# Joint Leadership Board - HUD CoC Committee Agenda

**Monday, April 25th, 2022**  
**1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

**Zoom Link:**  [https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82227753659](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82227753659)  
**Meeting ID:**  822 2775 3659  
**One tap mobile:**  +16699006833, 82227753659# US (San Jose)

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents with lived experience of homelessness are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person.  [Click here to learn more about the public participation policy.](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:00-1:05pm      | **1. Welcome**  
/> C'Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair |
| 1:05-1:15pm      | **2. HUD CoC Public Comment** |
| 1:15-1:20pm      | **3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #3- 03.28.22**  
/> **Action Item** |
| 1:20-1:25pm      | **4. Homeless System Updates**  
/> (All)  
/> **Update** |
| 1:25-1:30pm      | **5. Governance Update**  
/> (Chelsea)  
/> **Update** |
| 1:30-1:40pm      | **6. YAB Update**  
/> a. **Transition of Fred Finch Youth Project**  
/> **Action Item**  
/> i. Revised recommendation for approval (Larkin Street)  
/> b. **YHDP Planning Grant Request**  
/> **Action Item** |
| 1:40-1:50pm      |  
/> **7. System Performance Measures Q&A**  
/> (Katie Haverly)  
/> **Update** |
| 2:00-2:10pm      | **8. HMIS Data Quality Action Plan**  
/> (Katie Haverly)  
/> **Update** |
| 2:10-2:15pm      | **9. Coordinated Entry / Emergency Housing Voucher Update**  
/> **Update** |
| 2:15-2:30pm      | **10. NOFO FY 2022 Update**  
/> (Chelsea)  
/> **Action Item**  
/> a. Procurement Update |
b. NOFO Committee

11. HHAP Funding Update (Suzanne Warner) 2:30-2:50pm
   Update

12. Point in Time Count Unsheltered Data [CLOSED SESSION] 2:50-3:25pm
   Action Item

13. HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events 3:25-3:30pm
   a. HUD CoC Committee meeting – May 30th, 2022
   b. Leadership Board meeting – April 28th, 2022
HUD CoC Committee Meeting Notes
Monday, March 28th, 2022
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Present: C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland), Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley), Marnelle Timson (Consumer Member), Paul Berry (Youth Action Board), Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland), Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services), Tunisia Owens (Family Violence Law Center), Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project)

Absent: none

Members of the public: Antonio Pizano (Voices Youth Center), Andy Duong (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Hannah Moore (All In), Arlene Hipp, Christoverre Kohler, Michelle Starratt (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions), Judy Elkan, Kathie Barkow (Aspire Consulting), Patrick Crosby (Alameda County Housing and Community Development), Sahra Nawabi (Youth Action Board), Sangeeta Chadha, Suzanne Warner (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency), Tammy Nguyen (Youth Action Board), Suzanne Campillo (Alameda County Housing and Community Development)

EveryOne Home Staff: Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director), Katie Barnett (Systems Planning Coordinator), Katie Haverly (Director of Research and Data Analytics), Dorcas Chang (Operations Manager), Quintin Mecke (Director of Policy and Homelessness Strategies)

Meetings are public. Alameda County residents with lived experience of homelessness are encouraged to attend. Public Comment will be taken at the beginning of each meeting and is limited to 2 minutes per person. Click here to learn more about the public participation policy.

1. Welcome (C’Mone Falls, HUD CoC Chair)

2. HUD CoC Public Comment
   a. Judy Elkan (member of the public) registered concerns about the proposed revisions to the HMIS Privacy Policy. It’s likely that many people will not realize what they have consented to, or that they have given consent just by attempting to access resources.
   b. Christoverre Kohler (member of the public) encouraged the committee to think carefully about the proposed changes to the HMIS Privacy Policy, stating his strong support for providing clients with a verbal and written explanation of the policy and requiring a signature to indicate informed consent.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes, #2- 02.28.22
a. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) motioned to approve the meeting minutes from 2/28/22.
   i. Paulette Franklin (Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services) seconded.
      1. C'Mone Falls - Yes
      2. Josh Jacobs - Yes
      3. Marnelle Timson - Yes
      4. Paul Berry - Yes
      5. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
      6. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
      7. Paulette Franklin – Yes
         1. Motion passed.

