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INFORMATION TO PARTICIPATE

• Call-in information:
  Phone Number: (213) 929-4232
  Access Code: 724-973-493

• To submit live questions, click on the “questions” panel, type your question, and click “send.”

• Presentation materials and audio will be sent to all registrants and posted at www.jbaforyouth.org under “Training Archive.”
• Overview of the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP)
• Report Released Today:
  • Methodology
  • Findings
  • Recommendations
• Question & Answer – don’t forget to submit your questions!
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THE HOMELESS EMERGENCY AID PROGRAM (HEAP) IS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATE

- The HCFC was established by SB 1380 (Mitchell) in 2016
- Up to 19-member body; 7 appointed by the Governor
- SB 850 (2018) made significant changes:
  - Moved Council from Department of Housing & Community Development to Business, Consumer Services & Housing Agency (BCSH)
  - Designated Secretary of BCSH as Chair, provided permanent staff
  - Added formerly homeless youth as Council member
- Meets quarterly; subscribe to email list at: http://www.bcsb.ca.gov/hcfc/webapps/subscribe.php
HEAP FUNDING IS COMPRISED INTO THREE CATEGORIES

- SB 850 established the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP), a $500 M one-time flexible block grant program.

- Funds were allocated to local communities to address their immediate homelessness challenges.

- $100 million allocated to 43 Continuums of Care (CoCs) based on share of the total homeless population in 2017 Point-In-Time (PIT) Count.

- $150 million allocated to 11 cities with a population >330,000 as of January 1, 2018.

- $250 million allocated to 43 CoCs based on total number of homeless individuals in 2017 PIT count.
THE “BIG ELEVEN”
POPULATIONS OF OVER 330,000 AS OF JANUARY 1, 2018

- Sacramento
- Fresno
- San Francisco
- San Jose
- San Diego
- Los Angeles

- Santa Ana
- Anaheim
- Bakersfield
- Oakland
- Long Beach
HEAP TIMELINE: EXPEDITED APPLICATION & DISTRIBUTION PROCESS

NOFA Release

Applications accepted on rolling basis

September 5, 2018

Funds disbursed by State within 15 days of receiving an executed agreement

December 31, 2018

Application Cut-Off Date

January 31, 2019

January 1, 2020

June 30, 2021

50% of funds must be contractually obligated by local jurisdictions

50% of funds must be expended by local jurisdictions

100% of funds must be expended by local jurisdictions

Any funds not expended shall be returned to the State and revert to General Fund

100% funds were awarded by State to local jurisdictions

100% of funds must be expended by local jurisdictions

Report due to State

100% of funds must be expended by local jurisdictions

January 1, 2020

Report due to State

Any funds not expended shall be returned to the State and revert to General Fund
Each CoC and large city had to engage in a collaborative process prior to submitting their application to determine how HEAP funds would be utilized.  

- Could include public meetings, regional homeless task force meetings, letters of support, an adopted homelessness plan, or an adopted budget which includes HEAP funds.
Intended to provide immediate emergency assistance to people who are homeless or at imminent risk of homelessness.

Program parameters were intentionally broad to allow communities to be creative and craft programs that met local needs.

Broad categories of uses include services, rental assistance, and capital improvements.

At least 5% of funds had to be used to address the needs of homeless youth.

No more than 5% of programs funds may be used for administrative costs.

Program funds may not be used for overhead or planning activities.

ALLOWABLE USES OF HEAP FUNDING
“No less than five percent of the total of each applicant’s allocation shall be used to establish or expand services meeting the needs of homeless youth or youth at risk of homelessness.”

- Five percent was a floor, not a ceiling.
- Funding could not be used to supplant existing funding: *establish or expand*.
- Funding may be used to meet the needs of homeless youth or youth at risk of homelessness.
REPORT RELEASED TODAY

Available online:
https://www.jbaforyouth.org/heap-youth-2019/
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Overall, report contains findings gleaned from jurisdictions that were collectively awarded 89% of the state’s HEAP funds (95% CoC funds; 80% large city funds)
REPORT FINDINGS

Distribution Process
Three-quarters of the State’s HEAP funding will be awarded or committed by July 1, 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date by which &gt;80% of Jurisdictions’ HEAP funds are awarded or committed</th>
<th>% of CoCs</th>
<th>% of CoC HEAP Funding</th>
<th>% of Large Cities</th>
<th>% of Large City HEAP Funding</th>
<th>% of all jurisdictions</th>
<th>% of all jurisdictions’ HEAP Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By February 1, 2019</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By March 1, 2019</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By April 1, 2019</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By May 1, 2019</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected by July 1, 2019</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds not projected to be awarded or committed by July 1, 2019</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
91% of jurisdictions utilized competitive bidding processes to award HEAP funding, including the youth set-aside.
The technical assistance provided by the HCFC greatly assisted jurisdictions with adhering to tight timelines associated with administering their HEAP funding.

