



How Close Are We to Ending Homelessness among Families in California and What Are the Next Steps?

-A brief prepared by Joe Colletti, PhD and Sofia Herrera, PhD-
Urban Initiatives on Homelessness and Poverty
December, 2016

We may be getting close to ending homelessness among unsheltered and sheltered families (households with children under 18) in California. The comparison of recent data in Table 1 (see Appendix A) shows that the total number of unsheltered and sheltered families decreased between 2010 and 2016 according to unduplicated one-night (point-in-time) count estimates of both unsheltered and sheltered persons reported by the continuums of care¹ that make up California.

How Close Are We?

As was mentioned above, the total number of unsheltered and sheltered families in California decreased between 2010 and 2016.² In 2010 there were 8,312 unsheltered and sheltered families compared to 7,338 in 2016, which represents a decrease of 974 families or 12%. More

¹ A "Continuum of Care" is a geographically based group of representatives that carries out the planning responsibilities of the Continuum of Care program, as described in 24 CFR Part 578 [Docket No. FR-5476-I-01] RIN 2506-AC29 Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing: Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These representatives come from organizations that provide services to the homeless, or represent the interests of the homeless or formerly homeless.

² The 2010 data was collected from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Assistance Programs Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Reports which are available on-line.² The 2016 data was collected from the 2016 Continuum of Care Program applications, which were submitted to HUD for funding last September.

specifically, in 2010 there were 2,362 unsheltered families, a number that went down to 1,564 in 2016 representing decrease of 798 families or 34%. The total number of sheltered families only decreased slightly between 2010 and 2016. In 2010 there were 5,950 sheltered families compared to 2016 when there were 5,774 sheltered families, which represents a decrease of 176 families or 3%.

Advancing Current Strategies

This brief takes a close look at the strategies that were included in the 2016 Continuum of Care Program applications submitted by 40 California continuums of care to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in September. This brief also focuses on advancing these strategies as outlined in the last section.

A Close Look at the Strategies

The first part of subsection 3B-Objective 2 in the 2016 Continuum of Care Program application focused on ending homelessness among households with children. The subsection outlined several related tactics to help end homelessness among families as follows:

1. “Comparing the total number of homeless households with children as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT (point-in-time) count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015);
2. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported in the 2016 PIT count as compared to the 2015 PIT count;
3. Compare the number of RRH (Rapid Rehousing) units available to serve families from 2015 and 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC);
4. What factors will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY 2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply);
5. Describe the CoC’s strategies, including concrete steps to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless; and
6. How does the CoC ensure emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC do not deny admission to or separate any family members from other members of their family based on age, sex, gender or disability when entering shelter or housing? (Check all that apply).”³

HUD stated that it “will evaluate CoCs based on the extent to which they are making progress to achieve the goal of ending homelessness among households with children by 2020” through the use of these tactics.⁴

³ “FY 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application Detailed Instructions,” pp. 52 - 55.

⁴ “FY 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application Detailed Instructions,” p. 52.

1. Comparing the total number of homeless households with children as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT (point-in-time) count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015)

Table 2 (see Appendix B) compares the total number of unsheltered and sheltered adults and children in households with children in 2015 and 2016. In 2015, California CoCs reported a total of 8,122 households with children, and a total of 7,338 in 2016, which represents a decrease of 784 households with children or approximately 10%.

Table 2 also compares the total number of unsheltered households with children and the total number of sheltered households with children:

- In 2015, California CoCs reported a total of 1,936 unsheltered households with children in comparison to 1,564 in 2016, which represents a decrease of 372 households or 19.2%.
- California CoCs also reported a total of 6,186 sheltered households with children in 2015 and 5,774 in 2016, which represents a decrease of 412 households or 6.7%.

2. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported in the 2016 PIT count as compared to the 2015 PIT count.

After comparing the total number of homeless households with children as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT (point-in-time) to the number in 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015), HUD asked each CoC that had an increase or no change in the total number of homeless households with children to explain the increase or no change.