4. Homeless System Updates
   a. Michelle Starratt (Alameda County Housing and Community Development) provided an update about the need for an effective countywide response strategy when the eviction moratorium ends.
      i. The Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) is funded at $129 million, and requests exceed $286 million.
      ii. There are not enough attorneys with this expertise in the county to handle the expected surge in three-day eviction notices that will be issued when the moratorium ends. The current assumption is that it will be an emergency by September.
      iii. About one hundred additional trained staff and volunteers will be needed for at least six months to assist tenants with the ERAP application process. A lot of coordinated effort will be necessary to make this happen.

5. Governance Update
   a. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) provided updates from the Transition Working Group.
      i. The Transition Working Group will seat a new Leadership Board and recruit members for the Race Equity Working Group. The new Leadership Board will appoint a Nomination Committee, which will work with the Race Equity Working Group to recruit and recommend new members to all other committees.
      ii. Orientation and training materials will be provided to new board and committee members, and all members will be trained on principles of trauma-informed care and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.
      iii. A funding committee is meeting to discuss operational challenges and bring in new funders to support the new committees and related initiatives, such as the Emerging Leaders Program.
      iv. To ensure continuity, some board members and committee chairs will be asked to hold over for a duration of time during the transition.
      v. The Transition Working Group aims to seat the new CoC Board by this summer and start the transition to new committees in late summer or early fall.
   b. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) introduced EveryOne Home’s new Director of Policy and Homelessness Strategies, Quintin Mecke.

6. Consulting Contracts Updates
a. A working group will meet on April 8th to review the FY 2021 NOFO consultant contract and make a recommendation to the HUD CoC Committee about the next steps in procuring a consultant for the FY 2022 NOFO.

b. Chelsea Andrews (Executive Director) provided an update on negotiations between Alameda County Housing and Community Development (HCD) and EveryOne Home related to the pass-through funding contract from the HUD planning grant:
   i. In the past, the federal planning grant has been split between the two entities, with 62% going to EveryOne Home and 38% going to HCD. An increase to EveryOne Home’s allocation has been proposed this year.
   ii. EveryOne Home receives 92% of its operational support from the federal and local government. The proposed increase to the percentage in this contract would ensure that the cost of keeping the organization staffed is covered by the most reliable funding source.
   iii. Approval of key terms is being sought to allow for the contract to be brought before the Board of Supervisors before the current contract ends on April 30th.

c. C’Mone Falls (City of Oakland) motioned to approve key contract terms between Alameda County Housing and Community Development and EveryOne Home regarding the federal planning grant, with the understanding that exact percentages will still be negotiated between the two parties.
   i. Lara Tannenbaum (City of Oakland) seconded.
      1. C’Mone Falls - Yes
      2. Josh Jacobs - Yes
      3. Marnelle Timson - Yes
      4. Paul Berry - Yes
      5. Riley Wilkerson - No
      6. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
      7. Paulette Franklin - Yes
      8. Tunisia Owens - Abstain
         1. Motion passed.

7. Review NOFO 2021 Competition Awards
   a. The CoC was awarded over $40 million in total. All tier-one renewal projects and two new Domestic Violence (DV) bonus projects were funded. Two new bonus projects in tier two were not funded.
   b. A thorough analysis will be shared with the community soon.

8. YHDP Coordinated Community Plan Draft Review (All In / YAB)
   a. Hannah Moore (All-In) and members of the Youth Action Board (YAB) presented the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) Coordinated Community Plan (CCP). It will return to the committee for a vote of approval on April 5th.
      i. The CCP outlines the intended use of this $6.5 million grant. Funding provided by this grant spans two years. Projects funded by it will be treated as renewals in subsequent rounds of the annual CoC NOFO competition.
      ii. At the end of last year, the YHDP core team hosted six community brainstorming sessions, each dedicated to the needs and experiences of a special population as designated by HUD. Some of the key needs identified during that process are greater resource accessibility in unincorporated areas of the county, better coordination between service providers, and new flexible housing options for youth.
iii. The projects and allocated funding identified in the Coordinated Community Plan is outlined below:

1. Approximately 30% of the grant will be used to hire and train youth with lived experience to serve as Peer Navigators who can guide other youth through the system and help them identify relevant resources.

