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Background

- Urban Institute: Washington, DC based social research firm
- Homelessness consulting services for Alameda County August-December 2017
- Recommendations to address recent reported increase in homelessness based on:
  - Interviews with county officials and partner organizations
  - Review of local data
  - Survey of county and city agencies and community-based organizations
  - Review of national best practices
Presentation Overview

• Summary of existing data on homelessness in Alameda County
• Data Dashboard
• Promising practices in Alameda County and comparable communities
• Policy and programmatic recommendations
• Discussion
Definitions

Crisis Programs
• Outreach
• Emergency Shelter
• Transitional Housing

Permanent Housing Programs
• Rapid Re-Housing
• Permanent Supportive Housing
• Permanent Housing

Homelessness Systems
• Continuum of Care (CoC)
• System Performance Measures
• Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
• Coordinated Entry
Homelessness in Alameda County

2017 Snapshot and Trends
Homelessness in Alameda County, 2017

Source: 2017 Alameda County PIT Count
Rates of Homelessness in Alameda County and Other California Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rate of Homelessness, 2017 (per 10,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (city)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County (unincorporated)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017 PIT count; 2016 Census Bureau population estimates
Overall Trends in Homelessness: 2007-2017

Source: Alameda County PIT counts

Source: Alameda County PIT counts

- Non-Chronically Homeless Individuals
- Chronically Homeless Individuals
- People in Families
Local Perceptions of Homeless Trends

• In survey of 11 cities & 11 CBOs, 72% of city respondents thought homelessness in their cities was increasing, 28% thought it had stayed the same

• 100% of respondents from community-based organizations (CBOs) thought homelessness was increasing

• Nearly every respondent cited increasing housing costs and/or a shortage of supply as the main driver of the increased homeless count

• Most common responses about how homeless population was changing:
  • More families doubled-up or living in their cars
  • More opioid and methamphetamine users

*CBO survey was completed by 12 staff members of local CBOs that were identified by the County

Source: Surveys of Cities & CBOs in Alameda County
Drivers of increase in homelessness

- Change in methodology for counting unsheltered between 2015 & 2017: PIT is a factor in magnitude of increase
  - Shift from service-based count to full canvas of the area
  - Difficult to quantify impact
- Part of a statewide phenomenon (Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Clara all saw double digit increases in homelessness)
- HUD Fair Market Rents not keeping pace with rental market led to difficulties using tenant-based rental assistance (vouchers, rapid rehousing)

Source: Urban Institute Affordability Gap Map
Homeless Assistance in Alameda County

Housing Inventory, Funding, and Performance
Homeless Assistance Bed Inventory, 2017

**Family Beds**
- 49.3% Interim
- 16.6% Transitional Housing
- 13.0% Rapid Re-Housing
- 21.0% Permanent Supportive Housing

**Individual Beds**
- 15.8% Emergency Shelter
- 15.0% Transitional Housing
- 64.6% Permanent Supportive Housing
- 4.6% Interim

1,970 Family Beds
2,848 Individual Beds

Source: HUD HIC data
HUD Continuum of Care Funding, FFY 2016

- Permanent Supportive Housing: 69.1%
- Transitional Housing: 12.6%
- Rapid Re-Housing: 3.1%
- Supportive Services Only: 2.5%
- Planning: 1.2%
- HMIS: 1.2%
- Total: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>$23,486,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>$4,268,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>$3,968,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Services Only</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$845,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$33,998,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CoC data
Budgeted FY 2016-17 County Homelessness Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>$28,425,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Resource Centers</td>
<td>$8,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter &amp; Transitional Housing</td>
<td>$7,704,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>$5,827,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>$1,274,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$11,597,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,728,918</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda County, Board of Supervisors presentation (July 18, 2017)
Served by Program Type, FFY 2014-16