Of the 40 California CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application to HUD, 11 CoCs or 28% reported an increase or no change in the total number of homeless households with children between 2015 and 2016. The increase in the total number of homeless households with children was small. Among the 11 CoCs, eight had an increase of 10 households with children or less and six of the eight CoCs had an increase of five households with children or less.

The three CoCs that had an increase of 10 households with children or more, noted that their increase for families was due to an increase in the overall number of homeless households in their regions. Each of them also noted that the increase was primarily among sheltered households with children.

3. Compare the number of RRH (Rapid Rehousing) units available to serve families from 2015 and 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

The primary reason why HUD asked the CoCs to compare the number of Rapid Rehousing units available to serve families from 2015 and 2016 is because HUD has made it clear that the key to making progress towards ending homelessness among households with children is by

implementing a best practice known as Rapid Rehousing. This is a practice promoted by a wide-range of national, state, and local public and private organizations. Rapid Rehousing, as described by HUD,

“is an intervention, informed by a Housing First approach that is a critical part of a community’s effective homeless crisis response system. Rapid re-housing rapidly connects families and individuals experiencing homelessness to permanent housing through a tailored package of assistance that may include the use of time-limited financial assistance and targeted supportive services. Rapid rehousing programs help families and individuals living on the streets or in emergency shelters solve the practical and immediate challenges to obtaining permanent housing while reducing the amount of time they experience homelessness, avoiding a near-term return to homelessness, and linking to community resources that enable them to achieve housing stability in the long-term.”⁵

Table 3 (see Appendix C) reveals that the 40 California CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application had 2,403 Rapid Rehousing units available to serve families in 2015, and 3,395 Rapid Rehousing units in 2016, which is an increase of 992 units or 42%. The table provides a breakdown of units available for each CoC.

4. What factors will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY 2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply)

In the 2016 grant application, HUD linked the implementation of a Rapid Rehousing intervention with a coordinated entry process. HUD requires all continuums of care to put into operation a Coordinated Entry System (CES) which helps

“communities prioritize assistance based on vulnerability and severity of service needs to ensure that people who need assistance the most can receive it in a timely manner. Coordinated entry processes also provide information about service needs and gaps to help communities plan their assistance and identify needed resources.”⁶

HUD acknowledged the progress to date regarding assistance based on vulnerability and severity of service needs by the CoCs

“As a part of the ongoing development of CoC coordinated entry processes, CoCs are increasingly prioritizing assistance for households with children who are most vulnerable or have the highest needs, rather than prioritizing households who are “motivated” or possess other characteristics that may increase their chances for success.”⁷

⁵ <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Rapid-Re-Housing-Brief.pdf>.

⁶ <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Coordinated-Entry-Policy-Brief.pdf>

⁷ Ibid.

To further this progress, HUD asked the following question in the application: “What factors will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY 2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply):” Factors included:

- Vulnerability to victimization;
- Number of previous homeless episodes;
- Unsheltered homelessness;
- Criminal History;
- Bad credit or rental history including not having been a leaseholder; and
- Head of household has mental/physical disabilities.

The following summarizes the answers listed in Table 4 (see Appendix D) regarding factors that CoCs decided to prioritize. Among the 40 California CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application to HUD,

- 38 or 95.0% will prioritize unsheltered homeless households;
- 37 or 92.5 will prioritize heads of household that have mental/physical disabilities;
- 36 or 90.0% will prioritize vulnerability to victimization;
- 36 or 90.0% will prioritize households with a number of previous homeless episodes;
- 24 or 60.0% will prioritize households with bad credit or rental history, including not having been a leaseholder; and
- 24 or 60.0% will consider criminal history.

5. Describe the CoC’s strategies including concrete steps to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless

Four strategies that HUD noted to rapidly rehouse every household with children with 30 days included participating in the coordinated entry process, implementing a Housing First approach, maximizing Continuum of Care (CoC) funds, and maximizing Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds.⁸

As noted in Table 5 (see Appendix E), among the 40 CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application to HUD,

- 38 or 95.0% will apply a housing first approach;
- 37 or 92.5% will include maximizing continuum of care funds;
- 32 or 80.0% will include a coordinated entry process;
- 31 or 77.5% will include maximizing emergency solutions grant funds.

