Ad Hoc Funding Committee Update

Committee Members:
Moe Wright, Chair, EveryOne Home
Chelsea Andrews, Executive Director, EveryOne Home
Ray Bonilla, Meta
Gloria Bruce, EBHO
Doug Biggs, Alameda Point Collaborative
Recommendations

➢ Provided Recommendation Memo (03.22.22)

➢ **VOTE:** The Leadership Board support and become Ambassadors on behalf of EveryOne Home by engaging with the County Administration and Board of Supervisors to provide funding for the initial staffing needs for the governance expansion.

➢ Supporting the initial staffing of 3 new Full-Time Employees, 1 Part-Time Employee, and a DEI Consultant, with an estimated budget of $450,000. However, an ongoing evaluation will be required to determine when and how best to support the funding needed to expand operational support.
Transition Team Update

Co-Chairs:
Moe Wright, EOH Leadership Board Chair
Natasha Paddock, Deputy Director HCD
Kate Hart, System Coordination Committee Co-Chair
Proposed Transition Sequence

Transition Working Group seats the New Leadership Board and Racial Equity Working Group

New Leadership Board appoints the Nomination Committee members

Nomination Committee & Racial Equity Working Group recruits and recommends new EOH Committee members

EOH CoC membership votes to approve elected Leadership Board seats
• Met on March 7th & 14th (weekly meetings)

• Orientation/Training Materials and Requirements for Leadership Board and Committees
  • Kate Hart, Co-Chair; Recruit Co-Chair from Working Group

• Committee Transition Plan
  • Exploring potential Consultant support

• Planning and Soliciting Funding for new structure & resources needed
  • New Funding Committee created and meeting this Friday
  • Members: Doug Biggs, Ray Bonilla, Gloria Bruce, Vivian Wan and Moe Wright

• Nominations & Elections Process
  • Recommendations forthcoming
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Person with <strong>lived expertise</strong> <em>(1/3 of Board; elected by Nomination Committee)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Person with lived expertise <em>(Youth Action Board Seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>City of Oakland <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>City of Berkeley <em>(represents Albany and Emeryville, appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>City from the <strong>mid-county region</strong> <em>(elected from Alameda County Conference of Mayors)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>City from the <strong>south-county region</strong> <em>(elected from Alameda County Conference of Mayors)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>City from the <strong>east-county region</strong> <em>(elected from Alameda County Conferences of Mayors)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Alameda County <strong>Health Care Services Agency, Office of Homeless Care and Coordination</strong> Director <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Alameda County <strong>Social Services Agency</strong> <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Alameda County <strong>Housing and Community Development</strong> <em>(represents unincorporated areas, appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Alameda County <strong>Probation</strong> <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Public Housing Authority <em>(elected from membership)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Representative from <strong>nonprofit affordable housing development</strong> <em>(elected from membership)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Non-profit <strong>homeless service providers</strong> <em>(4 seats, Nomination Committee)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Non-profit homeless service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Non-profit homeless service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Non-profit homeless service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Advocacy and/or citizen <em>(elected from membership)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Policy advocacy or affordable housing advocacy organization <em>(elected from membership)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Chair or co-chair from <strong>Racial Equity Workgroup</strong> <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td><strong>Chairs of the Committees</strong>, if different than those serving on the Leadership Board <em>(appointed seat)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Potential LB holdover
Work Flow

**Working Group Engagement**
- Nomination and Election Process
- Orientation/Training Materials and Requirements for Leadership Board and Committees
- Committee Transition Plan
- Planning and Soliciting Funding for new structure & resources needed
- Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Plan

**EOH Staff Recommendations**
- New Leadership Board Retreat (Summer ’22)
- EOH Staffing Plan
Hold-Over Scenario Outcome

- 2 Lived expertise seats hold for 6 months – 1 year; then 8 seats nominated by new Nomination Committee

- 4 Non-profit provider seats hold for 6 months – 1 year; Then nominated by new Nomination Committee

- 1 Advocacy/Citizen seat would be temporarily held by 4 Board members and hold over for 6 months – 1 year; Then elected by the membership

