1. Welcome and Introductions
   - RBA Committee is an open committee and welcomes participation from anyone committed to learning and implementing the RBA framework
   - Next RBA Meeting: 2-3:30 PM on Monday January 4

2. COVID-19 Updates: Project Roomkey Prioritization and Demographics

3. System Modeling Update
   - Executive Summary Released and Report Coming Soon

4. FY20 System Performance Measures
   - Review FY20 system performance compared to previous years
   - Some measures disaggregated by race
Roomkey Prioritization and Demographics

November 2, 2020
Method and data sources

• Separated the FEMA programs from the BNL using “most recent enrollment.”
• Divided Comfort hotels (C and Q) from Safer Ground
• Looked at BNL without FEMA
• And, separated out the non-FEMA 2020 Assessments to control for outdated assessments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BNL (minus FEMA)</th>
<th>2020 Assessments</th>
<th>Safer Ground</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>6814</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &gt;=147</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritization Score Comparison

- Safer Ground
- Comfort
- 2020 Assessments (minus FEMA)
Geography & Prioritization Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Balance of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &gt;=147</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geography & Prioritization Scores
Race & Prioritization Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/PI</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latinx Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>118.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% &gt;=147</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race & Prioritization Scores
Centering Racial Equity in the Homeless System Design

Darlene Flynn, Director of Race and Equity, City of Oakland
Jessica Shimmin, Director of Analytics, EveryOne Home
Executive Summary is available to download at www.everyonehome.org.
**Working Assumptions**

- Race matters. Almost every indicator of well-being shows troubling disparities by race.

- Disparities are often created and maintained inadvertently through policies and practices that contain barriers to opportunity.

- It’s possible -- and only possible -- to close equity gaps by using strategies determined through an intentional focus on race.

- If opportunities in all key areas of well-being are equitable, then equitable results will follow.

- Given the right message, analysis, and tools, people will work toward racial equity.

Credit to the RACE MATTERS Toolkit, researched and funded by Annie E. Casey Foundation.
Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Alameda County’s General Population (blue) Compared With Alameda County’s Homeless Population (orange)

- **African American**: 11% (General) vs. 47% (Homeless)
- **American Indian or Alaska Native**: 1% (General) vs. 4% (Homeless)
- **Asian**: 32% (General) vs. 14% (Homeless)
- **Multi-Racial**: 5% (General) vs. 2% (Homeless)
- **Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander**: 1% (General) vs. 2% (Homeless)
- **White**: 50% (General) vs. 31% (Homeless)
- **Hispanic/Latino**: 22% (General) vs. 17% (Homeless)

*Source: Alameda County General Population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2018 QuickFacts) & Homeless Population (PIT Count, 2019)*
A History of Systemic Racism; Racial Residential Segregation, Persistent Poverty and Housing Insecurity

Source: ACPHD 2014
System Change Requires Challenging Narratives

**Dominant Narrative**
(No system change implied)

- Individualism - winners/losers
- Matter of personal merit or deficit
- People get what they deserve
- Rationalized by highly racialized assumptions (racist ideas)

**Equity Narrative**
(System transformation opportunity)

- Individuals develop in the context of access to opportunity
- There is much more at play than personal merit or deficit
- What people get is influenced by many factors outside their control
- Racist ideas and discrimination present life long risks and challenges
• Understanding the impacts of race and having a plan is the first step
• Reaching our goal means starting in a different place and leaving no one behind
• The root causes of racial disparities must be addressed to change outcomes
• Our systems need to be retooled to get different outcomes
• We won’t be perfect, but we must center racial equity and be accountable
Racial Equity Impact Analysis

- Administrative data shows racial disparities in:
  - Inflow/first time homelessness
  - Returns to homelessness

- Engaged people who have been impacted by racial disparities to challenge assumptions about that experience.
  - 8 Focus groups involving 52 people
  - 67% of participants were currently homeless
  - 33% of participants were formerly homeless
  - Focus Groups Organized through: BACS, BANANAS, Asian Prisoner Support Committee, Intertribal Friendship House, Open Heart Kitchen, Roots Community Health Center, St Mary’s Center, South Hayward Parish, Youth Advisory Board

---

### Race of Participants in REIA Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>January-March 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>18 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Hispanic</td>
<td>13 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>6 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>6 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response/Other</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Age of Participants in REIA Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>January-March 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>9 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>9 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>6 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>21 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to state</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racial Equity Impact Analysis Findings

- Structural racism is obscured by personal responsibility narrative
- Structural racism impacts entire social systems, distressing the networks and supports that may otherwise prevent homelessness
- Racial discrimination and economic inequality are interconnected
- Black and Indigenous people continue to be viewed as “high risk” tenants in the housing market and continue to face housing discrimination
- Homeless housing programs participate in the displacement of low-income communities of color from Alameda County
- Low-income/homeless does not always mean high service needs
- Low-income Black, Indigenous, People of Color are underserved by the current homelessness system; the services that would address the causes of homelessness for them are extremely limited
Optimal System Pathways for Adult Only Households
True peace is not merely the absence of tension: it is the presence of justice

We must do better!