It is important to note that of the seven CoCs that did not describe a coordinated entry process as a strategy, all but two noted that they will soon have a coordinated entry process. It is also important to note that not all California CoCs have a county or a city(ies) that receive a direct

⁸ “FY 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application Detailed Instructions,” p. 53.

allocation of Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds annually. These funds are designated for Rapid Rehousing activities. However, CoCs that do not have a county or a city that receives a direct allocation of Emergency Solutions Grant funds annually can apply to the California Department of Housing and Community Development for an allocation of Emergency Solutions Grant funds for Rapid Rehousing efforts.

6. How does the CoC ensure emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC do not deny admission to or separate any family members from other members of their family based on age, sex, gender or disability when entering shelter or housing? (Check all that apply).

In relationship to the question above, HUD stated the following:

“Involuntary separation of family members most commonly takes the form of separating male members of the household to admit female members into a project. The CoC Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.93 (e) and 24 CFR 576.102(b) explicitly prohibit any kind of involuntary family separation and the denial of admission to selected family members, including those described above in all CoC Program-funded projects and ESG-funded emergency shelters. HUD’s FAQ 1529 provides additional clarification on this requirement.”⁹

In the 2016 grant application, HUD instructed CoCs to

“Select all of the options from the checklist that apply to the actions and policies that are in place to ensure housing providers in the CoC do not deny admission to or separate family members from other members of their families based on age, sex, gender, or disability when entering a shelter or housing.”

Options included

- CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation;
- CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year; and
- There is a method for clients to alert CoC when [they are] involuntarily separated.

As noted in Table 6 (see Appendix F), of the 40 CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application to HUD,

- 34 or 85% stated that CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation are in place;
- 23 or 57.5% stated that the CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year; and
- 19 or 47.5% stated that there is a method for clients to alert CoC when involuntarily separated.

⁹ “FY 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application Detailed Instructions,” p. 54.

Advancing the Strategies to end homelessness among homeless households with children

This section of the brief focuses on advancing each of the six strategies that were noted above.

1. Comparing the total number of homeless households with children as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT (point-in-time) count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015)

In 2016, the 40 California CoCs that submitted a CoC Program application to HUD, reported that there were 7,338 homeless families of which 1,564 or 21% were unsheltered and 5,774 or 79% were sheltered. Thus, approximately one of five families were unsheltered.

All California CoCs should enhance efforts to engage unsheltered families in order to determine if a family is chronically homeless. This would help ensure that the hardest-to-house families are not left behind. Chronically homeless families are often best housed through a housing first approach that is tied to permanent supportive housing.

Ending a chronically homeless family's experience of homelessness involves housing stability. Permanent supportive housing provides the necessary on-site and off-site services that increases a family's ability to maintain a stable housing situation. Identifying chronic homelessness and the issues that need to be addressed to achieve housing stability can occur through the coordinated entry system described in the fourth strategy below.

2. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported in the 2016 PIT count as compared to the 2015 PIT count.

HUD asks CoCs to explain the reason(s) for any increase or no change in the total number of homeless households with children. All California CoCs, however, should take the time to explain the reason(s) for any increase or no change in the total number of unsheltered households with children and for sheltered households with children.

Taking the time to explain any reasons for any increase or no change in the total number of unsheltered households with children would also help ensure that the hardest-to-house families are not left behind by letting CoCs know the specific reasons why there was an increase or no change such as the lack of enough permanent supportive housing.

Similarly, taking the time to explain any reasons for any increase or no change in the total number of sheltered households with children would help underline 1) the need for more permanent supportive housing units for sheltered households with children that are chronically homeless and, 2) the need for more Rapid Rehousing units for sheltered households with children that are not chronically homeless as noted in the focus of the next strategy below.

