



YOUTH HOMELESSNESS IN CALIFORNIA

**What Impact has the Five Percent Youth
Set-Aside in the Homeless Emergency Aid
Program had so Far?**

May 2019



**JOHN
BURTON**
Advocates for Youth

www.jbaforyouth.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Background | 1 |
| Methodology | 2 |
| Findings | 3 |
| Distribution Process | 3 |
| Utilization of Funds | 5 |
| Recipient Organizations | 12 |
| Funding, Planning and Collaboration | 13 |
| Recommendations | 16 |
| Conclusion | 19 |
| Appendices | 20 |
| Appendix A: HEAP Distribution Amounts and Supplemental Information (Continuums of Care) | 20 |
| Appendix B: HEAP Distribution Amounts and Supplemental Information (Large Cities) | 22 |
| Appendix C: Acknowledgements | 23 |

BACKGROUND

In recognition of the severe housing crisis facing Californians, the State's 2018-19 budget included a one-time investment of \$500 million to address homelessness. The funding created the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP), and communities were required to designate a minimum of five percent of their HEAP funding to address youth homelessness.ⁱ

While unaccompanied individuals under age 24 comprise 9.5 percent of the homeless population in California, there has been little state policy and even less state funding to address their distinct needs.ⁱⁱ This is due in large part to the State's approach to youth homelessness, which has historically mirrored that of the federal government, prioritizing the chronically homeless and veterans. California's inclusion of at least \$25 million (5% of the state's \$500 million in HEAP funding) was a promising first step, a "down payment" on the historically overlooked, but conspicuous problem of youth homelessness.

HEAP is administered by the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council (HCFC) within the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency. By January 31, 2019, the HCFC had awarded the entire \$500 million in block grants to the 43 local Continuums of Care (CoCs) and the 11 large cities eligible for HEAP funding.ⁱⁱⁱ CoCs were awarded \$250 million of HEAP funding based on their 2017 Homeless Point-in-Time Count (PIT) ranges, and \$100 million based on their percent of California's homeless population, also according to the 2017 PIT.^{iv} Cities with populations over 330,000 (the "11 large cities") were awarded \$150 million of HEAP funding based on their general population size. *See Appendices A and B for specific distribution amounts.*

Eligible uses of HEAP funding were intentionally broad to encourage jurisdictions to fund programs that meet specific local needs that have been identified in their communities. Eligible activities under HEAP were those directly related to providing immediate emergency assistance to people experiencing homelessness or at imminent risk of homelessness, falling into three overarching categories: services, rental assistance or subsidies, and capital improvements. Administrative costs were capped at five percent of program funds, not including staff costs directly related to carrying out program activities.

CoCs and large cities applying for HEAP were required to conduct a local collaborative application process to determine how HEAP funds would be utilized in the CoC or large city. Each jurisdiction had to demonstrate coordination with stakeholders, such as homeless service and housing providers, law enforcement, cities, and homeless advocates.

In recognition of an historic lack of investment in youth homelessness, and that homeless youth have different needs than homeless adults, the California State Legislature required that a minimum of five percent of HEAP funds be used to establish or expand services meeting the

needs of homeless youth or youth at risk of homelessness. This report focuses on how communities used their youth set-aside funding, the impact of the required set-aside and future implications for addressing youth homelessness in California.

METHODOLOGY

In December 2018, John Burton Advocates for Youth (JBAY) administered an online survey to California's 43 CoCs, gathering information on local services for homeless youth and how each community has structured their HUD-mandated coordinated entry system into homeless youth services. The survey also included questions related to CoCs' intended HEAP investment for youth. A total of 30 (70%) CoCs responded to the survey.

Between March and May of 2019, JBAY conducted interviews with CoCs to gather information about the services that were funded locally by the youth set-aside, what proportion of HEAP funding was dedicated to serving homeless youth, and the experience of CoCs with implementation of the youth funding. A total of 38 CoCs provided information to JBAY, with 11 participating in an in-depth interview. JBAY also conducted in-depth interviews with seven of the 11 large cities that received HEAP funding: Bakersfield, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose and Santa Ana.

JBAY attended community engagement and planning meetings at CoCs in four jurisdictions, such as stakeholder input sessions, and post-award planning sessions in order to learn about local processes. Lastly, JBAY provided technical assistance to service providers in five communities as they navigated the process of applying for HEAP funds in their jurisdiction.

