Leadership Board Meeting  
Thursday, February 15, 2:30pm-5:30pm  
Highlander Room  
1404 Franklin St, Suite 200, Oakland

**Agenda**

1. Welcome, Purpose and Introductions  
   2:30-2:45

2. Review and Approval of October and December Minutes  
   2:45-2:50
   Approve

3. Updating the EveryOne Home Plan  
   2:50-5:15
   a. Focus Group Summary  
   b. Needs Analysis  
   c. Recommendations for Summit  
   Update  
   Approve

5. EveryOne Home Project Updates  
   5:15-5:30
Leadership Board Meeting

October 26, 2017

Attendance: Robert Ratner, Supervisor Nate Miley, Jill Dunner, Wendy Jackson, Peggy McQuaid, Margot Kushel, Sara Bedford, Susan Shelton, Riley Wilkerson for Linda Gardner, Melanie Ditzenberger, Liz Varela, Suzanne Shenfil, Doug Biggs, Vivian Wan, Terrie Light, Moe Wright, Sylia Soublet for Lori Cox, Gloria Bruce, and Darin Lounds.

Staff: Elaine de Coligny, Julie Leadbetter, Laura Guzman, Jessica Shimmin and Alexis Lozano

1. Introductions and Announcements:
   - Sutter Health's intends to close Alta Bates Medical Center. Closing this hospital will leave Berkeley and other cities without access to a full-service, acute-care hospital. The lives of patients who are critically ill and suffering life threatening emergencies are at risk. The Leadership Board is invited to come to a rally on November 05, 2017 at 11:30 a.m.–1 p.m.
   - The City of Albany opened a community resource center for those experiencing homelessness. It is a drop-in center that allows people to see what resources are available.
   - City of Oakland’s winter shelter will open in November.
   - The Alameda County Sheriff’s Department reported that a Family Reunification Center is now open in Oakland. The have counselors and a complex for playing kid’s sports, food and more.
   - The City of Fremont will be opening its warming center very soon and will be open to children.
   - The Berkeley Housing Resource Center housed its 100th person.
   - The East Bay Housing Organization’s annual membership party is coming up, all are invited.

2. Review and Approval of August Minutes—The minutes were moved and seconded with the modification that the “Prioritization Tool is a work in progress and we will review the performance of the tool that may lead to modifications that is not tied to an annual basis”. The motion passed with Riley Wilkerson, Gloria Bruce, Suzanne Shenfil and Liz Varela abstaining.

3. Governance Charter Changes—The HUD CoC Committee is asking the Leadership Board to approve the listed changes to the Governance Charter and forward them to the membership for ratification. There was the addition of appointed representatives, NOFA Appeals Panel, polices adopted by the Leadership Board in 2017, standards of care, and changes to the System Coordination Committee.
   - In 2017, the work of the System Coordination Committee has been happening in the Implementation and Learning Collaborative since most of the work has been on procedural and operational details.
   - It was moved and seconded with the modifications that 1) the language on membership selection will reflect the traditional process of a selected membership committee and 2) language will be embedded from the appendix to the charter on prioritization and matching for rapid rehousing. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Champions—Recently there has been interest in re-establishing the EveryOne Home Champions. Champions are elected, business, philanthropic, civic and cultural leaders committed to EveryOne Home’s mission of achieving a safe, permanent home for every person in Alameda County. They
bring their abilities to enact public policy, marshal resources, raise public awareness and inspire other leaders and citizens to get involved. The Champions existed before when EveryOne Home was established and included multiple County Supervisors. It would exist outside the current governance structure for more flexibility. Staff is asking for feedback from the Leadership Board on next steps.

- It takes a lot of work to keep these leaders engaged; it would be useful but staff needs to ensure there is the capacity to support it
- Staff needs to ensure there is clarity on the roles and responsibilities
- Maybe it can be more of a task force than an ongoing committee
- There would also need to be an education component where participants know all the work happening across Alameda County and the role of EveryOne Home
- To make it successful the group successful, the conversations would need to be framed around what the participants get out of it
- Have an educational piece so participants know what’s happening already.

5. **Progress on 2017 Work Plan**—Staff reviewed the progress so far.

6. **Updating the EveryOne Home Plan**—Staff is asking the Leadership Board for direction on updating the EveryOne Home Plan. Staff has provided a draft summary of action items and is seeking feedback on the items and next steps. There are three groups for the small group activity discussing Prevention, Safety Net, and Permanent Homes. Overall, the Leadership Board was supportive of the strategies and there was consensus about the need for capitol and resources (especially for supporting services). Staff will work on refining with the feedback given and bring to the membership meeting on October 30th.
Leadership Board Meeting

December 14, 2017

Attendees: Gloria Bruce, Susan Shelton, Darin Lounds, Vivian Wan, Chris Gouig, Margot Kushel, Moe Wright, Suzanne Shenfil, Paulette Franklin, Jill Dunner, Peggy McQuaid, Paul Buddenhagen, Supervisor Nate Miley, Wendy Jackson, Sara Bedford and Linda Gardner.

Staff: Elaine de Coligny, Jessica Shimmin, Julie Leadbetter and Alexis Lozano

1. **Welcome Purpose and Introductions**—
   - East Bay Housing Organizations is hosting a Happy Hour next Tuesday. All are welcome to come.
   - The Berkeley Winter/Warming Shelter should be advertised better because people are having a hard time finding them. People are cold on the street and need warm things like socks, shoes and sweaters.
   - The Berkeley City Council in December allocated $1.9 million for Pathways Project, that has two modular units with 25 beds in each. The City will work with Bay Area Community Services to support and it’s expected to be running by February.
   - Staff would like to start the meeting with data. One of our goals as a community to know every person experiencing homelessness. In the data provided to the Leadership Board, the curve is turning slightly up and shows right now we are not doing well. Another part of the data not captured is flow of those entering and exiting the system.