Total Served (FFY 2016): 8,610

Source: Alameda County HMIS administrative data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number served annually</td>
<td>12,383</td>
<td>11,567</td>
<td>11,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Homelessness</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>2,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Homelessness</td>
<td>230 days</td>
<td>398 days</td>
<td>437 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits to Permanent Housing</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exits to Permanent Housing</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 2 years</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Returns to Homelessness (within 2 years)</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>18.70%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda County HMIS administrative data
Performance by Program Type, FFY 2016

Note: Timeframe is 24 months

Source: Alameda County HMIS administrative data
Data Dashboard

Population Need, Performance, and Resources
Dashboard Data Sources

• HUD data on housing inventory & CoC funding

• EveryOne Home

• HCD, SSA, HCSA budgets and documents

• Survey of city agencies
## Alameda County funding by City & Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
<th>Rapid Re-Housing</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Supportive Services</th>
<th>Coordinated entry</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Other Program Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$569,949</td>
<td>$17.4m</td>
<td>$2m</td>
<td>$1.96m</td>
<td>$547,603</td>
<td>$5.3m</td>
<td>$1.5m</td>
<td>$30.2m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$748,226</td>
<td>$231,426</td>
<td>$5.2m</td>
<td>$490,019</td>
<td>$1.3m</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$108,528</td>
<td>$8.7m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.1m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>$79,684</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$165,263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$394,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda (city)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$74,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$199,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1.75m</td>
<td></td>
<td>$186,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.1m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$411,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>$21,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$206,602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$227,781</td>
<td>$455,562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Alameda County (HCD only)</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$81,320</td>
<td>$43,358</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$306,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City survey responses from most recent fiscal year. Missing data for Newark, Piedmont, and Hayward.
## Additional measures to track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated Entry/HRC</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Household type (composition, gender, age)</td>
<td>• Individual or household contacts</td>
<td>• Returns to homelessness within 3 months of PH exit</td>
<td>• City and County funding by program type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current housing situation</td>
<td>• Encampment of 15 or more (Y/N)</td>
<td>• Duration of assistance/length of stay in program</td>
<td>• CoC funding by program type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current ZIP code</td>
<td>• Geographic information</td>
<td>• Length of time between program entry and move-in date</td>
<td>• City and County costs per night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of assistance required</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent of entries by chronically homeless</td>
<td>• City and County costs per household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistance received</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Total assistance per household</td>
<td>• City and County costs per household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Average assistance per household</td>
<td>• City and County costs per permanent housing exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Average household income at program entry &amp; exit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dashboard Recommendations

- Do not solely rely on a survey to capture this information
- Develop a process to collect and standardize financial data across agencies and County and city governments
- Focus on available funding streams and eligible uses to avoid coverage gaps
- Share findings to confirm accuracy and inform investments and policies
- Integrate financial data with EveryoneHome system performance goals
Profiles of Promising Practices in Comparable Communities
Introduction to different jurisdictions