Overall, this report contains findings gathered from CoCs that were collectively awarded 95 percent of the CoC HEAP funds, and large cities that were collectively awarded 80 percent of large city HEAP funds. Together, these jurisdictions received 89 percent of the total HEAP funding. *See Appendix C for a complete list of report contributors.*

FINDINGS

Distribution Process

1. Three-quarters of the state's HEAP funding will be awarded or committed at the local level by July 1, 2019.

During the first half of year one of HEAP implementation, the majority of jurisdictions are on track with state-mandates regarding fund expenditure timelines for HEAP, which require 50 percent of the awarded funds to be contractually obligated by January 1, 2020, and 100 percent of the funds to be expended by June 30, 2021.^v

The HCFC worked expeditiously to move the funds from the State to local jurisdictions in order to enable jurisdictions to meet statutory obligations. The HCFC accepted applications on a rolling basis between September 5 and December 31, 2018, and disbursed funds within 15 days of receiving an executed agreement.

By March 1, 2019, twenty-one percent of CoCs and 43 percent of large cities that provided information for this report (24% of all jurisdictions) had finalized their HEAP awards to local service providers or committed their funds to projects. By May 1, 2019, thirty-nine percent of CoCs and 71 percent of large cities that provided information for this report (44% of all jurisdictions) had finalized their HEAP awards to local service providers or committed their funds to projects. By July 1, 2019, these figures are expected to increase to 53 percent (CoCs), 71 percent (large cities), and 56 percent (all jurisdictions).

The 56 percent of jurisdictions that project to have awarded or committed funding by July 1st collectively received 78 percent of HEAP funds statewide. The remaining 44 percent of jurisdictions that provided information for this report were still in the process of awarding funds as of May 1st and could not project their award timelines.

As illuminated in Figure 1, CoCs and large cities are administering their HEAP funding at different rates. Of the CoCs and large cities represented in this report, large cities have collectively moved through the funds distribution process more rapidly than CoCs. While this may be viewed favorably it is important to consider the factors that may contribute to a more drawn-out timeline. CoCs tended to utilize more comprehensive stakeholder input processes, and in nearly all cases utilized competitive bidding processes versus sole sourcing to administer their HEAP funding.

As noted previously, jurisdictions were required to conduct a local collaborative application process to determine how HEAP funds would be utilized in the CoC or large city, characterized by coordination with stakeholders. This may include a public meeting, regional homeless task force meeting, letters of support with signatures of endorsement, an adopted homeless plan, or

an adopted budget which includes HEAP funds. Jurisdictions reported that conducting meaningful and comprehensive stakeholder input can be a lengthy process.

Those communities that had existing infrastructure in place for managing stakeholder input—particularly those that had previously or were currently conducting a stakeholder input process for other funding or for a specific effort—were better-positioned to move through this process rapidly.

For example, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) developed recommendations for how to utilize their HEAP funding based on previous stakeholder planning for funding they received to address homelessness through local Measure H.^{vi} They shared these recommendations with stakeholders and solicited feedback in August 2018. This front-loaded process enabled them to begin soliciting proposals from service providers as early as December 2018.

Figure 1: Time Frame for Local Jurisdiction HEAP Distribution

| Date by which >80% of Jurisdictions' HEAP funds are awarded or committed | % of CoCs | % of CoC HEAP Funding | % of Large Cities | % of Large City HEAP Funding | % of all jurisdictions | % of all jurisdictions' HEAP Funding |
|--|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| By February 1, 2019 | 11% | 6% | 29% | 13% | 13% | 8% |
| By March 1, 2019 | 21% | 21% | 43% | 21% | 24% | 21% |
| By April 1, 2019 | 29% | 26% | 43% | 21% | 31% | 24% |
| By May 1, 2019 | 39% | 32% | 71% | 27% | 44% | 31% |
| Projected by July 1, 2019 | 53% | 70% | 71% | 98% | 56% | 78% |
| Funds not projected to be awarded or committed by July 1, 2019 | 47% | 30% | 29% | 2% | 44% | 22% |

Jurisdictions that did not provide information for this report are excluded from the data displayed in Figure 1.

2. HEAP funding was predominantly awarded through a comprehensive, competitive process at the local level; large cities were more likely than CoCs to sole source.

Nearly all (91%) jurisdictions utilized competitive bidding processes to award HEAP funding, including the set-aside to address youth homelessness. One (3%) out of the 38 CoCs and three

(43%) out of the seven large cities that provided information for this report, sole sourced their HEAP youth set-aside funding.

Communities' competitive bidding processes generally consisted of a comprehensive stakeholder input period, a release of a request for proposals, a review period and award announcement. This is an important finding given early concerns raised about whether a formula-funded program would foster and be compatible with a comprehensive planning process to assess local needs and determine how local funding is spent.

Representatives from jurisdictions that sole sourced their youth set-aside funding in some cases, explained that there was only one organization or agency positioned to carry out these services or execute their intended project. Sole sourced projects primarily included shelter expansions and expansion of other housing programs.

3. The technical assistance provided by the HCFC greatly assisted jurisdictions with adhering to tight timelines associated with administering their HEAP funding.