2. **Approval of 2018 Work Plan**—Staff reviewed the draft work plan with the Leadership Board. At their first meeting in 2018, committees will detail timelines and activities for the year and those will be distributed to Board electronically. Feedback and revisions to the 2018 Work Plan
   - In activity #1 there would need to be a shelter funding conversation. If all shelter is going to be tied to Coordinated Entry that would be a fundamental shift that would require additional resources to provide a level of services to commensurate with higher levels of need.
   - In activity #2 there should be a production goal for people experiencing homelessness (it is 15,000 in current plan). It should also have goals for service capacity and figuring out what is in the pipeline.
   - In activity #2 there should also be an analysis on how current funding is used, and what would it take to solve the issue.
   - In work plan make sure to note that HMIS and HCD are the same entity.
   - In activity #11 note that this work should be coordinated with other funders that monitor same project(s).
   - Staff will detail out more in the Organizational Operations and Development section.
It was moved and seconded to approve the 2018 Work Plan with the edits noted above. The motion passed unanimously. Board members noted that we should make sure we’re reviewing and updating our work plan throughout the year because priorities might change.

3. **Elections**—The Leadership Board reviewed slates. Staff discussed the difference between the Implementation and Learning Community (ILC) and the System Coordination Committee. The ILC are more focusing on the nuts and bolts of Coordinated Entry. As noted in the memo, staff is asking for an expansion of the system coordination committee to have “8-15” members. Leadership Board members suggested reaching out to Our Beloved Community, Christine Beach from City Serve, landlords, or real estate industry to fill vacancies.

It was moved and seconded that 1) System Coordination Committee be allowed to recruit 8-15 members and 2) the rosters of the selected membership committees be approved. The motion passed unanimously. The Leadership Board will receive final rosters when complete.

4. **Adopting the System Performance Measures**—Staff went over the guiding principles, participation from broad group and public input process that went into drafting the system performance measures. The Leadership Board is being asked to adopt the tables provided in the materials and the concept of a dashboard. Feedback and questions about the measures:

   - How can we define cost effectiveness in a way that’s fair and that also gets us information? There is potentially cross-fertilization of HUD CoC Committee and Results Based Accountability Committee to look at this question. Note that San Francisco is working with Tipping Point to build a regional dashboard
   - Feedback on graphics—Separating out buckets.

It was moved and seconded to approve the proposed Population Indicators and System Performance Measures as the basis for tracking and reporting, Data Dashboard concept and the process for monitoring and updating the measures and dashboard design. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Review and Approval of October Minutes/Announcements**—There was not a quorum to approve minutes. They will be reviewed at the next Leadership Board meeting.
A. Introduction
As part of the process of updating the Alameda County EveryOne Home Plan and solicit key stakeholders’ input, EveryOne Home designed and implemented a series of County-wide Consumer Focus Groups to solicit the opinion and expertise of people experiencing homelessness. The goals of the Focus Groups were to document existing systems’ gaps and determine people experiencing unsheltered homelessness’ immediate priorities to weigh in the Plan. In addition, we sought suggestions on how participants would allocate any additional funding from a dedicated source that would focus on housing and homelessness.

The six (6) Focus Groups took place consecutively on January 25th (East Oakland), January 26th (Berkeley), January 29th (West Oakland), January 30th (Hayward), January 31st (Livermore), and February 1st (Fremont), and were attended by a total of 67 participants. The great majority of attendees were single individuals and existing participants of the chosen programs/sites, which congregate primarily unsheltered, single adults through meal programs or warming shelters. Few attendees lived in encampments, and some have lived on their cars.

We want to acknowledge and thank the partners who hosted the Focus Group and worked close with EveryOne Home staff with very short notice: East Oakland Community Project, Dorothy Day House, St. Mary’s Center, Abode Services, Ashbury Methodist Church, and Fremont Family Resource Center. Special thanks to ROOTS Clinic Outreach Project for assisting recruit encampment participants for the East Oakland site, Peter Radu from the City of Berkeley, who assisted to identify the Berkeley site, City of Livermore staff Claudia Young and Dominique Green for organizing the Focus Group at Ashbury Church, and City of Fremont staff Loretta Williams and Gerry Lovejoy by providing food and additional gift cards to attendees.

B. Methodology
The Focus Groups were designed to be an hour-long, facilitated and recorded by EveryOne Home staff. Each group was not to exceed more than 20 people, to facilitate dialogue, participation, and prioritization. In addition to food provided at each site, all participants received male and female hygiene kits prepared by the EveryOne Home’s team.

Each session began with a brief description of EveryOne Home as a collective impact initiative, the need to update our County Plan, and the importance of including the expertise of people experiencing homelessness in the Plan. The format included a set of questions that sought to elicit 1) general ideas about preventing homelessness’ efforts given participant’s personal experience, and what could have potentially helped them to stay housed, 2) a brainstorm on what specific protections (other than services) Cities and County could provide to people experiencing unsheltered homelessness, and 3) a brainstorm on what specific services should Cities and County focus immediately to address unsheltered homelessness, and 4) a general closing question on how should Cities and County utilize any new dedicated funding source for services and housing. Questions 2) and 3) were asked to be prioritized by each Focus Group, with each participant selecting their 2 most important priorities for each question.
C. The Talk of the Town: Common Themes

Some major common themes, which resulted in some of the most voted prioritized recommendations and emerged in every Group, are worth mentioning. These were described by different participants when asked questions about what would have prevented their homelessness and/or brainstorming about safety net protections and services:

1) The dignity and value of people experiencing homelessness must be honored, and the systemic discrimination faced by people who are homeless must end: The majority of participants articulated that people who are homeless need to be recognized as human beings, and not be discriminated against—whether by law enforcement, government, social services agencies, motels/hotels, employers, transit, security guards, and other people, without redress. A participant from the East Oakland Focus Groups stated, “Some bus drivers do not allow homeless to ride due to hygiene. Some homeless will ride all night for a place to stay warm, drivers will ask them to leave regardless of paying fare. Some drivers will even turn on the A/C and keep the windows down to make it uncomfortable.” In the Fremont Group, one participant stated that “After the Compassionate Fremont Campaign passed— the City of Fremont turned off power at the alcove, posted no trespassing signs, and removed bushes which provided storage and sleeping space,” while another stated that at the same time the City parks “removed benches.”
2) **People experiencing homelessness feel unsafe and request health and safety protections, including protection from harassment and mistreatment by law enforcement.** Most participants stated they did not have a safe and permanent space to sleep during the night and/or be during the day, which was a major stressor and made them vulnerable to harassment, assault, and violence. Women (and men) described several accounts of violence and sexual assault against women while on the streets or inside their cars. Most participants mentioned that in addition to the lack of housing, the lack of access to basic sanitation (including toilet access, shower and laundry services – including mobile toilets/shower units, garbage collection, and access to cooking facilities) is one of their primary health and safety concern, followed by access to spaces where they could sit, charge phones, and store belongings. Recommendations for safe spaces at night varied, including expanding existing shelter capacity (such creating year-round warming shelters, and repurposing existing or empty buildings), safe parking spaces, and increasing health and safety in shelters, including lice and bedbugs’ infestations, and unsafe ratios of staff to residents in some shelters. For day services, many participants mentioned “repurposing” existing spaces for access and community support, including multi-services centers, drop in centers and trailers. Many participants also echoed the constant presence of law enforcement, primarily police, in their lives, with whom they engage daily. Participants felt that police (including Cities’ police, UC Berkeley Police, Alameda County Sheriff, Fire Department, and security guards) move them from space to space, and often mistreat them, rather than offer to them the protection, help and support they deserve. One participant stated, “*When you see police, you think you are in trouble,*” while another added that if police would give out information or resources to the homeless, rather than asking the question “what are you doing?,” they would feel more protected.

3) **Mistrust in the system and 211:** Many participants articulated their mistrust of the system and reflected that, in their experience, no matter what input they provide, it does not result in agencies or government meeting their basic needs. One participant from East Oakland stated that “*many front desk staff are rude, and the process to get assistance is very tedious and complicated.*” One of the most echoed concerns was their response to the question about their experience with 211, where participants responded it was not a place to call to get help. Many described reports of unsuccessful assistance, including receiving wrong or disconnected phone numbers, being hung up on by staff, and calls going unanswered. Although many responses were past (rather than current experiences) with 211, only 2 participants reported positive experiences after they were referred to temporary warming shelters.

4) **People experiencing homelessness request access to income, life skills, employment training, and job opportunities.** As most people lost their homes because of inability to pay for high rents, many participants requested that the system removes barriers to access more income and employment. The suggestions ranged from addressing discrimination by employers, who do not hire people while experiencing homelessness; offering showers and clothes for those engaged in job seeking activities; life skills and meaningful vocational training; casual employment for those on SSI/SSDI; and opportunities to barter services with businesses and residents in exchange for safe spaces to sleep at night. An East Oakland participant added that vacant properties should be preserved and re-utilized for affordable/homeless housing and “*homeless individuals employed to rehab to build job skills and ownership in the property.*” A Berkeley participant suggested businesses offering “*gift cards in exchange for cleaning/working*” areas where people sleep at night.
D. Protections’ Priorities
The top two (2) most voted priorities of Specific Protections that the Cities and County could provide to people experiencing unsheltered homelessness were the following: 45% (n=30) of Participants voted and recommended to prioritize the protection of health and safety, while 22% (n=15) voted to recommend protection against law enforcement. For many, the protection of health and safety included being free from all forms of harassment and discrimination. As mentioned above, health and safety protections included increasing safe night and day spaces – including safe parking, increased access to sanitation (including 24 hours toilet access, showers, laundry and dumpster and garbage services), and increasing health and safety standards in shelters.

E. Services’ Priorities
The top (2) most voted priorities on what Specific Services should Cities and County should focus immediately to address unsheltered homelessness were the following: 69% (n=voted) and recommended to prioritize upscale Basic Sanitation, to include 24 hours toilet access, shower and laundry services, dumpster access and garbage services, and access to warming/cooking facilities, while 38% (n=26) voted to recommend the provision of additional Shelter/Safe Spaces at night, including expanding warming shelters year-round, repurposing spaces, and allowing other spaces to sleep, including safe camping spaces for those residing in vehicles/RVs.

F. Recommendations for the Utilization of a Dedicated Source
In responding to the question on how the Cities and County should utilize any (new) dedicated funding source for services and housing for unhoused individuals, the number one priority was housing and housing vouchers/subsidies. The order of importance included: 1) housing rental subsidies for affordable housing at 30% AMI, including long term, deep subsidies for the disabled and elder; 2) preservation, repurposing and rehabilitation of existing empty buildings and utilize homeless individuals as workforce, and 3) provision of supportive services, including housing stabilization support and life skills trainings, for those that need it, and mental health support. Most Participants also indicated that in addition to the above recommendations, any dedicated funding should also provide for sanitation services adequate to meet the demand for those still on the streets.
TURNING THE CURVE: HOMELESSNESS IN ALAMEDA COUNTY, CA

Draft Needs Analysis and Recommend Strategies for Reductions by the 2023 Point-In-Time Count

Abstract

In our county where nearly 4,000 people stay on the streets every night, we ask what will it take to ensure that every person who loses their home has a place to stay indoors that same day by January 2023? The answer, not surprisingly is that more targeted permanently affordable housing and more focused prevention is needed. This report’s needs analysis tackles how much, at what scale, and recommendations for how to close the gaps.

Elaine de Coligny, Executive Director, EveryOne Home
I. Introduction

Residents of the San Francisco Bay Area identify homelessness and the cost of housing as the most pressing issues we face in poll after poll\(^1\). Increasingly, lifelong residents are forced out of their homes and neighborhoods. Those who can, move. Those who cannot, join the growing population of housing refugees living unsheltered on the sidewalks, underpasses, parks and arroyos throughout Alameda County. The inhumane conditions people on the streets face daily call us all to address the housing crisis with renewed urgency.

The report seeks to answer the question: **What would it take to end unsheltered homelessness by the January 2023 Homeless Point-In-Time Count?**

On January 31, 2017 nearly 400 volunteers fanned out across every census tract in Alameda County, counting 3,863 unsheltered people sleeping in vehicles, tents, abandoned buildings, parks, and other places not meant for people to live. Another 1,766 people stayed in shelters and transitional housing. Taken together, a total of 5,629 people were without a permanent home that night in January. Our data indicates that over 12,000 people each year will experience an episode of homelessness. For some that episode will be brief, lasting only weeks, but for more than half their homelessness will last a year or longer.