3. Compare the number of RRH (Rapid Rehousing) units available to serve families from 2015 and 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

Table 3 (see Appendix C) reveals that the 40 California CoCs that submitted a 2016 CoC Program application had 2,403 Rapid Rehousing units available to serve families in 2015 and 3,395 Rapid Rehousing units in 2016. This is an increase of 992 units or 42%. In order to continue to increase the number of Rapid Rehousing units, all California CoCs should promote the following sources of funding for which Rapid Rehousing as an eligible activity among qualified public and private agencies within their jurisdiction:

Permanent Housing Bonus Continuum of Care Program Competition

For the past few years HUD has assigned an amount of funds to each CoC prior to the annual Continuum of Care Program Competition. Eligible activities include:

- new permanent supportive housing projects that will serve 100 percent chronically homeless individuals and families, and
- new Rapid Rehousing projects that will serve homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, which include persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness.

Reallocation of Renewal Funding through the Continuum of Care Program Competition

For the past few years, HUD has promoted a process that allows CoCs to reallocate funding for projects eligible for renewal funding. This provides CoCs with the opportunity to reallocate funds designated for a project that is not performing well and/or underspending their award to one of the following eligible activities:

- new permanent supportive housing projects that will serve 100 percent chronically homeless individuals and families, and
- new Rapid Rehousing projects that will serve homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, which also include persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness.

Emergency Solutions Grant

The Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act was enacted in 2009, which reauthorized HUD's McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs. Among the HEARTH Act's provisions was the revision of what was previously known as the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program and which is now renamed the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program because of its new focus on permanent housing placement and retention. ESG funds can be used for a variety of activities, including Rapid Rehousing for families. ESG recipients are required to use a minimum of 40 % of their ESG funds on prevention or Rapid Rehousing.

CalWORKs Housing Support Program

The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Housing Support Program (HSP) is administered by the California Department of Public Social Services. HSP provides a wide-range of support that is similar to the Rapid Rehousing assistance provided by the ESG Program. Support for families include temporary rental subsidies, move-in assistance, financial counseling, credit repair and intensive case management. County Welfare Departments (CWDs) have been receiving HSP allocations for the past few years.

4. What factors will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY 2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply)

All California CoCs should use all the factors to prioritize households with children which include:

- Vulnerability to victimization;
- Number of previous homeless episodes;
- Unsheltered homelessness;
- Criminal History;
- Bad credit or rental history including not having been a leaseholder; and
- Head of household has mental/physical disabilities.

As previously noted, HUD linked the implementation of a Rapid Rehousing intervention with a Coordinated Entry System (CES). The CES is a requirement for all CoCs that receive HUD funding. A primary purpose of a CES is to identify the vulnerability and severity of service needs of homeless households including families. Thus, HUD asked CoCs to answer the following question within the application which of the following factors “will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY 2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply).”

As noted in table 4 (see Appendix D), not all priority factors will be used by all CoCs. The factors that will be used the most are

- unsheltered homelessness (97.5%);
- head of household has mental/physical disabilities (95%);
- vulnerability to victimization (92.5%); and
- number of previous homeless episodes (92.5%).

However, the factors that will be used the least by the 40 California CoCs are 1) criminal history (62.5%) and, 2) bad credit or rental history (62.5%).

5. Describe the CoC’s strategies including concrete steps to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless

All California CoCs should include the four strategies that HUD encourages to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless and describe concrete steps to implement them if not done already.

The four strategies that HUD encourages include:

- Coordinated Entry Process;
- Housing First Approach;
- Maximizing Continuum of Care Funds; and
- Maximizing Emergency Solutions Grant Funds.

As noted in table 5 (see Appendix E), nearly all (97.4%) California CoCs described adhering to a Housing First approach and 94.4% described maximizing continuum of care funds as strategies to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless. However, only 82% of the CoCs described incorporating a coordinated entry process (CES) and only 79.5% adopted maximizing Emergency Solutions Grant funds as strategies. Those CoCs that do not have a county or a city that receives a direct allocation of Emergency Solutions Grant funds annually, can apply to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for an allocation of Emergency Solutions Grant funds by following the process outlined by HCD (see <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/financial-assistance/emergency-solutions-grant-program/index.html>).

6. How does the CoC ensure emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC do not deny admission to or separate any family members from other members of their family based on age, sex, gender or disability when entering shelter or housing? (Check all that apply).

All California CoCs should help ensure that all emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC do not deny admission to or separate any family members from other members of their family based on age, sex, gender or disability when entering shelter or housing.