Representatives from several CoCs and large cities who were interviewed emphasized that the technical assistance provided by the HCFC was helpful during the local HEAP implementation process. Interview respondents indicated that with federal funding streams, this type of guidance is not easily available. The weekly calls hosted by the HCFC were particularly popular, enabling jurisdictions to ask questions as they arose and consult with their peers in other jurisdictions. Given how quickly HEAP rolled out, the frequency of these calls and the responsiveness of the HCFC aided jurisdictions in working through obstacles to keep pace with their implementation timelines.

Utilization of Funds

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

Seven large cities and 25 CoCs provided information about the interventions they were funding using HEAP youth set-aside dollars. As shown in Figure 2, thirty-six percent of these CoCs and 29 percent of these large cities utilized at least a portion of their HEAP youth set-aside to fund youth shelter. This is 34 percent of the jurisdictions that provided information and the most common category funded with HEAP youth set-aside dollars. With youth being among the least sheltered homeless populations (80% unsheltered), some communities viewed HEAP as a timely opportunity to address this service gap.^{vii} For example, the CoC representing Watsonville/Santa Cruz City and County which has a sizable homeless youth population—26 percent of their homeless population are youth according to the 2017 PIT Count, previously had no youth shelter.

This jurisdiction viewed HEAP as an important opportunity to build capacity in their community to meet the needs of unsheltered homeless youth.

Thirty-two percent of CoCs and 14 percent of large cities utilized at least a portion of their HEAP youth set-aside to fund transitional housing. This is 28 percent of the jurisdictions that provided information and the second-most common category funded with HEAP youth set-aside dollars, followed by Rapid Re-Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing.

As discussed in more depth later in this report, concerns were raised in some jurisdictions, however, about how to sustain funding for shelter and housing interventions after the two-year time frame when HEAP funds expire.

Thirteen CoCs had not finalized their awards or commitments at the time they were contacted and were unable to share this information. Four large cities and five CoCs did not provide any information for this report. These 22 jurisdictions are excluded from the data shared above and displayed below in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Percent of Jurisdictions Using Some Portion of Youth Funding for Each Intervention Type

| Interventions Funded with HEAP Youth Set-Aside | Percent of CoCs | Percent of Large Cities | Percent of All Jurisdictions |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Shelter | 36% | 29% | 34% |
| Transitional Housing | 32% | 14% | 28% |
| Rapid Re-Housing | 16% | 43% | 22% |
| Permanent Supportive Housing | 24% | 0% | 19% |
| Navigation Center/Access Point | 20% | 0% | 16% |
| Capital Improvements | 12% | 14% | 13% |
| Case Management | 12% | 0% | 9% |
| Host Homes | 8% | 14% | 9% |
| Prevention Services | 8% | 0% | 6% |
| Hotel Vouchers | 8% | 0% | 6% |

5. Spending on homeless youth exceeded the state-mandated five percent required by HEAP, reaching ten percent statewide.

In jurisdictions’ applications to the HCFC, CoCs and large cities collectively indicated an intent to utilize 6.8 percent (\$34 million) of HEAP funds statewide to address youth homelessness. However, according to the information jurisdictions subsequently reported to JBAY, 10.3 percent of HEAP funding (\$51.6 million) was spent to address youth homelessness statewide. See *Appendices A and B for the youth set-aside proportion by jurisdiction.*

As shown in Figure 3, forty-four percent of jurisdictions designated more than five percent of their HEAP funding to addressing youth homelessness. For the jurisdictions that were unable to provide the amount of their youth set-aside because they were not far along enough in their funds distribution process, and for the jurisdictions that did not provide information for this report, a five percent figure was utilized when calculating the figures displayed in Figure 3.

Twenty-eight percent of jurisdictions spent more than five percent and up to ten percent, seven percent of jurisdictions spent more than ten percent and up to 15 percent, and six percent of jurisdictions spent more than 15 percent and up to 20 percent. The San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing—which administered both the CoC HEAP funds and San Francisco’s large city HEAP funds—spent 60 percent of their HEAP funds on addressing youth homelessness, by far the largest proportion invested.

Some representatives interviewed indicated they would have preferred that the proportion of dedicated homeless youth funding be tied to the proportion of youth identified in the local PIT Count, even while recognizing that these numbers commonly undercount the homeless youth population. In many communities the proportion of homeless youth identified in the PIT Count far exceeds five percent.