- 1 Policy advocacy or affordable housing advocacy organization seat would be temporarily held by 1 Board member and hold over for 6 months – 1 year; Then elected by the membership

- 1 Nonprofit Affordable Housing Development seat would be temporarily held by 2 Board members and hold over for 6 months – 1 year; Then elected by the membership
Recommendations

➢ Approve Leadership Board 'Hold-Over' scenario
➢ Minimum term extension of 1 year terms
➢ Invite current Committee Co-chairs to the Leadership Board through the transition period
Executive Director Updates

Leadership Board Meeting

March 24, 2022
Emerging Leaders Launch!

LEARN ABOUT:
- EveryOne Home
- Racial Equity
- HUD Policies
- Strategic Communication
- Civic Engagement
- Community Organizing
- Public Boards & Commissions

WHAT IT IS
The Emerging Leaders Program is a 6 session, 6-week training course providing individuals with lived experience of homelessness the skills and knowledge to be an effective advocate, organizer, and community leader.

HOW IT WORKS
- Each coalition is limited to 13 individuals
- All sessions will be held remotely
- Coalitions meet once a week for six weeks
- Compensation is $25 per hour (totaling $225)

WHO IT’S FOR
Formerly and currently unhoused residents of Alameda County who are committed to ending homelessness and interested in having a critical, decision-making role on boards, committees and commissions.

No experience or education is necessary. Adults of all ages are encouraged to apply.

MAKING IT HAPPEN
We are committed to making the Emerging Leaders Program as accessible as possible.

In addition to a $25/hour stipend, resources are available to assist participants with specific support costs, such as childcare, access to technology, etc.

APPLY ONLINE:
everyonehome.org/leaders

APPLICATIONS DUE FEBRUARY 17

QR CODE:
Aim your smartphone camera at the code to learn more online.

Questions? Contact info@everyonehome.org

EveryOne Home is made possible by the EveryOne Home & EveryOne Fund, a 501c3 nonprofit organization.
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Youth Homeless Demonstration Program (YHDP) Upcoming Timeline

• March 28th
  • Drafted Coordinated Community Plan (CCP) presented to the HUD CoC Committee/LB Joint Meeting

• Week of April 4th
  • CCP presented for approval at special meeting of the HUD CoC Committee/LB Joint Meeting

• April 15th
  • HUD deadline for CCP submission
EveryOne Home / HCD – HUD CoC Planning Grant Update
Key Contract Terms

**Term:** May 1, 2022 – April 30, 2022

**Parties:** EOH & HCD

**Payment Terms:**
- 2 months advance payment
- Invoices processed monthly within 30 days of receipt

**FY ‘20 HUD Planning Grant Total:** $1,058,132

**EOH % - TBD** (Previously 62%, proposed min of 75%)

**HCD % - TBD** (Previously 38%)

**County Contribution:** TBD (Current allocation $55k)

**Scope:** Key provisions reflective of prior years, does not include expansion
Highlights

• Our Continuum was awarded a total of $40,087,543.00 for all Tier 1 renewals, two new DV bonus projects, and the CoC Planning Grant

• All renewal projects were funded but renewal rental assistance projects were decreased

• Two NEW DV Bonus Projects were awarded: Rapid Rehousing for Transitional Age Youth Victims of Violence and DV CES, totaling $1,921,891.00

• New projects not funded: HMIS Expansion and Rapid Rehousing for LGTBQ+TAY Victims of Violence
NOFO Consultant Contract/Procurement Working Group

• Workgroup to meet in the next few weeks to review consultant procurement options

• Members: Chelsea Andrews (EOH), Lara Tannenbaum (HUD CoC), Doug Biggs (LB), Kerry Abbot (HCSA), Natasha Paddock (HCD)
Point In Time Count Update
Upcoming Key Dates for PIT 2022

3/28 - HUD CoC Committee to review and approve sheltered HIC and occupancy data

4/25 - HUD CoC Committee to review and approve all data and narrative responses that will be submitted to HUD

4/29 - Upload full HDX submission to HUD Including descriptive narratives

5/16 - Proposed press conference to release all data to the public + Cities will receive infographic reports + data dashboard goes live on Alameda County Website

6/30 - Full County and City Reports to be delivered by ASR
Explaining PIT Count Data Trends

- **Descriptive narratives** are required by HUD to explain any increases or decreases identified in PIT Count Data when submitted.