2. Joint Component Housing, which combines Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing, will be funded with 50% of the grant.
   1. In this model, youth reside in site-based housing with a roommate as they learn to live independently. After 1-2 years, they transition to permanent housing with their own lease, which they eventually take over after a set period of assistance.

3. About 17% of the grant will go to Transition Age Youth (TAY) related improvements to Coordinated Entry. This includes creating TAY access points, hiring Peer Navigators to work with Coordinated Entry specialists, and training Coordinated Entry specialists on topics like youth development.

4. HMIS will receive 3% of the grant to support the ongoing monitoring of these new projects.

b. Wendy Jackson (East Oakland Community Project) asked if existing programs that require more funding for staff would be eligible for this.
   i. There will be a YHDP specific NOFO process later this year. This funding can be used for staffing costs. More information will be made available once that phase of the project is underway.

c. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) asked if there are plans to ensure equal outreach to non-systems-involved youth.
   i. One of the findings in this planning process was the need to provide support for non-systems-involved youth. There will be a concerted effort to coordinate with partners in other sectors, such as education when creating youth-specific Coordinated Entry access points.

9. HMIS Privacy Policy Revisions (Jessica Hanserd / Suzanne)
   a. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) presented a revised HMIS Privacy Policy, which uses an inferred / assumed consent model.
      i. The policy approved by the committee in October 2021 would require written consent before entering Personally-Identifying Information (PII) into HMIS.
      ii. With assumed consent, when a client meets with a member of an organization or receives services, they consent to allowing that organization to use and share information about them for certain reasons.

      iii. Staff will sign a form attesting that they reviewed the one-page privacy notice with a client, asked if they understood, and gave them an opportunity to ask questions.

   b. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) noted that two public comments were made that expressed concern about clients not knowing their consent is inferred. There’s a request for clarification about why this change was necessary.
      i. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) explained that assumed consent is a lower barrier approach. Clients will have the right to not share personal information and still receive limited services.

   c. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) asked about recourse if a client is upset their information has been shared with other entities and says they were not informed about the policy.
i. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) noted that HUD only requires providers have a sign posted where intake occurs. The one-page privacy notice can be used for that.

d. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) opened the floor for public comment.

i. Christoverre Kohler (member of the public) stated that he advocates for obtaining written consent. Without that, there is no way to verify staff did advise the client of the policy.

ii. Arlene Hipp (member of the public) asked if the client will receive a copy of the staff’s attestation that they verbally reviewed the policy, and if they can obtain copies of the personal information that is recorded.

1. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) responded that a copy of the privacy notice will be available to the client upon request.

e. Marnelle Timson (Consumer Member) asked if this process is similar to a digital ROI.

i. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) responded that a digital ROI is a form of explicit consent, and it is difficult for providers to care for clients if their hands are tied by higher barrier policies.

f. Judy Elkan (member of the public) stated her support for obtaining written consent and emphasized the importance of trust between a provider and person in crisis. The additional time it may take to obtain a signature is worth it if it ensures trust has been established.

g. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) noted that this policy does not prevent programs from requiring ROIs. Clients benefit when information can be shared between agencies, particularly those at risk of being retraumatized by answering intake questions multiple times.

h. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) asked if it would be difficult to have clients initial the privacy notice to indicate they saw it.

i. Jessica Hanserd (Hanserd Health Solutions) answered that providers would not be able to enter information into HMIS unless the client provided their initials, so it would not lower any barriers.

i. Josh Jacobs (City of Berkeley) motioned to approve the revisions to the HMIS Privacy Policy to reflect an inferred consent model.

i. Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development) seconded.

