



Nearly All Continuum of Care Funded Projects Are Implementing a Low Barrier and Housing First Approach to End Homelessness in the State of California

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

Last September, 40 California continuums of care (CoCs) submitted a 2016 Continuum of Care Program application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for funding of new and renewal projects. Within the application, HUD strongly encouraged CoCs to have new and renewal projects implement a low barrier and Housing First approach to help end homelessness, which is the focus of this brief.

Findings

As noted in the last row of table 1 below,

- 98% of all new and renewal projects submitted to HUD in 2016 for funding by the 40 California CoCs stated that they operate as low barrier projects, which means that the projects do not screen out potential project participants for permanent supportive housing¹ and rapid rehousing assistance² based on the following four barriers: 1) too little

¹ Permanent supportive housing is for persons who have a disabling condition and high levels of service needs and necessitate subsidized housing for which they pay no more than 30% of their adjusted monthly income. Services are provided on-site and off-site. The type of services depends on the needs and the will of the residents. Services may be short-term, sporadic, or ongoing indefinitely. Supportive services may include education, emergency assistance, employment, health care, mental health care, substance use counseling and treatment, and trauma care.

² Rapid re-housing assistance helps individuals and families quickly exit homelessness to permanent housing. The resources and services provided are typically tailored to the unique needs of the household. The core components

or little income; 2) active or history of substance use; 3) criminal record, with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions; and 4) history of having been or being currently a victim of domestic violence (e.g., lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, or law enforcement involvement);

In 2015, 91% of all new and renewal projects submitted to HUD for funding by the 40 California CoCs stated that they operated as low barrier projects.

As noted in the last row of table 2 below,

- 95% of all new and renewal projects submitted to HUD in 2016 for funding by the 40 California CoCs stated that they operate as Housing First projects, which means that the projects do not terminate residents from permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing assisted housing based on the following reasons: 1) Failure to participate in supportive services; 2) Failure to make progress on a service plan; 3) Loss of income or failure to improve income; 4) Fleeing domestic violence; and 5) Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project's geographic area.

In 2015, 91% of all new and renewal projects submitted to HUD for funding by the 40 California CoCs stated that they operated as Housing First projects.

Next Steps

A brief released last month noted that progress has been made towards ending chronic homelessness in California as a result of implementing a low barrier and Housing First approach.³ Earlier this month, another brief was released that noted that significant progress has been made towards ending homelessness among families in California as a result of implementing a low barrier and Housing First approach.⁴

In order to achieve 100% implementation of a low barrier approach in 2017, 20 projects would have to commit to implementing a low barrier approach. Thirty (30) of 40 California CoCs have indicated that they already have 100% of their projects implementing a low barrier approach and the remaining CoCs indicated that they have nearly all of their projects implementing a low barrier approach.

In order to achieve 100% implementation of a Housing First approach, 48 projects would have to commit to implementing a Housing First approach. Twenty-nine (29) of 40 California CoCs have

of rapid re-housing assistance include housing identification services, financial assistance for rent and move-in, and accompanying case management and supportive services.

³ "How Close Are We to Ending Chronic Homelessness in California?" (see http://www.urban-initiatives.org/images/reports_briefs/oct2016/Chronic_Homelessness_and_California_CoCs_10272016.pdf).

⁴ "How Close Are We to Ending Homelessness among Families in California and What Are the Next Steps?," (see http://www.urban-initiatives.org/images/reports_briefs/dec2016/Family_Homelessness_and_California_CoCs_Final.pdf).

indicated that they already have 100% of their projects implementing a Housing First approach and the remaining CoCs have also noted that nearly all of their projects implementing a Housing First approach.

As the two earlier briefs referenced above noted, there are several approaches and strategies that California CoCs are implementing that are helping end chronic homelessness and homelessness among families. Having all new and renewal projects implementing a low barrier and Housing First approach will likely enhance the success of other approaches and strategies and further the progress that has been made towards ending homelessness in California.

