board meetings in 4th quarter, 2013	Message to CoC Governance structure the support of Safe Harbors and its use to the data.
6.R.2: Safe Harbors and the recommended Steering Committee should implement the existing Communications Plan.	• Safe Harbors began a Safe Harbors newsletter in May 2013 as an ongoing communication vehicle • Safe Harbors has developed communications templates for system-related messages • Safe Harbors has increased its messages to keep users informed of system bugs and fixes	• Identify and refine existing Safe Harbors communications plan • Implement communications plan • Consider surveying users to assess effectiveness of communications • Create a positive proactive approach to communication utilizing data; ensure transparency
6.R.3: Safe Harbors should keep improving its use of communications technology.	• Safe Harbors improved its external website to strengthen communication between stakeholders and agency partners • Safe Harbors began a Safe Harbors newsletter in May 2013 as an ongoing communication vehicle • Safe Harbors has developed communications templates for system-related messages • Safe Harbors has increased its messages to keep users informed of system bugs and fixes • Safe Harbors implemented enhanced Web technology for user training communications August 2013	Webinar capacity; enhanced use of technology • Identify improved communications technology • Implement improved communications technology

MTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix C: Cost Information and Assumptions

MTG
Management
Consultants

Appendix C: Cost Information and Assumptions

The following assumptions were used to create the costs presented in this report. Any modification to the assumptions will change the associated costs outlined in the report.

- There may be a cost to each HMIS user organization related to the transition. The costs may be associated with changing administrative materials and procedures, disruption in service, changes or reductions in customer service due to staff changes, and, as staff are involved in implementation tasks, learning new policies and procedures, etc. This cost is not included in the estimates but should be considered as a factor in any decision to implementation any option other than B.1.

- There is a planned transition gap of three to four weeks, during which service will be interrupted. SH will need to minimize this gap; however, there is a cost tradeoff in reducing the gap any more than two to three weeks.

- A PM will be necessary to effectively manage the transition from SH in its current form to any of the options in a different form. This will minimize confusion, reduce impact to staff during the changeover, and ensure all tasks are efficiently completed.

- Included in the "Form Organization" are the initial decisions that must be made about shared resource savings, such as using an existing organization's office space or a King County project manager.

- Government staff costs were estimated at 8 people at $75 per hour with a 35 percent benefits overhead.

- The ED salary, $155,250, was estimated at $115,000 plus 35 percent overhead for benefits and employer costs. Based on comments from the TAG, no performance incentive model is anticipated.

- Private staff costs were estimated to be 10 percent greater than government staff costs (e.g., the ED for the 501c[3] and Consortium is estimated to be $177,775, 10 percent higher.)

- The ED position for options C.1, C.2, and C.3 is an upper level manager. Therefore the 10 percent addition for private staff costs described above is not applied.

- Ongoing infrastructure costs were estimated 40 percent of the original cost. This consists of 25 percent of the original cost plus an additional 15 percent of the original cost for licenses, maintenance contracts, and general wear and tear costs.

- Monthly lease cost is calculated to provide 10 spaces, including some private office space, for approximately 2,800 square feet of rentable space. At average downtown Seattle rates, the lease would be $6,000 monthly.

- Initial lease costs represent one lease payment held for retention on the lease and the equivalent of one lease payment to the broker assisting with the lease.

- Many options were assumed to have a 10 percent annual operational cost, which was based on the annual budget of the organization.

MTG
Management
Consultants

- Alternate chargeback costs for office space, where applied, were based on the King County estimate of $5,000 per year per employee.

- Alternative IT infrastructure chargeback costs, where applied, were based on the King County estimate of $2,600 per year per employee. This included phone costs, which reduce the annual communications cost.

- The cost of $60 per hour was used as an average cost for hourly staff services, given that various levels of staff would be necessary.

Variations on these assumptions are noted in the options when the deviation occurred.