Figure 3: HEAP Youth Set-Aside Ranges

| Percentage of HEAP Funding Designated to Address Youth Homelessness | CoCs | Large Cities | All Jurisdictions |
|---|------|--------------|-------------------|
| 5% | 58% | 45% | 56% |
| More than 5% | 42% | 55% | 44% |
| HEAP Youth Set-Aside Ranges | CoCs | Large Cities | All Jurisdictions |
| 5% | 58% | 45% | 56% |
| 5.1% to 10.0% | 23% | 45% | 28% |
| 10.1% to 15.0% | 9% | 0% | 7% |

| | | | |
|-----------------|----|----|----|
| 15.1% to 20.0% | 7% | 0% | 6% |
| 20.1% or higher | 2% | 9% | 4% |

6. CoCs with the smallest HEAP allocations were less likely to exceed the five percent minimum youth set-aside.

As shown in Figure 4, when broken into five groups of equal dollar ranges based on overall HEAP allocation size, the 17 CoCs that received \$4.0 million or less in HEAP funding were the least likely to designate more than the minimally required five percent to addressing youth homelessness. The group that was most likely to designate more than five percent to addressing youth homelessness received HEAP allocations between \$4.1 to \$8.0 million—64 percent of these CoCs exceeded the five percent minimum.

Half (50%) of the group of CoCs that received \$12.1 to \$16.0 million in HEAP funding, and half (50%) of the group that received \$16.1 to \$20.0 million exceeded the five percent minimum. Of the group of CoCs that received \$8.1 to \$12.0 million, one-third (33%) exceeded the five percent minimum. Los Angeles City and County was excluded from this analysis as their overall HEAP allocation of \$81.1 million greatly exceeded other CoCs’ allocations.

Figure 4: HEAP Allocation Size of CoCs that Designated More than Five Percent to Youth Homelessness

| HEAP Allocation Size | Number of CoCs with HEAP Allocations within Range | % of CoCs from Each Funding Range that Exceeded the 5% Youth Set-Aside |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Under \$4.0 million | 17 | 24% |
| \$4.1 to \$8.0 million | 11 | 64% |
| \$8.1 to \$12.0 million | 6 | 33% |
| \$12.1 to \$16.0 million | 4 | 50% |
| \$16.1 to \$20.0 million | 4 | 50% |
| \$20.1 million or higher | 1 (Los Angeles) | 100% |

7. Jurisdictions located in the coastal and central regions of California were more likely to exceed the five percent minimum youth set-aside.

A regional breakdown by county was utilized to evaluate how the proportion of HEAP funding designated for youth differed across the state. As shown below in Figure 5, sixty-seven percent of Coastal California jurisdictions and 58 percent of Central California jurisdictions designated

more than the minimally required five percent to addressing youth homelessness. Thirty-one percent of Northern California jurisdictions, 25 percent of jurisdictions located in California’s mountain region, and 11 percent of Southern California jurisdictions designated more than the minimally required five percent to addressing youth homelessness.

Figure 5: Proportions of Jurisdictions by Region that Exceeded the HEAP Five-Percent Youth Set-Aside^{viii}

| Region | Counties Included | % Jurisdictions that Exceeded 5% Youth Set-Aside |
|----------|--|--|
| Coastal | Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma | 67% |
| Central | Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Tulare, Ventura | 58% |
| Northern | Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba | 31% |
| Mountain | Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Inyo, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sierra, Tuolumne, Yolo | 25% |
| Southern | Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego | 11% |

8. The percentage of HEAP funding CoCs invested in addressing youth homelessness was not typically proportionate to the percentage of youth in their homeless populations.

While representatives from some CoCs reported using the percentage of youth in their overall homeless population identified by the 2017 PIT Count as a marker for how much funding to allocate to youth services, in most cases, CoCs did not match their youth investment to their youth PIT Count percentages. This finding is significant for CoCs as \$250 million of their collective HEAP funding was allocated to them by the State based on their local PIT Count ranges.

Of the 24 CoCs with youth PIT Count percentages higher than five percent, the majority (14) opted to spend the minimum five percent of HEAP funding on addressing youth homelessness, and ten opted to spend more than the minimum five percent. Seven CoCs that *did not* have youth PIT Count percentages above five percent, opted to spend more than the five percent minimum to address youth homelessness. Those CoCs, the percentage of youth in their homeless populations, and their designated youth set-aside amounts are displayed below in Figure 6.

Figure 6: CoCs with Youth PIT Counts Under Five Percent that Designated More than Five Percent to Youth Homelessness

| CoC Region | Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count | Percentage CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness |
|--|--|--|
| Mendocino County | 3% | 5.4% |
| Davis, Woodland/Yolo County | 4% | 5.2% |
| Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa Counties | 4% | 8.1% |
| Stockton/San Joaquin County | 4% | 10.0% |
| Richmond/Contra Costa County | 4% | 14.0% |
| Merced City & County | 5% | 9.3% |
| Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County | 5% | 17.6% |

While the percentage of HEAP funding that CoCs set aside for youth was not generally aligned with youth PIT Count percentages, the five CoCs with the highest youth PIT Count percentages in the state did exceed the five percent minimum in HEAP funds addressing youth homelessness. Those CoCs, the percentage of youth in their homeless populations, and their designated youth set-aside amounts are displayed below in Figure 7.