Table 1. A Comparison of CoC Projects That Implemented A Low Barrier Approach in 2015 and 2016

Continuum of Care:	Total # of Projects 2015	Projects that were Low Barrier in 2015		Total # of Projects 2016	Projects that were Low Barrier in 2016	
		#	%		#	%
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	41	41	100	36	36	100
San Francisco CoC	65	60	92	54	54	100
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	51	50	98	49	48	98
Sacramento City & County CoC	38	34	89	32	32	100
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	16	15	94	15	15	100
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	26	25	96	19	19	100
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	14	6	43	6	4	67
Marin County CoC	14	14	100	16	16	100
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	17	17	100	11	11	100
Mendocino County CoC	5	5	100	4	4	100
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	24	7	29	19	16	84
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	12	12	100	11	11	100
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	21	21	100	20	20	100
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	17	17	100	17	17	100
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	24	24	100	28	28	100
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	12	12	100	12	12	100
Redding/Shasta County CoC	4	4	100	4	4	100
Napa City & County CoC	4	4	100	6	6	100
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	16	16	100	15	15	100
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	11	9	82	10	10	100
Merced City & County CoC	7	7	100	8	8	100
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	11	9	82	6	6	100
Humboldt County CoC	10	10	100	10	10	100
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	1	1	100	0	0	0
El Dorado County CoC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	9	9	100	9	9	100
Tehama County CoC	0	0	0	1	1	100
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	213	183	86	207	198	96
San Diego City and County CoC	58	54	93	52	50	96

Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	45	44	98	37	37	100
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	15	13	87	15	14	93
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	23	21	91	21	21	100
Long Beach CoC	18	17	94	18	18	100
Pasadena CoC	13	13	100	13	13	100
Riverside City & County CoC	29	25	86	25	25	100
San Bernardino City & County CoC	21	21	100	22	22	100
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	17	17	100	18	18	100
Glendale CoC	12	10	83	11	10	91
Imperial County CoC	2	2	100	3	2	67
San Luis Obispo County CoC	6	5	83	8	8	100
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:	942	854	91	868	848	98

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2015 and 2016.

Table 2. A Comparison of CoC Projects That Implemented A Housing First Approach in 2015 and 2016

Continuum of Care:	Total # of Projects 2015	Projects that Adopted a Housing First approach in 2015		Total # of Projects 2016	Projects that Adopted a Housing First approach in 2016	
		#	%		#	%
San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	41	41	100	36	36	100
San Francisco CoC	65	60	92	54	54	100
Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC	51	50	98	49	48	98
Sacramento City & County CoC	38	34	89	32	32	100
Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC	16	15	94	15	15	100
Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	26	25	96	19	19	100
Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC	14	6	43	13	8	62
Marin County CoC	14	14	100	16	16	100
Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	17	17	100	11	10	91
Mendocino County CoC	5	5	100	4	4	100
Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	24	7	29	19	9	47
Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	12	12	100	11	11	100
Daly City/San Mateo County CoC	21	21	100	20	20	100
Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	17	17	100	17	17	100
Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC	24	24	100	28	28	100
Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties	12	12	100	12	12	100
Redding/Shasta County CoC	4	4	100	4	4	100
Napa City & County CoC	4	4	100	6	6	100
Vallejo/Solano County CoC	16	16	100	15	15	100
Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC	11	9	82	10	10	100
Merced City & County CoC	7	7	100	8	8	100
Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC	11	9	82	6	6	100
Humboldt County CoC	10	10	100	10	10	100
Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yuba City/Sutter County CoC	1	1	100	0	0	0
El Dorado County CoC	0	0	0	0	0	0

Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties CoC	9	9	100	9	9	100
Tehama County CoC	0	0	0	1	1	100
Lake County CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles City & County CoC	213	183	86	207	187	90
San Diego City and County CoC	58	54	93	52	47	90
Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC	45	44	98	37	37	100
Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC	15	13	87	15	11	73
Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	23	21	91	21	21	100
Long Beach CoC	18	17	94	18	18	100
Pasadena CoC	13	13	100	13	13	100
Riverside City & County CoC	29	25	86	25	25	100
San Bernardino City & County CoC	21	21	100	22	22	100
Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC	17	17	100	18	18	100
Glendale CoC	12	10	83	11	10	91
Imperial County CoC	2	2	100	3	2	67
San Luis Obispo County CoC	6	5	83	8	8	100
Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total:	942	854	91	875	827	95

*CoC did not submit a CoC Program application to HUD for funding in 2015 and 2016.