- Alameda County, California
- San Francisco, California
- Santa Clara County, California
- Los Angeles County, California
- King County, Washington
- Maricopa County, Arizona
- Salt Lake County, Utah
## Summary of Peer County Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>S.F. County</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>L.A. County</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>1,647,704</td>
<td>870,887</td>
<td>1,919,402</td>
<td>10,137,915</td>
<td>2,149,970</td>
<td>4,242,997</td>
<td>1,121,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest City</strong></td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC/Lead Homeless Agency</strong></td>
<td>EveryOne Home</td>
<td>Local Homeless Coordinating Board</td>
<td>Santa Clara Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA)</td>
<td>All Home King County</td>
<td>Maricopa County Continuum of Care Board</td>
<td>Homeless Services Dept, Salt Lake County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Homeless (2017 PIT)</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>7,499</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>57,794</td>
<td>11,643</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Homeless (2015 PIT)</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>7,539</td>
<td>6,556</td>
<td>44,359</td>
<td>10,047</td>
<td>5,631</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change Homeless (‘15-’17)</td>
<td>+39%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td>+30%</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unsheltered (2017 PIT)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change Unsheltered (‘15-’17)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless rate (per 10,000)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Summary of HUD Support across Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>S.F. County</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>L.A. County</th>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>Salt Lake County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 CoC Award</strong></td>
<td>$33,998,867</td>
<td>$31,804,009</td>
<td>$20,015,353</td>
<td>$104,971,653</td>
<td>$34,457,083</td>
<td>$25,418,465</td>
<td>$7,291,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSH</strong></td>
<td>$23,486,919</td>
<td>$27,859,037</td>
<td>$13,271,375</td>
<td>$80,178,096</td>
<td>$22,730,226</td>
<td>$21,276,438</td>
<td>$5,760,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RRH</strong></td>
<td>$3,968,479</td>
<td>$1,907,516</td>
<td>$4,460,850</td>
<td>$11,982,113</td>
<td>$4,349,594</td>
<td>$2,148,898</td>
<td>$683,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH</strong></td>
<td>$4,268,153</td>
<td>$445,438</td>
<td>$868,271</td>
<td>$8,948,799</td>
<td>$3,305,818</td>
<td>$415,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Serv.</strong></td>
<td>$1,038,071</td>
<td>$132,364</td>
<td>$130,241</td>
<td>$479,058</td>
<td>$1,872,500</td>
<td>$855,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMIS</strong></td>
<td>$391,907</td>
<td>$540,621</td>
<td>$714,321</td>
<td>$1,549,260</td>
<td>$400,921</td>
<td>$223,151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Haven</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$584,327</td>
<td>$791,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoC Award/Person</strong></td>
<td>$6,040</td>
<td>$4,241</td>
<td>$2,706</td>
<td>$1,816</td>
<td>$2,959</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
<td>$3,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESG (County)</strong></td>
<td>$772,508</td>
<td>$790,330</td>
<td>$1,856,207</td>
<td>$314,480</td>
<td>$239,473</td>
<td>$207,331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESG (City)</strong></td>
<td>$640,000 (Oakland); $222,546 (Berkeley)</td>
<td>$1,484,425</td>
<td>$4,496,906</td>
<td>$819,850</td>
<td>$1,306,316</td>
<td>$290,179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Only reflects money from HUD, not overall dollars in county.
Source: 2017 Point in Time Count; 2016 HUD CoC Dashboard.
Notable Initiatives

Alameda County

• Whole Person Care
• Measure A1 Bond
• Early mover on Housing First

**Other Counties’ Initiatives**

**Increased or innovative funding**

• Measure H/HHH (LA County/City)
• Medicaid Demonstration (Maricopa County)
• Support from faith-based community, philanthropy, business (Salt Lake County)

**Studies & plans**

• Home Not Found – Cost of Homelessness Study (Santa Clara County)
• Action Plan (LA County)
• Rapid Re-Housing study (Maricopa County)

**Improving service provision**

• Homeless Outreach Team (SF County)
• Encampment Resolution Team (SF County)
• Human Services Campuses (Maricopa County)

**Housing solutions**

• Housing Choice Voucher set aside for PSH (multiple counties)
• Project Welcome Home (Santa Clara County)
• Landlord Liaison Project (King County)
Notable Initiatives – Studies & Plans

• Home Not Found – Cost of Homelessness Study (Santa Clara County)
  • Homelessness cost Santa Clara County over $500 million per year

• Action Plan (LA County)
  • LA County Board of Supervisors approved action plan of nearly four dozen strategies, including funding to implement

• Rapid Re-Housing study (Maricopa County)
Notable Initiatives – Increased or Innovative Funding

• *Measure A1 Bond (Alameda County)*
  
• Measure H/HHH (LA County/City)
  • Will also pay for rental assistance and services

• Medicaid Demonstration (Maricopa County)
  • Allow Medicaid to pay for support services for single adults

• Support from faith-based community, philanthropy, business (Salt Lake County)
Notable Initiatives - Improving Service Provision

- Whole Person Care (Alameda County)

- Homeless Outreach Team (SF County)
  - Collaboration that provides services, case management, and street medicine

- Encampment Resolution Team (SF County)
  - Resolved 17 encampments in first year, placing over 300 people into safe residential programs