![2017 Sheltered/Unsheltered Population](image)

Given the scale of people living outdoors today, is it possible to create a coordinated system of care that has a bed for every person who loses their home on any given night? It will take bold, coordinated action and significant investments. **We will need to reduce the numbers of people becoming homeless each year through prevention, and to increase the number of people exiting to a home through a range of permanent housing options.** By focusing our investments and collaboration on prevention and permanent housing resources, we have the best chance of achieving this ambitious goal, restoring dignity and humanity to those experiencing a housing crisis, and to us all.

**Target: Reduce the Point-In-Time Count to 1,365 people or less by January 2023**

As of January 2017, the housing crisis response system had a year-round shelter capacity of 1,636 beds. Reducing the number of people experiencing homelessness to below the existing shelter capacity will enable us to offer an interim housing bed to anyone who has lost their housing on the same day. This report makes recommendations designed to realize that goal.

---

The strategies advanced in this report are informed by over two dozen key stakeholder interviews, six focus groups attended by 67 people currently living on the streets and in shelters across the entire county, two community forums with the EveryOne Home membership, and a review of existing practices.

The projected types, scale and cost of interventions needed for people to return to permanent homes recommended in this report are based on the Countywide Point-In-Time Counts, Homeless Housing and Services Inventories, Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data on demographics, service utilization and performance. They make use of projection tools developed by CSH and the National Alliance to End Homelessness to assist communities with system planning. Coordinated Entry will enable us to collect additional data to refine the analysis and revise projections in the years to come.

Thank you to all who contributed to developing these draft recommendations—the membership, the leadership board, elected officials, those currently experiencing homelessness, county and city staff members, non-profit partners, and the staff of EveryOne Home, all of whom worked on this report.

II. Homelessness in Alameda County—Current census and services:

Homelessness is the most egregious outcome of a housing market that no longer meets the needs of its residents. In a January 25, 2018 Trulia Blog titled; “The Rent is Getting Too Damn High” David Weidner identifies Oakland as the 5th most expensive rental market in the nation and the market with the 2nd steepest increases in median rent over the last five years, from $1,952 in 2012 to $2,950 in 2017, a 51% increase. The Urban Institute noted in its April 2017 Map of the Rental Housing Crisis that Alameda County has a 44,000 unit gap between the number of extremely low-income renters and the number of units affordable to them—71,000 renters versus 28,000 units. It is no wonder that more people are losing their housing and becoming trapped in homelessness for months, even years.

As indicated in the chart below, Alameda County experienced a significant increase in the number of people estimated to be homeless on a given night in January 2017 when compared to prior years. Though the use of a new methodology probably contributed to this change, the reality is that homelessness has gone up in our community.

---

**Annual Estimates of Homelessness**

EveryOne Home used the Point-In-Time Count and Survey data to estimate the number of individuals and households who experienced homelessness over the course of 2017. The countywide homeless count identified 5,629 people—4,859 households—experiencing homelessness on the night of January 30, 2017. In the two weeks following 1,228 people experiencing homelessness were surveyed. A small percentage, (2.2%), indicated that they had been homeless for seven days or less. That number was used to calculate the number of people becoming homeless each week in Alameda County as well as to estimate the total over the course of year.

\[
2.2\% \times 5,629 = 124 \text{ people becoming homeless each week}
\]

124 people/week \times 52 weeks = \textbf{6,440 people in 5,545 households becoming homeless annually}

6,440 new people + 5,629 people already homeless as of January 2017 = \textbf{12,069 total people in 10,400 households experiencing homelessness annually}

**Current Countywide Capacity and Spending**

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requires all communities that receive federal homeless assistance funding to maintain an inventory of all housing dedicated to serving those experiencing homelessness. This inventory, known as the Housing Inventory Chart (HIC), is updated annually each January. It includes all known public and privately funded housing, both short term and permanent, building based and scattered site vouchers. According the January 2017 HIC, providers across Alameda County offered the following housing interventions:

- 1,636 emergency and transitional housing beds in operation 365 days per year
- 309 additional seasonal and inclement weather beds
- 900 Rapid Rehousing Housing slots over the course of the year
- 2,930 beds of Permanent Supportive Housing, which translates to 2,321 units.

In addition to operating short term and permanent housing. The community’s response to homelessness includes the provision of a wide range of services:

- Coordinated Entry—launched countywide as of January 2018
- Street Outreach—partners currently have approximately 12 full-time equivalent employees covering the entire county.
- Housing Navigation—to assist people in searching for and securing housing
- Legal Services—to assist people in resolving legal matters that could result in the loss of housing or prevent a return to housing
- Housing Education Workshops—conducted daily and available on a drop-in basis to those at risk and those already homeless.
- Health Care Services—provided through mobile and community clinics
Tenancy Sustaining Services—to assist newly housed people to settle in, connect to community resource and be good neighbors and tenants
Prevention—including housing problem solving and flex funds to pay rent and utility arrears.

Preliminary data indicates non-capital expenditures for housing and support services to people experiencing homelessness total approximately $105 million annually. About $60+ million is from federal sources including HUD, HHS, and VA administered by County and City departments as well as direct grants to non-profits. Another $20+ million comes from State funds including Whole Person Care, CalWORKS and Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). County and City general funds along with private sources provide the remainder of resources. The pie chart below indicates how the funding is distributed across service type. It is important to note that the data is incomplete and will need further refinement.

III. Projected Annual Capacity and Cost for System to Operate at Functional Zero
The Everyone Home Plan envisions a system of care in Alameda County that ensures that all extremely low-income residents have a safe, supportive and permanent place to call home with services available to help them stay housed and improve the quality of their lives. The vision is ambitious, and possible. We are building a future in which there are sufficient resources, political leadership, and community involvement to erase homelessness as a permanent fixture in our social landscape. The vision focuses on quick access to permanent housing, strength-based consumer relationships, coordination and collaboration with mainstream partners, policy and resource advocacy, and comprehensive community education. We will have arrived when
our community has no unsheltered or chronically homeless people, and we are returning as many people to permanent homes each month as lose them.