• In danger of getting further and further behind
• If we do it right, it will pay back in dividends
• Equity is the best model
The report:

• Details how homelessness is a race equity issue
• Is a case study on how to embed racial equity in system planning
• The report provides a path forward for meaningful progress
Homeless Response System Performance
Comparing Federal Fiscal Years 2015-2020
HUD System
Performance Measures

- 7 key performance measures that every Continuum of Care reports to HUD annually as part of the Continuum of Care funding competition.

- Standard Measures: the universe, data elements, and equations are defined by HUD and provided to HMIS vendors so that each CoC measures performance identically and measures consistent across the country.

- For more information about the measures and their calculation, see System Performance Measures, An Introductory Guide.

- Presentation excludes a graph of Measure 4, Growth in Income, because the tables are very complex.

- Measure 6 is reserved for high performing CoCs.
Measure 1: Length of Time Homeless

- What does it measure?
  - Measure 1a: How effective is our system in ending homelessness?
  - Measure 1b: How long are people experiencing homelessness?

- How does it measure?
  - Measure 1a: length of time from first ES or TH enrollment to housing move in.
  - Measure 1b: length of time from self-described start of homelessness to housing move in.

- What do we want to see?
  - Shorter is better: Reduction in the average and median length of time homeless.
  - Also desirable: average and median are the same.
Measure 2: Extent to which persons who exit to permanent housing return to homelessness

• What does it measure?
  • Whether our interventions are effective and long-lasting in ending homelessness.

• How does it measure?
  • Follows people who exited PH during the fiscal year 2 years previous and counts the number of people re-appear in HMIS in the subsequent two years.
  • Provides data on returns to homelessness at less than 6months, 6-12 months, 13-24 months, and total in 2 years.

• What do we want to see?
  • Reduce returns to homelessness.
  • Identify when households are vulnerable to returning to homelessness post-housing
Measure 2: Extent to which persons who exit to permanent housing return to homelessness
Measure 2: Disaggregated by Race
Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

• What does it measure?
  • Change in the number of sheltered homeless people in HMIS each year (HMIS, annual)
  • Change in the number of unsheltered homeless people (PIT Count, biennial)

• How does it measure?
  • Provides an unduplicated count of people who stayed in Emergency Shelter, Safe Haven, and Transitional Housing programs over the course of the year.

• What do we want to see?
  • Reductions in the number of people who are homeless.
  • Right now we may want to see an increase in unduplicated individuals served by shelters as a sign of system flow to permanent housing.
Measure 3: Unduplicated Count of Sheltered Homeless Persons in HMIS
Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth

• What does it measure?
  • Changes in income for adult system stayers and leavers.

• How does it measure?
  • Compares income and non-cash benefits at program entry, annual update, and exit assessment for adults in SH, TH, RRH, and PSH projects.

• What do we want to see?
  • A growing percentage of adults who gain or increase employment or non-employment cash income over time.
Measure 5: First Time Homeless

- What does it measure?
  - How many people became homeless for the first time during the reporting period.

- How does it measure?
  - Counts the number of people who entered ES, TH, RRH, and PSH programs during the year and subtracts those with a project entry within the prior 24 months.

- What do we want to see?
  - Decreasing number of people becoming homeless for the first time
Measure 5: First Time Homeless
Measure 7: Exits to/Retention of Permanent Housing

• What does it measure?
  • How many people achieved a positive housing outcome:
    • SO: moved indoors
    • ES, TH, RRH exited our system to permanent housing
    • PSH retained permanent supportive housing (PSH).

• How does it measure?
  • Counts people with successful housing outcomes and divides by total exits:
    • Street Outreach: exits to temporary and permanent housing destinations (excludes temporary homeless destinations)
    • Emergency Shelter, Transitional, and Rapid Re-Housing: Perm housing destinations
    • Permanent Supportive Housing: retention and exits to other perm housing destinations

• What do we want to see?
  • Increasing the proportion of people who move indoors from street outreach, exit to permanent housing, or retain permanent housing
Measure 7: Exits to Permanent Housing from ES, TH, and RRH
Measure 7: Disaggregated by Race

Exits to Permanent Housing by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Active in HMIS</th>
<th>Exits to Perm. Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Blue = Active in HMIS, Orange = Exits to Perm. Housing