- Human Services Campuses (Maricopa County)
  - Effectiveness is not clear: expensive and not always humane
  - There are better ways to co-locate services
Notable Initiatives – Housing Solutions

• *Early mover on Rapid Re-Housing and Housing First (Alameda County)*

• Housing Choice Voucher set aside for PSH (multiple counties)

  • Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles dedicates nearly all turnover units to homeless

• Project Welcome Home (Santa Clara County)

  • Pay for Success project – will provide permanent supportive housing for 150-200 chronically homeless individuals

• Landlord Liaison Project (King County)

  • Housed more than 7,000 people since 2009
Recommendations
Basis for recommendations

Synthesis of:

- Recommendations provided by respondents from CBO and city agency survey
- Interviews with county agency staff
- Review of best practices in comparable communities
Improve coordination and data sharing

• Expand current efforts to coordinate funding priorities between agencies

• Clarify roles and responsibilities between EveryOne Home, County, cities, and CBOs

• Establish formal data sharing process between city and County agencies to share information on funding by revenue source and program

• Ensure that ranking and rating process for CoC funding is clearly understood by key stakeholders
Take bold action on housing

• Continue focus on permanent housing as solution for homelessness

• Identify operating and service subsidies to target a greater share of affordable units to homeless and extremely low income

• Conduct a thorough needs assessment of # of units and estimated cost to prevent and end homelessness

• Develop a housing affordability plan to reach that unit target

• To increase housing supply, County could consider
  • local, dedicated funding stream for operations and services for supportive housing
  • Land-use reform to encourage micro-units and accessory dwelling units
Maximize potential of housing resource centers

• Continue support for implementing coordinated entry as it rolls out
• Establish a shared vision for how coordinated entry will improve system
  • Clear accountability for implementation progress
  • Transparency on how resources are allocated
  • Clear policies on how vacant housing units are filled
• Make sure HRCs have permanent housing resources to connect people to
• Continue to align contracts and other leverage points to increase participation among non-HUD funded providers, particularly outside of Oakland and Berkeley, including outreach teams
Use coordinated entry for systems planning

• Create a plan to regularly analyze the data collected through coordinated entry to:
  • Inform systems-level analysis of gaps and inefficiencies in the homelessness response system
  • Identify and address resource differences across regions to ensure equitable access of services across county
  • Monitor efficiency of coordinated entry system and functionality of the assessment tool
  • Develop system for sharing this data and using it for decision-making
Find new funding streams for long-term supportive housing tenants

- Most homeless funding goes to existing supportive housing tenants
- Assess ongoing service needs for longer-term supportive housing tenants
- When appropriate, offer regular voucher with connection to mainstream services
- Encourage PHA preferences for “stable” supportive housing tenants
- Identify Medi-Cal or other non-homeless targeted funding for housing navigation and tenancy supports
- Provide training to interested CBOs to bill Medi-Cal for eligible activities
Coordinate outreach efforts

- Support ongoing process to coordinate outreach efforts throughout the County and with cities
- Standardize practice across County regions
- Collect and use data collected by outreach teams in HMIS, integrate outreach into coordinated entry
- Assign outreach leads by geography
- Reward outreach providers for placements into temporary and permanent housing
- Increase oversight and monitoring of outreach teams
Encourage humane and efficient responses to unsheltered population

- Increase shelter capacity, with investment in housing resources needed for exit
  - Be mindful of the 3 P’s: partners, pets, and personal belongings

- Adopt humane responses for people who are outdoors now

- Establish county-wide policies and procedures for encampment clearing

- Work with cities to carefully monitor any sanctioned encampments
Clarify leadership and collective vision

• Strengthen the governance capacity and coordination of policies and funding decisions across the county

• Clarify roles and responsibilities between EveryOne Home and County and city governments
  • Ensure every entity has needed resources, skill sets, and authority to fill their assigned roles

• Opportunities for electeds, business leaders, philanthropists to show leadership on this issue

• Work to connect systems improvements at the front-door to housing opportunities at the backdoor
Discussion