1. **What do we think would resolve the homelessness of people served by the system over the course of 2017-2023?**

The Homeless Information Management System (HMIS) gathers data on people served in over 100 housing and homeless service agencies through the county. In 2017 programs that enter data into HMIS served 10,148 people experiencing homelessness. Others obtained homeless and housing services outside of HMIS or without public funding, such as domestic violence or faith-based programs. For example, 75% of emergency shelter beds enter participant data into HMIS, compared with 93% of transitional housing beds. Knowing that 75 to 80% of people experiencing homelessness are likely to have a HMIS record allows us to confidently apply aggregated HMIS data about incomes, disability, prior residences, to the population as a whole. This data was used to project the type of housing intervention that could have resolved the housing crisis of those service in 2017.

**a. Prevention**

Over the last three years, an average of 32% of people served had prior living situations that if assisted with prevention and housing problem solving resources could have avoided literal homelessness—time in emergency shelter, transitional housing, sleep outdoors or in other places not meant for people to live (HUD definition of homelessness). Those situations include

---

living in rental housing, with family or friends or in a hotel or motel. Applied to the entire population, an estimated 3,300 households would likely have benefited from prevention services. Such services include:

❖ Housing Problem Solving
❖ Legal assistance
❖ A flex fund for paying back rent or relocation costs, transportation and/or utility cost

b. One-Time/Short-Term assistance
An average of 30% of those who exited the system over the last three years did so to unassisted permanent arrangements. A portion of those individuals and families may avoid homelessness through prevention services. Some will not, and EveryOne Home projects that 1,640 households could regain housing with no or one-time housing assistance.

c. Rapid Rehousing
Rapid Rehousing programs including support for locating permanent housing, move in costs and ongoing subsidies for a period, until the household is in a position to pay the full rent. While the length and depth of rental assistance varies by funding source, the average length of program participation was just under nine months in 2017. Eighteen percent of adults served in 2017 had earned income, another 27% had income from sources such as TANF or GA that could increase during a Rapid Rehousing stay. After subtracting the portion who might be prevented or solved with one-time assistance, approximately 11.5% of 1,240 households were candidates for Rapid Rehousing.

d. Permanently subsidized housing
HMIS data indicates that 93% of adults served have incomes of under $2,000 per month, 75% have incomes under $1,000 per month, and of those, 21% had no income. While aspiring to gaining or increasing income, at least 58% of adults had fixed disability or retirement income sources. This group is likely to need ongoing subsidies to sustain housing. Some will also need intensive tenancy sustaining support services as well, but most could maintain permanent housing if it were affordable on their incomes. EveryOne Home estimates this was true of 2,560 households in 2017.

e. Permanent Supportive Housing
Permanent Supportive Housing combines deep subsidies and intensive supportive services for people who need both on a permanent basis to stay housed. It is the housing crisis response system’s most costly intervention and is not needed for every homeless person with a disability. CSH recommends calculating who needs permanent housing by looking at the portion of the population that exits emergency shelter and transitional housing back to unsheltered homelessness or unknown locations. This formula resulted in a projection of 1,700 households needing PSH last year. That is slightly larger than our Point-In-estimate of 1,652 chronically
homeless, but much lower than the proportion 60% of adults served who face disabling conditions.

2. **What scale of these housing interventions is needed to achieve the goal of no unsheltered homelessness by 2023?**

Achieving this goal requires three strategies pursued aggressively starting in 2018 through 2022, so that we achieve a PIT Count of 1,365 or lower by January 2023:

a. Increase prevention and focus on the front door of Coordinated Entry such that the number of households becoming homeless each year is reduced from the 5,545 estimated in 2017 to under 2,800 in 2022. In 2017 programs spent just under $3 million in prevention services. It is unclear the degree to which the services prevented an episode of homelessness versus prevented an eviction. Not all evictions result in homelessness and it will be important to monitor the impact of the anti-displacement funds entering the system in 2018 in terms of reduced numbers of new homeless episodes.

It is critical to emphasize that prevention services in isolation of policy actions to stabilize renters in their homes is far less likely to create the result we are hoping for. Cities across Alameda County are considering various renter protection policies. EveryOne Home strongly encourages this approach. *(We can add examples to the final report).* A final note on homelessness prevention: protecting tenants should be a locally controlled set of policies and not prohibited by state law as the current Costa Hawkins law does. EveryOne Home urges stakeholders to support the repeal efforts.

b. Increasing exits to permanent housing from 1,400 households in 2017 to 3,550 households in 2022:

i. Households resolving with One-Time Assistance increases to a peak of 1,127.

ii. Rapid Rehousing to increase from 534 families housed annually to 1,000.

iii. Create a deep subsidy program for households on fixed incomes, that ramps up from under 200 housed in 2017 this way to 1,440 housed in 2021. These subsidies are projected to be permanent like PSH and will accumulate to 5,000 by 2023, at which time the need will level off to the point that new households can be stabilized with 10% turnover. The subsidy program envisioned by this strategy uses the funds to pay the difference between the maximum rent on a unit for those at 50% Area Median Income and what a person on SSI Disability Income can afford to pay for rent, which in 2018 is about $700 dollars per month. The program anticipates renting the units created by measure A1 and other affordable housing sources. The public supported these bonds in large part
to end homelessness, and it is in our interest to create ways for homeless people to afford the units built with these funds.

iv. Increasing the number of persons obtaining PSH from 140 in 2017 to 400 annually by 2021. This can be done by adding 50-60 PSH units annually until we reach 2,500 total units. Our current count is 2,321. This strategy will eliminate chronic homelessness by 2021, and future need can be met using existing turnover at 8-10% and adding 200 annual “step down” Tenant Choice Vouchers from local housing authorities. Both OHA and HACA have offered such vouchers in the past.

c. Decrease the number of households exiting to temporary or unknown destinations, from 1,400 annually to 400 annually.