In the 2016 CoC Program application, HUD asked Cocs to “Select all of the options from the checklist that apply to the actions and policies that are in place to ensure housing providers in the CoC do not deny admission to or separate family members from other members of their families based on age, sex, gender, or disability when entering a shelter or housing.” Options included:

- CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation;
- CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year; and
- There is a method for clients to alert CoC when involuntarily separated.

Table 6 (see Appendix F), shows that a large majority (87.2%) of CoCs have policies and procedures that prohibit involuntary family separation. However, just over half (59%) of CoCs hold trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year and less than half (48.7%) have a method for clients to alert the CoC when involuntarily separated.

It is important to note that HUD stated that

“Involuntary separation of family members most commonly takes the form of separating male members of the household to admit female members into a project. The CoC Interim Rule at 24 CFR 578.93 (e) and 24 CFR 576.102(b) explicitly prohibit any kind of involuntary family separation and the denial of admission to selected family members, including those described above in all CoC Program-funded projects and ESG-funded emergency shelters. HUD’s FAQ 1529 provides additional clarification on this requirement.”¹⁰

However, it is also important to note that HUD has mentioned other types of involuntary separation of family members in the recently published Equal Access to Housing Final Rule (https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/EqualAccess_FinalRule_2.3.12.pdf). The Rule noted that

“Family includes, but is not limited to, regardless of marital status, actual or perceived sexual orientation, or gender identity, any group of persons presenting for assistance together with or without children and irrespective of age, relationship, or whether or not a member of the household has a disability. A child who is temporarily away from the home because of placement in foster care is considered a member of the family.

What this means is that any group of people that present together for assistance and identify themselves as a family, regardless of age or relationship or other factors, are considered to be a family and must be served together as such. Further, a recipient or subrecipient receiving funds under the ESG or CoC Programs cannot discriminate against a group of people presenting as a family based on the composition of the family (e.g., adults and children or just adults), the age of any member’s family, the disability status of any members of the family, marital status, actual or perceived sexual orientation, or gender identity.”

Also, it is important to note that HUD, in a joint letter with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) reminded federally funded housing and service providers that they

“must not turn away immigrants experiencing homelessness or victims of domestic violence or human trafficking, on the basis of their immigration status, from certain housing and services necessary for life or safety – such as street outreach, emergency shelter, and short-term housing assistance including transitional housing and rapid re-

¹⁰ “FY 2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Application Detailed Instructions,” p. 54.

housing funded through the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) and Continuum of Care (CoC) Programs.”¹¹

Ending homelessness for families and children is a priority for California’s CoCs. Significant improvements are achievable by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of interventions that work and an end to homelessness among families in California can happen if the California CoCs continue to strengthen their local crisis response systems and target resources to continue to implement evidence-based and best practices.

¹¹ See <https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/HUD-HHS-DOJ-Letter-Regarding-Immigrant-Access-to-Housing-and-Services.pdf>

Appendix A

Table 1. Comparison of Total Number of Unsheltered and Sheltered Adults and Children in Families in California: 2010 and 2016

California CoCs:	2010			2016		
	sheltered	unsheltered	total	sheltered	unsheltered	total
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	264	21	285	259	17	276
San Francisco CoC	168	10	178	190	11	201
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	412	72	484	269	47	316
Sacramento City & County CoC	191	6	197	183	11	194
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	203	2	205	149	7	156
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	116	5	121	74	39	113
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	89	28	117	146	0	146
Marin County CoC	75	10	85	55	2	57
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	131	14	145	97	73	170
Mendocino County CoC	37	7	44	52	43	95
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	116	165	281	69	23	92
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	281	0	281	785	48	833
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	100	20	120	97	35	132
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	49	59	108	39	6	45
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	236	77	313	59	6	65
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	91	27	118	25	0	25
Redding/Shasta County CoC	22	10	32	30	29	59
Napa City & County CoC	16	0	16	19	2	21
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	87	60	147	47	6	53
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	38	9	47	31	1	32
Merced City & County CoC	9	1	10	1	6	7
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	34	7	41	65	6	71
Humboldt County CoC	52	86	138	53	24	77
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC	13	5	18	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	65	7	72	35	0	35
El Dorado County CoC	12	3	15	7	0	7
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	14	22	36	25	8	33
Tehama County CoC*	-	-	-	8	1	9