Based on in-depth interviews conducted with CoCs, decisions to exceed the five percent minimum investment on youth homelessness was in most cases a direct result of advocacy on the part of stakeholders, and political will on the part of decision-makers.

Figure 7: Regions with Highest 2017 Homeless Youth Point-In-Time Counts

| CoC Region | Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count | Percentage CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| San Jose/Santa Clara City & County | 34.2% | 10.0% |
| Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County | 26.1% | 15.0% |

| | | |
|--|-------|--|
| City & County of San Francisco | 18.6% | 45.6% (CoC & City together spent 60%) |
| Santa Rosa/Petaluma/ Sonoma County | 18.8% | 17.0% |
| Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties | 18.6% | 6.7% |

For a complete list of each CoC’s youth PIT Count percentage and their youth set-aside percentage, see Appendix A.

9. Jurisdictions that were currently or previously engaged in organized efforts to address youth homelessness were more likely to exceed the five percent minimum youth set-aside.

A small number of communities across the state were currently or had recently been engaged in organized efforts to address youth homelessness that predated the allocation of HEAP funding. These jurisdictions, in almost all cases allocated more than the five percent of HEAP funding minimally required to address youth homelessness.

In 2017, San Francisco and Santa Cruz were two of 11 communities across the country awarded funds during round one of the Youth Homeless Demonstration Program (YHDP) by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).^{ix} In 2018, San Diego County was awarded YHDP funds during round two. As part of this project, all three of these communities developed a coordinated community plan to end youth homelessness, informed by stakeholders and approved by HUD.

In Los Angeles, as mentioned previously, LAHSA had led a stakeholder input process to determine how to direct Measure H funding to address homelessness, including youth homelessness. Sacramento was one of five communities in the U.S. participating in the 2018-19 100-Day Challenge funded by HUD designed to empower and support front-line teams in pursuit of an ambitious 100-day goal to address homelessness.^x Mendocino County participated in the 2017-18 100-Day Challenge.

Five out of the six communities mentioned above, either through their CoC or large city HEAP funding, designated more than the five percent of HEAP funding minimally required to address youth homelessness.

Recipient Organizations

10. HEAP funding for homeless youth largely went to entities currently funded by local CoCs.

Based on conversations with representatives from CoCs that had awarded their funds by the time of their interview, a limited number of new youth providers were awarded funding. While in some communities HEAP implementation did bring some new youth providers to the table that were not previously engaged with the CoC, funding was more commonly awarded to service providers that had previously or were currently receiving funding from the CoC. 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.

11. Youth providers that had never received CoC funding required technical assistance to become successful HEAP applicants.

In rare cases where new providers were awarded HEAP funding, they often required technical assistance with the process. JBAY worked closely with a number of service providers applying for HEAP funds, some that were already receiving funding from their local CoC, and some that had never received funding from their CoC.

Navigating the requirements presented capacity-building challenges, including understanding the purpose of and how the Coordinated Entry System works, embracing Housing First principles and practices and identifying how their proposed project or services fit into the CoC's priorities. Offering this type of technical assistance in the future may be an effective approach to developing greater community capacity to serve the homeless youth population.

12. Select jurisdictions used HEAP to address the issue of student homelessness.

Many jurisdictions viewed HEAP's one-time funding as an opportunity to think creatively and consider piloting certain interventions they had not previously funded. Select jurisdictions used HEAP funding to address the issue of college student homelessness, which—as a result of new research^{xi} on its pervasiveness and state legislative proposals addressing the issue—has received recent attention in the media.

The Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma CoC is funding a variation of College-Focused Rapid Re-Housing, a model developed by Jovenes, Inc. in 2016 in Los Angeles, consisting of partnership and co-location with community colleges, and housing supports tailored to meet the unique needs of students. Additional jurisdictions are actively considering similar proposals.

Efforts to address homelessness among K-12 students were also included in select CoCs' plans. In Lake County, the CoC opted to divert their HEAP funding for youth to the local K-12 school

districts' McKinney Vento Liaisons, intended to be used flexibly to stabilize students experiencing homelessness. The majority of the youth in the Lake County region that were identified as experiencing homelessness were public school students already in contact with these district staff members.

In Mendocino County, the CoC awarded a portion of their 5.4 percent youth set-aside to the Mendocino County Office of Education to support homeless students and their families in identifying and accessing shelter.

Funding, Planning and Collaboration

13. There was consensus among jurisdictions interviewed that set-aside funding for youth is necessary.

Representatives from 100 percent of the CoCs and large cities interviewed indicated that although youth ages 18 to 24 could technically be served with adult HEAP funding, a youth set-aside was still essential. Representatives noted the stark differences between the homeless youth population and homeless adult population, including the prevalence of family disruption as a leading factor in youth homelessness and the need for more social supports for youth exiting homelessness. These differences necessitate distinct housing and supportive service options. Representatives also noted the best practice of establishing separate shelters for youth, given their heightened vulnerability. Some communities have also opted to establish separate Coordinated Entry Systems for youth or have youth-specific coordinated entry access points.