The chart below illustrates the impact of more focused prevention and increased housing opportunities over five years. The bars illustrate the gradual increase in capacity of each intervention, with the most dramatic increase coming with the addition of deep permanent subsidies, a program that does not currently exist. The orange line traces reductions in the annual numbers of households entering homelessness, while the blue dots indicate the number people estimated to be homeless in January of the given year. The combination of prevention and increased housing exits will result in a 2023 PIT Count that is lower than the number of year-round shelter and transitional housing beds available, thus eliminating unsheltered homelessness.
3. What is the cost of increasing the scale needed to achieve the goal of unsheltered homelessness by 2023?

![Current v. Needed Investments](image)

*Rationale for projections will be included in the full report.*

*Permanent Subsidy would require a dedicated, permanent source for long-term sustainability.*

Cost estimates do not include current services, sheltering and admin costs which add an additional $50 million to the 2018 budget, and would likely add an even greater cost to 2022 amounts, though much less than the projected increases to housing costs.

IV. Addressing Unsheltered Homelessness

What needs to be done about unsheltered homelessness between now and achieving our goal of no unsheltered homelessness?

Given that our unsheltered population was at 3,863 at the 2017 Point in Time Count, there is still a long way to go to ensure that there is a shelter bed for every person experiencing homelessness. However, in the interim we believe there are some strategies that can be pursued to address the needs of people living outdoors, in cars, and/or temporary shelters.

EveryOne Home designed and implemented a series of County-wide Consumer Focus Groups to elicit the opinion and expertise of people experiencing homelessness. The goals of the Focus Groups were to document systems’ gaps and determine people experiencing unsheltered homelessness’ immediate priorities. In addition, we sought suggestions on how participants would allocate any additional funding from a dedicated source that would focus on housing and homelessness.
The six (6) Focus Groups took place consecutively on January 25th (East Oakland), January 26th (Berkeley), January 29th (West Oakland), January 30th (Hayward), January 31st (Livermore), and February 1st (Fremont), and were attended by a total of 67 participants. The great majority of attendees were single individuals and existing participants of the chosen programs/sites, which congregate primarily unsheltered, single adults through meal programs or warming shelters. Few attendees lived in encampments, and some have lived in their cars. The Focus Group Summary report is attached.

System Gaps and Immediate Priorities described:

❖ Health and Safety Protections. For many, the protection of health and safety included being free from all forms of harassment and discrimination.
❖ Basic Sanitation. This included 24-hour toilet access, shower and laundry services, dumpster access and garbage services, and access to warming/cooking facilities.
❖ Additional Shelter/Safe Spaces at night. This includes expanding warming shelters year-round, repurposing spaces, and allowing other spaces to sleep, including safe camping spaces for those residing in vehicles/RVs.

What resources need to be expanded to address the System Gaps and Immediate Priorities?

It is important to expand safety, hygiene and support services to unsheltered folks, but it is not cost effective to expand year-round shelter buildings. To be responsive, we recommend adding services that can easily be scaled back and/or converted to low cost permanent housing as the unsheltered numbers become lower. These include but are not limited to:

❖ Safe parking or camping spaces where people had access to toilets, showers, dumpsters and power. These can be located on vacant properties of parking lots of businesses, community centers or places of worship.
❖ Expand Drop-In Centers outside of Berkeley and Oakland for showers, laundry, and safe indoor spaces. Some HRCs could become such locations over time.
❖ Consider making existing warming shelters and seasonal beds available year-round.

How can jurisdictions create policies that address encampments?

Policy recommendations—EveryOne Home understands that communities in Alameda County are greatly impacted by the rise of unsheltered homelessness and are responding to the crisis by creating policies to address the needs, rights and concerns of those who are unsheltered, those who are housed, pedestrians and businesses. Given the shortage of permanent housing and emergency shelter, people will be forced to stay in places not meant for human habitation.

Any policies regulating outdoor living must remain human-centered and protect the dignity and stability of those experiencing homelessness while ensuring the health and safety of all community residents. In addition, the legislation should acknowledge that responses to encampments may have impacts that are arbitrary and capricious. By establishing
expectations, encampment’s policies need to be established to lessen the adverse effects and conditions caused by the lack of a home.

Additionally, if encampments are to be closed or temporarily moved, clear guidelines and criteria need to be in place to ensure residents are aware of processes. This includes but it not limited to: clear, written notices with long timeframes for abatement and removal, responses to health and safety concerns, ensuring a solution for belongings if displaced, and connecting those that are displaced to coordinated entry.

EveryOne Home would like to emphasize that whenever possible, encampments should only be closed or temporarily moved as a final resort. Not only is it disruptive and traumatic for residents but it is also costly to the Cities, County, and public transportation authorities. Resources should instead be spent on permanent housing solutions for people experiencing homelessness.

V. Goals and Targets for Sub-Populations (Needs further development)
   A. Reduce the number of families from 270 to under 100 by January 2021 PIT Count
   B. Reduce the number of veterans from 531 to under 90 by January 2021 PIT Count
   C. End chronic homelessness by the 2023 PIT Count
   D. Reduce the number of unaccompanied youth (18-24) from 970 to 250 by January 2023
   E. Reduce the number of people with serious mental illness from 1,622 to 1,000 by January 2023
General Updates for Leadership Board
February 2018

**Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care (HUD CoC) Committee:**

The HUD CoC Committee functions as the Continuum of Care Board, required by federal homeless assistance regulations to act on behalf of the membership to ensure the CoC responsibilities are fulfilled. CoC responsibilities include: designating and operating a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) database, Continuum of Care planning and needs analysis, conducting a biennial census of sheltered and unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness, monitoring project performance, and preparing an application for Continuum of Care funds (HUD NOFA).