1. C'Mone Falls - Yes
2. Josh Jacobs - Yes
3. Marnelle Timson - Yes
4. Paul Berry - Yes
5. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
6. Lara Tannenbaum - Abstain
7. Paulette Franklin - Yes
8. Wendy Jackson - Yes

1. Motion passed.

10. Coordinated Entry / Emergency Housing Voucher Update (Colleen)
a. Colleen Budenholzer (Alameda County Health Care Services Agency) provided updates on Coordinated Entry 2.0 and Emergency Housing Vouchers.
   i. There are currently 862 individuals are on the CE Crisis Queue, and 1,357 on the CE Housing Queue.
   ii. The total number of Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) is 875. There have now been 1,083 individuals matched to EHV through Coordinated Entry, 702 applications submitted to a housing authority, 548 vouchers issued, and 108 vouchers leased up.
      1. Out of the 10% set aside for the gender-based violence community, 86 applications have been submitted and 25 vouchers have been leased up. From the Transition Age Youth (TAY) set aside, 28 applications have been submitted and 9 vouchers have been leased up.

11. HMIS Data Quality Action Plan
   a. *Due to lack of time, the agenda item was not reached and will be addressed at the next meeting of the HUD CoC Committee.*

12. Point in Time Count Shelter Data (CLOSED SESSION)
   a. Riley Wilkerson (Alameda County Housing and Community Development) motioned to approve the shelter data substantially in the form of the submitted chart, with pending revisions.
      i. C'Mone Falls (City of Oakland) seconded.
         1. C'Mone Falls - Yes
         2. Marnelle Timson - Yes
         3. Paul Berry - Yes
         4. Riley Wilkerson - Yes
         5. Lara Tannenbaum - Yes
         6. Paulette Franklin - Yes
         7. Wendy Jackson – Yes
            1. Motion passed.

13. HUD CoC Committee Upcoming Events
   a. Special meeting to vote on YHDP CCP– April 5th, 12:30 pm – 1:30 pm
   b. Monthly HUD CoC Committee meeting – April 25th, 2022
Scorecard Evolution and Changes

• RBA Committee has created a new and updated proposed scorecard that
  • Includes 13 indicators **disaggregated by race/ethnicity** including ALL system performance measures
  • Includes **other data sources** including 211 and census data
  • Includes indicators to **monitor the new coordinated entry system**
  • Includes indicators to **monitor HMIS performance**
  • Presentation of new scorecard and data to be given in **February** to HUD CoC for review and approval
• **6 key performance measures** that every Continuum of Care (CoC) reports to HUD annually as part of the CoC funding competition.

• **Standard Measures**: defined by the US Dept of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and provided to Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) vendors so that each CoC measures performance identically across the country.

• **Creates a common language** for talking about outcomes and performance.
For more information about the measures and their calculation, see System Performance Measures, An Introductory Guide.
6 System Performance Measures

1. Number of Persons Homeless
2. First Time Homelessness
3. Length of Time Homelessness
4. Exits to Permanent Housing
5. Returns to Homelessness
6. Employment & Income Growth
1. **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 within a comprehensive HMIS.
- Right now, we may want to see an increase in unduplicated individuals served by shelters as a sign of system flow to permanent housing.
Unduplicated Annual Count of Sheltered Homeless Persons in HMIS

- Unduplicated Total Sheltered Homeless Persons in HMIS
- Emergency Shelter
- Safe Haven
- Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3547</td>
<td>3481</td>
<td>2963</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>5377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>3125</td>
<td>4470</td>
<td>5052</td>
<td>4270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EveryOneHome
Point in Time Count – Sheltered & Unsheltered Homelessness

Point in Time Count Data

- 2013: 4264
- 2014: 4040
- 2015: 5629
- 2016: 8022

Bar chart showing the point in time count data for each year from 2013 to 2021.
2. **First Time Homelessness**

**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 Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, and Permanent Supportive Housing 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
First Time Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **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 *Emergency Shelter, Safe Haven, or Transitional Housing* 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.
Length of Time Homeless – Average # of Nights