Although less pronounced in communities with substantial existing infrastructure for serving homeless youth, the State requiring that a minimum amount be designated to address youth homelessness developed capacity in the CoC or large city, and the larger community of service providers to meet the needs of this target population. Representatives from eight (44%) of the 18 jurisdictions interviewed indicated that the HEAP youth set-aside brought new youth providers to the table that had never before received their funding. These new providers attended community input sessions, and in some cases, applied for funding.

For example, the CoC in Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County awarded funds to a youth provider that had never previously received CoC funds, and historically served current and former foster youth. HEAP funding allowed this provider to expand their target population and address an unmet need in their community. Other CoCs and large cities indicated that while the process did not bring any new youth providers to the table, it did further engage existing youth providers, or foster new collaboration between providers that had not previously worked in partnership.

Concerns were raised that without a youth set-aside, the youth population's needs would not be adequately addressed, and that the youth set-aside was an important tool to counter-balance the

historic federal prioritization of homelessness among chronically homeless adults and veterans. A representative from one CoC stated, *“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.”* Other CoCs’ concerns included the increasingly challenging housing market, and the discrimination many young adults face on the private market. One CoC’s representative noted that youth were the fastest growing homeless subpopulation in their community and required significant attention.

14. CoCs are an effective entity to distribute and coordinate funding for homeless youth; city departments have varying capacities to do so.

One-hundred percent of the CoCs interviewed indicated that they felt it was “in their wheelhouse” to administer funding to address youth homelessness. Representatives from CoCs described having a broad, regional perspective on the needs of homeless youth and leading comprehensive stakeholder input processes that drew a diverse range of stakeholders and content experts to the table.

Requiring coordination with stakeholders naturally elevated the issue of youth homelessness in certain communities, and many respondents indicated that this planning process left their community better-equipped to serve homeless youth. Particularly in communities that felt they lacked infrastructure to serve this population, it was an opportunity to engage in community-wide discussion about the needs of homeless youth in their community.

While representatives from the large cities predominantly felt that having HEAP funding allocated specifically to address city-identified priorities was greatly beneficial, some felt that the actual administration of those funds was better-suited for the local CoC, which has historically administered homelessness funding, has existing infrastructure and pre-existing partnerships, and has an understanding of the regional landscape and various populations’ needs. In some cases, these large cities worked very closely with their local CoC during the HEAP implementation process, or even charged the local CoC with administering the actual large city HEAP funds.

However, other cities—particularly those with departments charged with addressing homelessness—felt well-equipped to administer HEAP funding. In some cases these departments coordinated with the local CoC, and in some cases the two entities used entirely independent processes to administer their HEAP funding.

15. HEAP highlighted the lack of adequate funding for homeless youth.

All 18 jurisdictions (100%) that participated in in-depth interviews noted that although the one-time state investment was a great resource in their community, the implementation process highlighted the dire need for ongoing funding to address youth homelessness.

Interview respondents noted that the one-time funding encouraged creativity and an opportunity to “try new things.” Some framed it as an opportunity to pilot interventions that they hope to secure ongoing funding to support, should they prove effective. Respondents also indicated that they appreciated how quickly the funding became available, acknowledging that it was intended to address emergency needs.

However, one of the great challenges of the funding being one-time was the difficulty of funding actual housing interventions which could continue beyond the life of the two-year program. The one-time funding was intended to address the emergency, however, as stated by one CoC representative, *“for youth, the emergency is that there is no housing in this market.”* Without ongoing funding for housing, communities must resort to emergency shelter, which is not intended to be a long-term intervention and does little to truly solve the crisis.

The time limitations of the funding also impacted which service providers had the capacity to provide services under HEAP. Smaller organizations with less infrastructure and funding were less likely to be able to ramp up quickly, meet their contractual obligations, then sustain their services—if needed—with other funding sources. This placed constraints on some jurisdictions that lacked provider capacity to implement HEAP.

16. HEAP highlighted the need to improve the Point-In-Time Count for homeless youth.

Representatives from some jurisdictions observed an increased focus on the Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count as a result of the HEAP stakeholder input process occurring during a similar timeframe. While the PIT Count provides an important tool for estimating homelessness, it is widely acknowledged that the youth PIT Count is a work in progress. Homeless youth were not included in the annual PIT Count required by HUD until 2015 and when they were included, it was well understood that the methodology resulted in a considerable “undercount.”

Understanding that the PIT Count is the tool that will be used to determine future funding levels, these jurisdictions indicated that engaging in stakeholder discussion about the pervasiveness of youth homelessness in their communities while gearing up for the PIT Count highlighted the ongoing need for improvement of the biannual process. Some representatives felt that if the PIT Count provided a more accurate snapshot of youth homelessness, this would have equipped them with stronger evidence to communicate the need for increased investment in youth homelessness.