California CoCs:	2010			2016		
	sheltered	unsheltered	sheltered	unsheltered	sheltered	unsheltered
Del Norte County*	5	0	5	-	-	-
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	1,365	475	1,840	1,441	855	2,296
San Diego City and County CoC	188	2	190	469	76	545
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	454	27	481	411	2	413
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	135	127	262	103	23	126
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	60	18	78	65	6	71
Long Beach CoC	156	68	224	62	44	106
Pasadena CoC	56	35	91	25	2	27
Riverside City & County CoC	270	123	393	64	10	74
San Bernardino City & County CoC	176	45	221	136	40	176
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	54	70	124	44	28	72
Glendale CoC	39	4	43	19	5	24
Imperial County CoC	33	0	33	40	0	40
San Luis Obispo County CoC	38	635	673	26	22	48
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:	5,950	2362	8,312	5,774	1564	7,338

*CoC did not report data for families in either 2010 and/or 2016.

Appendix B

Table 2. Comparison of Total Number of Unsheltered and Sheltered Adults and Children in Families in California: 2015 and 2016

California CoCs:	2015			2016		
	sheltered	unsheltered	total	sheltered	unsheltered	total
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	249	17	266	259	17	276
San Francisco CoC	201	11	212	190	11	201
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	277	47	324	269	47	316
Sacramento City & County CoC	227	1	228	183	11	194
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	119	8	127	149	7	156
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	91	25	116	74	39	113
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	143	4	147	146	0	146
Marin County CoC	55	0	55	55	2	57
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	94	185	279	97	73	170
Mendocino County CoC	40	89	129	52	43	95
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	58	20	78	69	23	92
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	703	48	751	785	48	833
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	112	65	177	97	35	132
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	46	1	47	39	6	45
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	94	2	96	59	6	65
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	37	24	61	25	0	25
Redding/Shasta County CoC	22	7	29	30	29	59
Napa City & County CoC	21	0	21	19	2	21
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	28	21	49	47	6	53
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	31	4	35	31	1	32
Merced City & County CoC	13	0	13	1	6	7
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	36	6	42	65	6	71
Humboldt County CoC	59	38	97	53	24	77
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	28	58	86	35	0	35
El Dorado County CoC	21	18	39	7	0	7
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	30	4	34	25	8	33

California CoCs:	2015			2016		
	sheltered	unsheltered	sheltered	unsheltered	sheltered	unsheltered
Tehama County CoC	6	1	7	8	1	9
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	1,546	873	2,419	1,441	855	2,296
San Diego City and County CoC	544	87	631	469	76	545
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	449	1	450	411	2	413
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	77	34	111	103	23	126
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	61	7	68	65	6	71
Long Beach CoC	82	83	165	62	44	106
Pasadena CoC	42	11	53	25	2	27
Riverside City & County CoC	79	10	89	64	10	74
San Bernardino City & County CoC	212	42	254	136	40	176
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	58	45	103	44	28	72
Glendale CoC	73	2	75	19	5	24
Imperial County CoC	32	6	38	40	0	40
San Luis Obispo County CoC	90	31	121	26	22	48
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:	6,186	1,936	8,122	5,774	1,564	7,338

*CoC did not report data for families in 2015 and 2016.