- Working now to identify/articulate the **structural causes** of any increases or decreases we may see is helpful for pre-planning.

- May want to collaborate with other CoC’s for **regional messaging**.
63% increase in unsheltered homelessness was attributed to:

- **Availability of Affordable Housing**
  - Large rental price increases
  - New units being allocated for high earning residents

- **Economic Conditions**
  - $35.67 hourly wage is required to rent a 1 bedroom unit

- **Low Rental Housing Vacancy Rate**
  - Severe shortages of housing and high cost of development
  - Migration from San Francisco and other locales
Anticipated Trends for 2022

- An overall **increase** in homelessness (sheltered and unsheltered)
- An **increase** in individuals living in RVs and Vehicles
- An **increase** in shelter beds and shelter programs, *thus an increase in sheltered homelessness*

Discussion – What do we believe could have led to these trends?
Timing of PIT Count

• Sheltered Count is Required by HUD Every Year
• Unsheltered Count is Required by HUD Every Other Year
• Some CoCs conduct the unsheltered count every year:
  • Los Angeles
  • San Diego
  • Contra Costa County
  • Sonoma County
  • Indianapolis
  • Chicago
  • New York City
Value of Conducting the Unsheltered Count

• **More accurately counts** and identifies needs of populations that may be hardest to serve (chronically homeless)
  • *HMIS data has limitations*

• Demonstrates a need for **resources**

• Supports **service planning**
  • *Decisions about resource allocations across jurisdictions or for different populations*

• Raises **public awareness** about the issue of homelessness

• **Measures performance** in reducing homelessness over time
Considerations for Conducting Annual Unsheltered Count

• **Resource intensive** – Traditionally around $150K in consulting fees

• **Time intensive** – Approximately 6 months of planning and preparation

• **People/staffing intensive** – Requires 500+ individuals to recruit and participate

• **It is an undercount**
  - *Not counted* – Those staying in a motel, couch surfing, doubled up, and those in institutions
  - *Hard to count* – Rural areas, areas where unsheltered folks wish to remain hidden
Unsheltered PIT Count Trends

- 2011: 2072
- 2013: 2337
- 2015: 2397
- 2017: 3863
- 2019: 6312

Unsheltered Count

- 2011: 0%
- 2013: 61%
- 2015: 61%
- 2017: 63%
- 2019: 63%
HEAP funding is divided into 3 categories of distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category for Distribution</th>
<th>Funded Amount</th>
<th>Eligible Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) CoC Based on Point in Time Count Ranges</td>
<td>$250M</td>
<td>CoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) CoC Based on Percentage of Homeless Population</td>
<td>$100M</td>
<td>CoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) City / City that is also a County Based on general population</td>
<td>$150M</td>
<td>Large cities with a population over 330,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HEAP Funding Allocations based on PIT Count