A representative from the San Jose/Santa Clara City and County CoC explained that their decision to spend ten percent of their HEAP funding on youth was not directly tied to their high youth PIT Count percentage of 34 percent. They do not believe the youth PIT Count accurately reflects the full picture of youth homelessness in their county, so they rely on additional data sources and community input to make funding decisions. For their community, strong advocacy

on behalf of providers and acknowledgement of their community's youth homelessness crisis was key to their decision to exceed the five percent HEAP youth set-aside minimum.

Conversely, representatives from some jurisdictions indicated that although not a perfect snapshot of youth homelessness, their youth PIT Count percentages did contribute to the decision to allocate more than the five percent minimum toward addressing youth homelessness, and that concurrently participating in the youth PIT Count sparked more discussion among stakeholders regarding the needs of local homeless youth.

A representative from the Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC highlighted the importance of an accurate youth PIT Count, explaining that because their community conducts an annual, very thorough youth PIT Count, targeting hot spots and using a refined methodology, their youth PIT Count is not believed to be artificially low as suspected in most communities across the state. For this reason, their community opted to nearly match their youth HEAP spending (17%) to their youth PIT Count percentage (19%).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Any funding to address homelessness should include a youth set-aside.

All CoCs and large cities interviewed indicated that although youth ages 18 to 24 could technically be served with adult HEAP funding, a youth set-aside was still needed to ensure adequate funding is allocated to address youth homelessness. Of the 54 jurisdictions that receiving HEAP funding from the State, twenty-four (44%) spent more than the required minimum five percent on addressing youth homelessness. In total, 10.3 percent of HEAP funding statewide was invested in addressing youth homelessness.

While close to half of jurisdictions opted to exceed the minimum five percent set-aside on youth, representatives interviewed expressed considerable concern that given federal funding priorities which are focused on chronic homelessness among adults, statewide, without a youth set-aside, youth needs will dissolve among the many priorities for adult funding.

Representatives from jurisdictions that exceeded the five percent youth set-aside explained that local advocacy efforts and political will on behalf of local leadership were key to their increased investment. Likewise, many jurisdictions that did not exceed the five percent youth set-aside reportedly lacked the political will on behalf of local leadership or did not have a strong enough youth advocacy base to draw support for the cause.

The minimum youth set-aside in future one-time funding to address homelessness should be set at 20 percent.

Statewide, unaccompanied homeless youth up to age 24 account for 9.5 percent of the overall homeless population.^{xii} Any future funding to address homelessness should require a minimum of 20 percent of funding to be directed toward addressing youth homelessness based on two factors:

- 1) As a result of historic lack of investment in homeless youth, the State has significant catching up to do. In many communities, HEAP highlighted youth homelessness as a glaring problem that has been largely ignored by the Federal Government.
- 2) Acknowledging that the youth PIT Count methodology requires improvement and produces an undercount resulting in artificially lower numbers of homeless youth, California should be investing more than the percentage established by the PIT Count.

As indicated by the 24 jurisdictions that exceeded the minimally required five percent HEAP investment, youth homelessness is more than a five percent problem, and requires significant investment and commitment to begin to solve.

Reducing youth homelessness in California requires an ongoing funding commitment.

One-hundred percent of the representatives from CoCs and large cities that participated in in-depth interviews, expressed the need for ongoing funding to address youth homelessness. Despite the challenges of funding housing interventions with one-time funding, the majority of the HEAP youth set-aside funding was put toward shelter, followed by transitional housing, Rapid Re-Housing, and Permanent Supportive Housing. This is an indication that the most pressing need in California among homeless youth is actual housing.

While one-time funding motivates creativity and provides the opportunity to pilot new approaches that can quickly ramp up then wind down, ongoing funding is required to expand housing capacity coupled with the services required to reduce youth homelessness in our state.

The youth Point-in-Time Count process must be refined to produce a more accurate snapshot of youth homelessness at the local level.

There was considerable discussion among representatives from CoCs that improving the youth PIT Count is necessary in order to more accurately estimate the pervasiveness of youth homelessness in local communities and statewide. Since youth were included in the PIT Count starting in 2015, communities across the state have made progress at the local level on refining their youth PIT Count methodology and recruiting volunteers to support these efforts.

Understanding that the PIT Count is the tool that will be used to determine future funding levels for addressing homelessness, improving the methodology of the youth PIT Count to avoid undercounts leading to artificially low numbers of homeless youth should be prioritized as a strategy to address youth homelessness.

Continuums of Care are well-positioned to administer youth homelessness funding locally.

The purpose and role of a CoC is to coordinate housing and service providers on a local level, contributing to a more structural and strategic approach to both housing and providing services. CoCs are also tasked with tracking and monitoring the homeless community in their area by engaging in the biannual Homeless PIT Count. This enables CoCs to manage and coordinate a system where resources are directed where most needed.