**Update:** The HUD CoC Committee discussed in January and will vote in its February meeting on the Committee's 2018 Work Plan, articulating its CoC Board responsibilities and tasks under HUD’s Interim Rule, and any pending item from the 2017/2018 Plan. Since the CoC is responsible for making decisions about HMIS management and administration, the Committee is actively working on executing a new Memorandum of Understanding with the HMIS Lead agency, the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development, and preparing to recruit members and launch the HMIS Oversight Subcommittee in April, to guide and support the implementation of the new HMIS system. In addition, staff is preparing to present to the Committee a 2018 NOFA Competition Work Plan, that includes a Project Performance Evaluation (in Quarter 1) and project monitoring activities that will stretch NOFA activities beyond the NOFA period. See attached work plan for more details. **NOFA Update:** On January 11, HUD announced funding awards for the 2017 Continuum of Care competition. Our Continuum was awarded a total of $35,327,971 for its combined Tier 1, Tier 2, Coordinated Entry, and CoC Planning Projects, the third largest award in California, after Los Angeles and San Francisco (see Memorandum attached for further details). All renewal projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2 (except one) were awarded. EveryOne Home staff is planning a NOFA debrief on February 27th, that will include a presentation on the 2018 NOFA Competition Work Plan.
Coordinated Entry and System Coordination Work:

Alameda County is moving towards coordinated entry system to serve people experiencing homelessness and support their transition to permanent housing. Coordinated entry is intended to make it easier for people to access services and match people to services according to their prioritized level of need. HUD requires each Continuum of Care to implement coordinated entry in their community.

Update: EveryOne Home staff, in coordination with Alameda County HCSA and HCD have held 12 trainings since October on the Housing Crisis Response System. The trainings cover Introduction to Coordinated Entry, 211 and Housing Problem Solving, Prioritization Tool, and Matching. There were over 376 attendees at the trainings, with likely overlap.

Additionally, 1,374 adult heads of household have been assessed and prioritized using the new tool since October 23, 2017. See attached for the detailed analysis.

The System Coordination Committee has been established and will have its first meeting on February 14th. The Committee includes diverse representation, including people with lived experienced of homelessness, service providers, funders and jurisdictional partners. See the roster below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riley Wilkerson</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>County Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara Tannenbaum</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Leyden</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Almanza</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Bay Area Community Services</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Wan</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison DeJung</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>211/Eden I&amp;R</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Radu</td>
<td>Homeless Services Coordinator</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Noha Aboelata</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Roots Community Clinic</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Lutsky</td>
<td>Management Analyst</td>
<td>Alameda County HCSA</td>
<td>County Dept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operation Vets Home:

Operation Vets Home is Alameda County’s initiative to end veteran homelessness. The initiative is implemented by a collaborative formed in early 2015 including EveryOne Home, Support Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) grantee agencies, Grand Per Diem (GPD) grantee agencies, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (V.A). This initiative is part of a nationwide effort to end veteran homelessness, called for by the Obama Administration and V.A. in 2014.

Update: The OVH partners continue to collaborate closely with one another towards the goal of declaring an end to veteran homelessness in our community. All agencies are now conducting Coordinated Entry assessments, and plan to integrate with Coordinated Entry process in the coming months. The committee is focusing on re-assessing the VASH Interest List, Chronically Homeless veterans into HMIS, and will assess all Veterans during intake and enrollment. The current count of homeless Veterans is 324. The committee also has a goal of ending Chronic Homelessness for Veterans by the end of 2018. The current count of chronically homeless Veterans is 84.

Results Based Accountability:

The Results Based Accountability (RBA) Committee supports the goal of ending homelessness through performance measurement that is attentive to effort, quality, and impact. The RBA Committee’s activities include: reviewing system performance by tracking and reporting population indicators and performance measures, recommending initial and updated performance measures and benchmarks, recommending dashboard design to EveryOne Home’s Leadership Board, ensuring the production of dashboards to keep the public informed of system performance and progress toward ending homelessness and working to integrate data from mainstream systems of care.
**Update:** The RBA Committee met in January to define the year's workplan. The RBA Committee will be focusing its attention on three major projects:
1. Developing and proposing the design for a data dashboard
2. Benchmarking targets for the system performance measures
3. Implementing the data development agenda that was defined in the system performance measures

During February the RBA Committee will not meet but will finish a draft response to the public comments to the system performance measures. As well, EveryOne Home will use that time to compile the first round of system performance data from 2017.

**Advocacy Committee:**
Due to scheduling conflicts the January Advocacy Committee meeting was postponed. Staff is working to reschedule and calendar all 2018 Advocacy meetings.
HUD announced funding awards for the 2017 Continuum of Care competition on January 11, 2017. Our continuum was awarded a total of $35,327,971 for its combined Tier 1, Tier 2, Coordinated Entry, and CoC planning projects, the third largest award in California after Los Angeles and San Francisco CoCs award. A link to all HUD’s list of all funded projects is here: https://www.hudexchange.info/onecpd/assets/File/2017-california-coc-grants.pdf. Alameda County’s list starts in the middle of page 4.

All renewal projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2 (except one), HMIS, Coordinated Entry and the CoC Planning Fund were awarded. This means that thousands of people in our Continuum will remain in affordable, safe homes and hundreds more will be assisted to end their homelessness. The attached list provides a comparison of what was requested by the Continuum versus what was awarded in the rank order from our local process as submitted to HUD. Highlights include:

- **All renewals funded except one.** All renewals, were funded in this round including Tier 2 projects, except one. Redwood Hills, a 28-unit affordable family housing project under development, was not renewed by HUD. The CoC grant would have funded services for six PSH units in the project once operational. Renewals for HMIS, Coordinated Entry and the CoC Planning Fund were also funded.

- **Renewal rental assistance projects were increased** by a combined total of $1,484,942 from the Annual Renewal Demand due as HUD made Fair Market Rent (FMR) adjustments to the awards. HUD uses the FMRs that were in effect at the time applications were due, which means that FY 2017 FMRs will be used for these awards.

- **Two traditional TH projects which proposed reallocation as TH-RRH projects** were awarded: Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Programs and Families in Transition. These projects will be our first TH-RRH Joint Component projects, and will add rapid rehousing slots to our continuum capacity.

- **The Bonus Projects were not funded.** Two new projects proposed by the City of Berkeley, Pathway Bridges (a proposed new TH-RRH project) and Coach Expansion (new PSH expansion), were not funded in this round.