Appendix C

**Table 3. Comparison of the Number of Rapid Rehousing Units Available to Serve Families:
2015 and 2016**

California Continuum of Care:	2015	2016	Difference
			+/-
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	2	102	+100
San Francisco CoC	184	191	+7
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	58	78	+20
Sacramento City & County CoC	79	26	-53
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	14	32	+18
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	13	62	+49
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	146	255	+109
Marin County CoC	56	56	0
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	38	149	+111
Mendocino County CoC	0	0	0
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	8	5	-3
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	0	13	+13
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	12	22	+10
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	7	30	+23
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	4	24	+20
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	53	42	-11
Redding/Shasta County CoC	0	0	0
Napa City & County CoC	11	14	+3
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	0	64	+64
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	0	5	+5
Merced City & County CoC	0	9	+9
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	7	1	-6
Humboldt County CoC	89	98	+9
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC*	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	0	0	0
El Dorado County CoC	0	128	+128
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	21	35	+14
Tehama County CoC*	0	0	0
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	699	451	-248
San Diego City and County CoC	56	70	+14
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	244	164	-80
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	9	24	+15
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	92	164	+72
Long Beach CoC	217	260	+43
Pasadena CoC	0	4	+4
Riverside City & County CoC	29	66	+37
San Bernardino City & County CoC	91	340	+249
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	129	305	+176
Glendale CoC	0	0	0
Imperial County CoC	0	32	+32
San Luis Obispo County CoC	35	74	+39
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-
Total:	2403	3395	+992

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2016.

Appendix D

Table 4. Factors CoCs Will Use to Prioritize Households with Children During the FY 2016 Operating Year

California Continuum of Care:	Vulnerability To Victimization	Number of Previous homeless episodes	Unsheltered Homelessness	Criminal History	Bad Credit or Rental History	Head of Household Has Mental/ Physical Disabilities
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco CoC		✓	✓			✓
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Marin County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Mendocino County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	✓	✓	✓			✓
Redding/Shasta County CoC		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Napa City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC			✓			
Merced City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Humboldt County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
El Dorado County CoC	✓		✓			✓
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tehama County CoC*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Diego City and County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Long Beach CoC	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Pasadena CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
Riverside City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Bernardino City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Glendale CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Imperial County CoC	✓	✓	✓			✓
San Luis Obispo County CoC	✓					✓
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
	36	36	38	24	24	37

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2016.

Appendix E

Table 5. Strategies Used to Rapidly Rehouse Families Within 30 Days of Becoming Homeless

California Continuum of Care	Coordinated Entry Process	Housing First Approach	Maximizing CoC Funding	Maximizing ESG Funding
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC		✓		
Marin County CoC		✓	✓	✓
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mendocino County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	✓	✓		
Redding/Shasta County CoC		✓	✓	✓
Napa City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	✓	✓	✓	
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC		✓	✓	✓
Merced City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC		✓	✓	✓
Humboldt County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC	-	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC				✓
El Dorado County CoC		✓	✓	
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tehama County CoC*	✓	✓	✓	
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Diego City and County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	✓	✓	✓	
Long Beach CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pasadena CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Riverside City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Bernardino City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Glendale CoC	✓	✓	✓	

California Continuum of Care	Coordinated Entry Process	Housing First Approach	Maximizing CoC Funding	Maximizing ESG Funding
Imperial County CoC			✓	✓
San Luis Obispo County CoC	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-
Total:	32	38	37	31

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2016.

Appendix F

Table 6. Ways CoCs Ensure Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, and Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) Providers Do Not Deny Admission

California Continuum of Care:	CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation	There is a method for clients to alert CoC when involuntarily separated	CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco CoC	✓	✓	✓
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento City & County CoC	✓		✓
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	✓	✓	
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC			✓
Marin County CoC	✓	✓	
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	✓	✓	
Mendocino County CoC		✓	
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC			✓
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	✓	✓	
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	✓		✓
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	✓	✓	✓
Redding/Shasta County CoC	✓		
Napa City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	✓		✓
Merced City & County CoC	✓		✓
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	✓		
Humboldt County CoC	✓	✓	
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC			
El Dorado County CoC			
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC			✓
Tehama County CoC*	✓	✓	
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	✓	✓	✓
San Diego City and County CoC	✓		
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	✓		✓
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	✓		
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	✓		✓
Long Beach CoC	✓		
Pasadena CoC	✓		

California Continuum of Care:	CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation	There is a method for clients to alert CoC when involuntarily separated	CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year
Riverside City & County CoC	✓		
San Bernardino City & County CoC	✓		✓
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	✓		
Glendale CoC	✓	✓	✓
Imperial County CoC	✓		✓
San Luis Obispo County CoC	✓	✓	✓
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-
Total:	34	19	23

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2016.