### CA HEAP Funds: Allocation directly tied to PIT Count numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total Homeless, 2017</th>
<th>Percent of Total State Homeless, 2017</th>
<th>Section 50213(a) Per Jurisdiction portion of $250M</th>
<th>Section 50213(b) $100M Distribution Based on Percent of Homeless Population</th>
<th>Total of CoC Distribution per 50213(a) and (b)</th>
<th>50214(c) 5% Minimum Youth Set-aside Per Continuum of Care total of 50213(a) and (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-600</td>
<td>Los Angeles City &amp; County</td>
<td>55,188</td>
<td>41.100%</td>
<td>$ 40,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 41,099,807.86</td>
<td>$ 81,099,807.86</td>
<td>$ 4,054,990.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-601</td>
<td>San Diego City &amp; County</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>6.822%</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 6,821,688.48</td>
<td>$ 18,821,688.48</td>
<td>$ 941,083.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-500</td>
<td>San Jose/Santa Clara City &amp; County</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>5.506%</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,506,496.54</td>
<td>$ 17,506,496.54</td>
<td>$ 875,324.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-501</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>5.107%</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 5,107,314.68</td>
<td>$ 17,107,314.68</td>
<td>$ 855,365.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-502</td>
<td>Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>4.192%</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 4,192,049.33</td>
<td>$ 16,192,049.33</td>
<td>$ 809,602.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-502</td>
<td>Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>3.569%</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 3,568,715.65</td>
<td>$ 15,568,715.65</td>
<td>$ 778,435.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-503</td>
<td>Sacramento City &amp; County</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>2.729%</td>
<td>$ 10,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,729,412.12</td>
<td>$ 12,729,412.12</td>
<td>$ 636,470.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-506</td>
<td>Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>2.505%</td>
<td>$ 10,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,505,250.30</td>
<td>$ 12,505,250.30</td>
<td>$ 625,262.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-504</td>
<td>Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>2.111%</td>
<td>$ 10,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,111,291.50</td>
<td>$ 12,111,291.50</td>
<td>$ 605,564.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-608</td>
<td>Riverside City &amp; County</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>1.792%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,791,805.06</td>
<td>$ 9,791,805.06</td>
<td>$ 498,590.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-508</td>
<td>Watsonville/Santa Cruz City &amp; County</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>1.675%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,674,883.45</td>
<td>$ 9,674,883.45</td>
<td>$ 493,744.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-514</td>
<td>Fresno City &amp; County/Madera County</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>1.501%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,501,362.84</td>
<td>$ 9,501,362.84</td>
<td>$ 475,068.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-809</td>
<td>San Bernardino City &amp; County</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1.390%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,389,654.30</td>
<td>$ 9,389,654.30</td>
<td>$ 469,482.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-606</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1.387%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,387,420.13</td>
<td>$ 9,387,420.13</td>
<td>$ 469,371.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-603</td>
<td>Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>1.385%</td>
<td>$ 8,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,385,185.96</td>
<td>$ 9,385,185.96</td>
<td>$ 469,259.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-510</td>
<td>Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1.237%</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,236,985.95</td>
<td>$ 7,236,985.95</td>
<td>$ 361,849.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-505</td>
<td>Richmond/Contra Costa County</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1.197%</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,196,770.88</td>
<td>$ 7,196,770.88</td>
<td>$ 359,838.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-511</td>
<td>Stockton/San Joaquin County</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1.148%</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,148,363.84</td>
<td>$ 7,148,363.84</td>
<td>$ 357,418.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-512</td>
<td>Daly City/San Mateo County</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>0.933%</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 933,138.71</td>
<td>$ 4,933,138.71</td>
<td>$ 246,656.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-509</td>
<td>Mendocino County</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>0.922%</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000.00</td>
<td>$ 921,967.86</td>
<td>$ 4,921,967.86</td>
<td>$ 246,098.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIT Count tied to State HHAP Funding

- Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) Program funding was allocated based on the pre-pandemic 2019 Point-In-Time (PIT) count.

- HHAP Round 3 funding totaling $800 million, which includes CoCs, large cities, and counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Date Funding Expires</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Date Funding Expires</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Date Funding Expires</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHAP- County</td>
<td>$8,754,710</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$4,002,153</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$11,206,028</td>
<td>6/30/2026</td>
<td>$23,962,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHAP- Oakland</td>
<td>$19,697,548</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$9,311,568</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$24,066,822</td>
<td>6/30/2026</td>
<td>$53,075,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>$37,902,216</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$17,785,099</td>
<td>5/31/2023</td>
<td>$47,279,309</td>
<td>6/30/2026</td>
<td>$102,966,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PIT Count Less Tied to CoC Funding

## Scoring of CoC Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Ranking, Review, and Capacity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Performance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Management Information System</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point-in-Time Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Coordination and Engagement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>163 + 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Healthcare Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>163 + 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: EveryOneHome*
POLL