Congratulations to all grantees and to our community for its participation, commitment to excellence, and strategic approaches to our collaborative application each year. We are looking forward to continuing to advance our collective efforts to strengthen our Continuum’s outcomes, maintain and enhance our housing and homeless services’ portfolio, and further develop housing access and
resources for those most vulnerable through our newly implemented Coordinated Entry system, upcoming new HMIS System implementation, and our Result Based Accountability processes and dashboard. 2018 will be a very busy and productive year!

Please feel free to distribute this to any sub-grantees or colleagues who were also part of the CoC NOFA process. If you have questions about your specific funding award amount, please direct them to Riley at riley.wilkerson@acgov.org. Other questions may be directed to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org.

A community debrief of the NOFA process will be convened sometime in February of 2017. Please stay tuned for invitations and announcements from EveryOne Home.

Thank you!!!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Rewarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laguna Commons Rental Assistance Program (RAP)</td>
<td>Alameda County BHCS</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$167,560.00</td>
<td>$173,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welcome Home San Leandro</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$665,628.00</td>
<td>$683,628.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope I</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$51,685.00</td>
<td>$70,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$187,315.00</td>
<td>$194,131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Bonita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$35,323.00</td>
<td>$39,767.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Berkeley Housing for Older Adults Project (HOAP)</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$282,624.00</td>
<td>$292,416.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oakland PATH Re-Housing Initiative</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$474,829.00</td>
<td>$620,822.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$297,138.00</td>
<td>$372,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$604,658.00</td>
<td>$783,579.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$215,356.00</td>
<td>$222,436.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>NEW Joint TH and PH-RRH</td>
<td>$264,765.00</td>
<td>$269,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Families in Transition</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>NEW Joint TH and PH-RRH</td>
<td>$249,815.00</td>
<td>$255,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$182,216.00</td>
<td>$188,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>InHOUSE</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>$391,907.00</td>
<td>$391,907.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$216,446.00</td>
<td>$294,015.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$971,983.00</td>
<td>$1,258,129.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$71,808.00</td>
<td>$82,552.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tri-City FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$42,973.00</td>
<td>$42,973.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$77,099.00</td>
<td>$92,458.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$2,958,286.00</td>
<td>$3,058,786.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Rewarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages Program</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$ 1,463,286.00</td>
<td>$ 1,499,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 456,916.00</td>
<td>$ 471,604.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 39,462.00</td>
<td>$ 45,245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 6,577,463.00</td>
<td>$ 6,806,807.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 822,707.00</td>
<td>$ 843,587.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Homes for Wellness</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 890,540.00</td>
<td>$ 917,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 674,734.00</td>
<td>$ 698,098.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Turning Point</td>
<td>Fred Finch Youth Center</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$ 489,001.00</td>
<td>$ 489,001.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 765,936.00</td>
<td>$ 794,964.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 85,788.00</td>
<td>$ 85,788.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$ 713,095.00</td>
<td>$ 713,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$ 1,864,465.00</td>
<td>$ 1,864,465.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 1,605,488.00</td>
<td>$ 1,657,388.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>North County Family Rapid Rehousing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$ 804,419.00</td>
<td>$ 822,119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Bridget House Transitional</td>
<td>Women's Daytime Drop-In Center</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$ 70,289.00</td>
<td>$ 70,289.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Banyan House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$ 81,320.00</td>
<td>$ 81,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bessie Coleman Court Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>Cornerstone Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 247,426.00</td>
<td>$ 254,926.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Carmen Avenue Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 36,166.00</td>
<td>$ 36,166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) Project</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 160,183.00</td>
<td>$ 160,183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Rewarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>North County Women's Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$ 390,535.00</td>
<td>$ 390,535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$ 393,908.00</td>
<td>$ 404,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOPE Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 470,509.00</td>
<td>$ 487,069.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>North County Homeless Youth RRH</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$ 1,306,866.00</td>
<td>$ 1,340,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network</td>
<td>LifeLong Medical Care</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 549,672.00</td>
<td>$ 549,672.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Alameda County CES</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>CES-R</td>
<td>$ 1,038,171.00</td>
<td>$ 1,038,171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 868,785.00</td>
<td>$ 1,309,124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 395,579.00</td>
<td>$ 1,111,092.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>APC Multi-Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 1,111,092.00</td>
<td>$ 1,111,092.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pathways Bridges</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>NEW Joint TH and PH-RRH</td>
<td>$ 996,375.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Redwood Hill Townhomes</td>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$ 61,626.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>COACH Project expansion</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>NEW PSH</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CoC Planning Project FY 2017 | $ 998,188.00 | $ 998,188.00 |
| Renewals                    | $32,330,261.00 | $ 33,805,123.00 |
| Bonus                       | $ 1,996,375.00 | $ 0.00 |
| Reallocated                 | $ 514,580.00  | $ 524,660.00  |
| **Total**                   | $35,839,404.00 | $ 35,327,971.00 |
Alameda County’s housing crisis response system implemented a standard Coordinated Entry: Assessment in October 2017. The assessment’s weighted scoring framework quantifies housing barriers and vulnerabilities, allowing the housing crisis response system to prioritize the most vulnerable households for housing and support resources.

1,374 adult heads of household have been assessed and prioritized since October 23, 2017. Prioritized assessments are distributed across the county as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Zones</th>
<th>Households Prioritized</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Front Door</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-County</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45-189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12-198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 73% of those households are composed of a single adult, and 27% are multi-person households.
- 13% of households have minor children
- 43% of the households fit the criteria of chronic homelessness

The below chart shows that prioritization scores is nearly normal, with scores skewing very slightly to the left. Until now, the average and median have been nearly identical, 110 and 111 at last look. Now we see the average score has dropped a bit more below the median (middle) score. This is only a subtle and minor change from the last review. More generally, the long distribution and narrowing at each end means that the assessment tool is sensitive to variations in vulnerability in both directions.

Average Score: 108
Median Score: 111
Standard Deviation: 38
Scores are higher among those who fit the criteria of chronic homelessness, with an average score of 133 and median score of 132. This is the same as at last analysis. The proximity of the average, or mean, and median indicate a symmetrical distribution within the chronically homeless sub-population.

**Distribution of Chronically Homeless Households' Prioritization Scores (n=590) compared to All Households' Prioritization Scores**

Average: 133
Median: 132