- Emergency Shelter/ Safe Haven/ Transitional Housing - Average # Nights in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4: 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 to permanent housing during the FY two years previous and counts the number of people who re-appear in HMIS in the subsequent 2 years.
• Provides data on returns to homelessness at less than 6 months, 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
# of Persons who Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations that Return to Homelessness in 2 Years

- **FFY 2015**: 373
- **FFY 2016**: 433
- **FFY 2017**: 433
- **FFY 2018**: 311
- **FFY 2019**: 312
- **FFY 2020**: 352
- **FFY 2021**: 432

# of Returns to Homelessness in 2 Years
Extent to which Persons who Exit to Permanent Housing Return to Homelessness in 2 Years

% Returning to Homelessness in 2 Years

- FFY 2015: 19.0%
- FFY 2016: 18.0%
- FFY 2017: 18.7%
- FFY 2018: 15.2%
- FFY 2019: 17.6%
- FFY 2020: 17.7%
- FFY 2021: 18.0%
Returns to Homelessness in The Last Two Years by Race/Ethnicity: 10/1/20-9/30/21

- African American: 55% returning to homelessness, 57% percent of total enrollments
- White: 21% returning to homelessness, 26% percent of total enrollments
- Multi-Racial: 7% returning to homelessness, 10% percent of total enrollments
- Native American: 3% returning to homelessness, 5% percent of total enrollments
- Asian: 3% returning to homelessness, 3% percent of total enrollments
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 2% returning to homelessness, 3% percent of total enrollments
- Hispanic/Latinx: 17% returning to homelessness, 13% percent of total enrollments
- Not Hispanic/Latinx: 12% returning to homelessness, 83% percent of total enrollments

Source: 2010 Census Population Data - Alameda County
5: Exits to or Retention of Permanent Housing

**What does it measure?**

- How many people achieved a positive housing outcome:
  - Street Outreach: moved indoors
  - Emergency Shelter, Safe Haven, Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-Housing exited our system to permanent housing
  - Permanent Supportive Housing retained permanent housing.

**How does it measure?**

- Counts people with successful housing outcomes and divides by total exits:
  - Street Outreach: exits to temporary housing and permanent housing destinations (excludes temporary homeless destinations)
  - Emergency Shelter, Safe Haven, Transitional, and Rapid Re-Housing: Perm housing destinations
  - Permanent Supportive Housing: retention and exits to other permanent 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
Successful Exits to Permanent Housing from ES, SH, TH, and RRH

- FFY 2015: 1,663
- FFY 2016: 1,418
- FFY 2017: 1,389
- FFY 2018: 1,279
- FFY 2019: 1,344
- FFY 2020: 1,323
- FFY 2021: 1,198
% Successful Exits to Permanent Housing from ES, SH, TH, and RRH

FFY 2015: 47.7%
FFY 2016: 46.7%
FFY 2017: 46.2%
FFY 2018: 52.1%
FFY 2019: 53.8%
FFY 2020: 37.1%
FFY 2021: 44.6%
6: Employment and Income Growth

What does it measure?

• Changes in cash income for adult system stayers and leavers.

How does it measure?

• Compares earned income and cash benefits at program entry, annual update, and exit assessment for adults in Safe Haven, Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, and Permanent Supportive Housing projects.

What do we want to see?

• A growing percentage of adults who gain or increase employment or non-employment cash income over time.
Adults with Increased Total Income

**STAYERS** = Those that are still enrolled in any project type in HMIS and that have had an annual assessment

**LEAVERS** = Those that have exited the system
Summary of Findings

- First time homelessness has **decreased by 22%** since FFY 2020.
- Average length of time homeless in ES, SH, TH programs has **increased by 16%** since FFY 2020.
- Returns to homelessness has hovered around 18% for the last 3 years.
  - Those that identify as Multi-Racial, African American, Native American, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander have disproportionately higher rates of returns to homelessness.
Summary of Findings

• Successful exits to PH from ES, SH, TH, and RRH projects has increased by 7.5% since last FFY.

• Since FFY 2020, for system leavers/exiters there has been a 1.4% increase in total income and for system stayers there has been a slight decrease income (0.6%).