- With federal funding streams, this type of guidance is not easily available.
- Weekly calls with HCFC greatly aided jurisdictions in keeping pace with implementation timelines and learning from peers.
REPORT FINDINGS

Utilization of Funds
Shelter was the most common intervention category funded by the HEAP youth set-aside, followed by transitional housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions Funded with HEAP Youth Set-Aside</th>
<th>Percent of CoCs</th>
<th>Percent of Large Cities</th>
<th>Percent of All Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation Center/Access Point</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Homes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Vouchers</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spending on homeless youth exceeded the state-mandated 5% required by HEAP, reaching 10% statewide.

- 6.8% Jurisdictions applications to the State collectively indicated intent to direct $34 M toward youth homelessness.
- 10.3% Jurisdictions subsequently directed $51.6 M toward youth homelessness.

44% of jurisdictions designated more than 5% of their HEAP funding to addressing youth homelessness.
### HEAP YOUTH SET-ASIDE RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of HEAP Funding Designated to Address Youth Homelessness</th>
<th>CoCs</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>All Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAP Youth Set-Aside Ranges</th>
<th>CoCs</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>All Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1% to 10.0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1% to 15.0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1% to 20.0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1% or higher</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdictions with the smallest HEAP allocations were less likely to exceed the 5% minimum youth set-aside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAP Allocation Size</th>
<th>Number of CoCs with HEAP Allocations within Range</th>
<th>% of CoCs from Each Funding Range that Exceeded the 5% Youth Set-Aside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $4.0 million</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.1 to $8.0 million</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.1 to $12.0 million</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12.1 to $16.0 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16.1 to $20.0 million</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20.1 million or higher</td>
<td>1 (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdictions located in the coastal and central regions of California were more likely to exceed the 5% minimum youth set-aside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Counties Included</th>
<th>% Jurisdictions that Exceeded 5% Youth Set-Aside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Tulare, Ventura</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Inyo, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Tuolumne, Yolo</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The percentage of HEAP funding CoCs invested in addressing youth homelessness was not typically proportionate to the percentage of youth in their homeless populations.

Of the 24 CoCs with youth PIT Count percentages higher than 5%:
- 14 (58%) opted to spend the minimum 5% of HEAP funding on youth.
- 10 (42%) opted to spend more than the minimum 5%.

Of the 19 CoCs that did not have youth PIT Count percentages higher than 5%:
- 12 (63%) opted to spend the minimum 5% of HEAP funding on youth.
- 7 (37%) opted to spend more than the minimum 5%.
## Continuums of Care with Youth PIT Counts Under 5% That Designated More Than 5% to Youth Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Region</th>
<th>Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count</th>
<th>Percent CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino County</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Woodland/Yolo County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton/San Joaquin County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond/Contra Costa County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced City &amp; County</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regions with Highest 2017 Homeless Youth Point-in-Time Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Region</th>
<th>Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count</th>
<th>Percentage CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose/Santa Clara City &amp; County</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/Santa Cruz City &amp; County</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; County of San Francisco</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>45.6% (CoC &amp; City collaboratively spent 60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jurisdictions that were currently or previously engaged in organized efforts to address youth homelessness were more likely to exceed the 5% minimum youth set-aside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Region or Large City</th>
<th>Percentage CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness</th>
<th>Current or Previous Organized Effort/Planning Process to Address Youth Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CoC:** City & County of San Francisco  
**Large City:** San Francisco | 45.6% 85.2% (CoC & City collaboratively spent 60%) | Youth Homeless Demonstration Program, Round 1 |
| **CoC:** Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County | 15.0% | Youth Homeless Demonstration Program, Round 1 |
| **CoC:** San Diego County  
**Large City:** San Diego | 5.0% 5.0% | Youth Homeless Demonstration Program, Round 2 |
| **CoC:** Los Angeles City & County  
**Large City:** Los Angeles | 9.0% 5.8% | Measure H Planning |
| **CoC:** Sacramento City & County  
**Large City:** Sacramento | 5% 8% | HUD 100-Day Challenge (2018-19) |
| **CoC:** Mendocino County | 5.4% | HUD 100-Day Challenge (2017-18) |
REPORT FINDINGS

Recipient Organizations
Limited number of new youth providers were awarded HEAP funding.

- However in some jurisdictions, new providers did engage in HEAP stakeholder input activities.

- In jurisdictions with few youth providers, HEAP funding was, in some cases, awarded to adult housing providers that expanded their target populations to serve youth.
Youth providers that had never received funding from their CoC required technical assistance to become successful HEAP applicants.

Capacity-building challenges:

- Understanding the purpose of and how the Coordinated Entry System works
- Embracing Housing First principles and practices
- Identifying how their proposed project or services fit into the CoC’s priorities

Offering technical assistance in the future may be an effective approach to developing greater community capacity to serve the homeless youth population.
Select jurisdictions used HEAP to address the issue of student homelessness.

- **Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma CoC**
  - Funding a variation of College-Focused Rapid Rehousing

- **Lake County CoC**
  - K-12 school districts’ McKinney Vento Liaisons – flexible funding to stabilize students experiencing homelessness

- **Mendocino County CoC**
  - County Office of Education – funding to support homeless students and their families in identifying and accessing shelter
REPORT FINDINGS

Funding, Planning and Collaboration
There was consensus among jurisdictions that set-aside funding to address youth homelessness is necessary.

Is a youth set-aside necessary to direct funding to homeless youth?

- Yes: 100% (CoCs Respondents)
- Yes: 100% (Large City Respondents)

“It’s clear we have an adult based system, so if nothing is allocated to transition-age youth it will dissolve among the many priorities for adult funding.”
CoCs are an effective entity to distribute and coordinate funding for homeless youth; city departments have varying capacities to do so.

Is administering funding to address youth homelessness within your area of expertise?

Yes: 100%

CoCs Respondents

Why?

“Broad, regional perspective”

“Experienced at facilitating comprehensive stakeholder input processes”

“Regularly coordinate with housing providers”

“Currently develop regional plans to address homelessness”
HEAP highlighted the lack of adequate funding for homeless youth.

Is ongoing funding required to address youth homelessness?

Yes: 100%

18 CoC and LCs that participated in in-depth interviews

Impact of one-time funding:

- Some jurisdictions tried new things
- All cited the difficulty of funding housing interventions which could continue beyond the life of the two-year program
- Led to investment in shelter over other strategies
- Prevented smaller organizations from applying
HEAP highlighted the need to improve the Point-In-Time Count for homeless youth.

Widely recognized to be a significant undercount for homeless unaccompanied youth.

Use of PIT to allocate HEAP heightened awareness of this and stimulated conversations about how to improve.

Absent an accurate count, strong local advocacy led to investment above 5%.

For some, HEAP allocated by PIT sparked first-ever conversation about accuracy of count and unaccompanied homeless youth generally.

Jurisdictions that had invested in improving their count were more likely to use the higher percentage (e.g. Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC).
RECOMMENDATIONS
Funding to address homelessness should include a youth set-aside.

**Without a youth set-aside:**
Youth needs may dissolve among the many federal priorities for adult funding.

**Jurisdictions that did not exceed the five percent reported:**
Lacking in political will on behalf of local leadership & not enough youth advocacy base to draw support.

CoCs’ HEAP Spending on Youth Homelessness

- Met the Five-Percent Minimum: 56%
- Exceeded the Five-Percent Minimum: 44%

= $51.6 million
(10.3%) on youth homelessness
The minimum youth set-aside in future one-time funding to address homelessness should be set at 20%.

- Inaccuracy of PIT Count for unaccompanied youth
- Historic underinvestment in youth homelessness
- Rapid growth in youth homelessness
Reducing youth homelessness in California requires an ongoing funding commitment.

100% of CoCs interviewed expressed need for ongoing funding to address youth homelessness.

**One-time funding:**

Calls for creative approaches that can quickly ramp up and wind down

**Ongoing funding:**

Enables long-term solutions such as expansion of housing capacity coupled with the services required to reduce youth homelessness.
The youth Point-In-Time Count process must be refined to produce a more accurate snapshot of youth homelessness at the local level.

Strategies to Consider

- Engage youth service providers
- Engage LGBTQ Partners
- Expand coverage
- Hold magnet events
- Improve training
- Involve youth

Recommendations from Urban Institute's Youth County! Process Study
Continuums of Care are well-positioned to be the entity to administer youth homelessness funding locally.

**Areas of Strength**
- Coordinate housing and service providers
- Relationships with housing providers
- Broad array of key stakeholders
- Utilize an existing data system

**How CoCs Can Improve**
- Improved knowledge of youth development
- Outreach to youth providers
- TA provided to new providers
- Improved understanding of youth homelessness
The provision of technical assistance should be included in any future state funding plans to address homelessness.

One of the contributing factors to jurisdictions feeling equipped to administer HEAP funding was the availability of technical assistance and the accessibility of the HCFC to the CoCs and large cities administering funding at the local level.
WHAT’S NEXT FOR HEAP?

- Assembly’s budget proposal includes $650 million for HEAP with an intention to set aside funding for homeless youth, but no percentage specified.
- Senate’s budget proposal includes $600 million with a 10% youth set-aside.

Budget Conference Committee will begin meeting next week.

Please join us in requesting a 20% youth set-aside in HEAP.
To submit questions, click on the “questions” panel, type your question, and click “send.”

• To contact JBAY at a later date, e-mail Simone Tureck Lee at simone@jbay.org.
• Presentation materials and audio will be e-mailed to all webinar registrants and posted at www.jbaforyouth.org under “training archive.”