CoCs are made up of a broad array of key stakeholders, which may include nonprofit homelessness assistance providers, local governmental agencies, advocates, public housing agencies, school districts, social services providers, mental health agencies, affordable housing developers, faith-based organizations, businesses, hospitals, universities, law enforcement and homeless or formerly homeless individuals. The purpose of requiring stakeholder representation from a wide range of entities across the CoC's communities is to ensure the right people are at the table to develop and implement a range of housing and services that will further the local efforts to end homelessness.

It is for these reasons that 100 percent of the CoCs interviewed indicated they felt it was "in their wheelhouse" to administer funding to address youth homelessness, and that CoCs were capable of coordinating the stakeholder input necessary to direct HEAP funding to meet local needs. To ensure a coordinated and well-informed approach, any future funding to address youth homelessness should be administered by the CoC, as opposed to a single local government agency.

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. Jurisdictions reported that although it was challenging administering HEAP funding in such a short time-frame, the technical assistance provided by the HCFC made this possible. Any future state funding to address homelessness should build in funding to support the provision of technical assistance to local jurisdictions.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research and information that informed this report and recommendations, the most pressing piece of evidence was the need for funding to specifically address youth homelessness in California. CoCs, large cities, and providers alike reached consensus that any funding to address homelessness in our state must include funding specifically set aside for the youth population, who have risk factors, needs and protective factors that are distinct from the adult homeless population.

Addressing youth homelessness is widely viewed as a prevention strategy—up to 50 percent of chronically homeless adults are estimated to have been homeless as youth.^{xiii} Given the importance of addressing homelessness among the youth population, in order to ensure this population is not pushed aside as communities access federal funding prioritizing the chronically homeless and veterans, a youth set-aside is vital to addressing our state’s overall homelessness crisis.

Another key point of consensus among those interviewed was the need for ongoing funding versus one-time funding. One way of describing the perspective of many jurisdictions was that HEAP was a “down payment” of sorts on youth homelessness. The one-time funding motivated a planning process to address youth homelessness which uncovered in some cases, even greater need than was anticipated.

There was great consensus that the next step for our state is to invest in long-term strategies to address youth homelessness because as stated by many interview respondents, *“homelessness doesn’t have a one-time fix.”* A representative from one CoC stated *“One-time money is better than no money, but California has to make up for decades of under-investing in addressing the housing needs of its population.”*

APPENDIX A
HEAP Distribution Amounts and Supplemental Information: Continuums of Care

| Continuum of Care (CoC) | Allocation Amount | Date Application Submitted to State | Date of Award to CoC | Date of Disbursement to CoC | Percent CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness (this may be a different amount than what was indicated in their application to the State) | Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties | \$590,111.56 | 12/20/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 1/30/2019 | 5.0% | 4.1% |
| Bakersfield/Kern County | \$2,603,226.14 | 9/24/2018 | 9/28/2018 | 10/22/2018 | 5.0% | 6.5% |
| Chico, Paradise/Butte County | \$4,889,944.74 | 11/30/2018 | 12/12/2018 | 1/24/2019 | 6.2% | 5.7% |
| Colusa, Glen, Trinity Counties | \$631,071.36 | 11/28/2018 | 12/14/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 5.0%** | 4.0% |
| Daly City/San Mateo | \$4,933,138.71 | 12/26/2018 | 1/25/2018 | 4/3/2019 | 5.0% | 2.4% |
| Davis, Woodland/Yolo County | \$1,341,828.15 | 12/19/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 2/19/2019 | 5.2% | 3.9% |
| El Dorado County | \$1,448,323.63 | 12/14/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 2/19/2019 | 5.0%** | 5.0% |
| Fresno City & County/Madera County | \$9,501,362.84 | 12/7/2001 | 12/28/2018 | 3/6/2019 | 5.0% | 5.0% |
| Glendale | \$625,113.57 | 10/4/2018 | 10/29/2018 | 1/4/2019 | 5.0% | 0.6% |
| Humboldt County | \$2,565,245.24 | 12/3/2018 | 12/19/2018 | 2/6/2019 | 18.4% | 10.8% |
| Imperial County | \$4,859,411.07 | 11/27/2018 | 1/3/2019 | 3/6/2019 | 5.0% | 2.1% |
| Lake County | \$1,298,634.18 | 12/27/2018 | 1/30/2019 | 2/19/2019 | 5.0%** | 4.0% |
| Long Beach | \$9,387,420.13 | 10/23/2018 | 11/8/2018 | 12/21/2018 | 5.0% | 3.4% |
| Los Angeles City & County | \$81,099,807.86 | 11/19/2018 | 12/18/2018 | 1/11/2019 | 9.0% | 9.4% |
| Marin County | \$4,831,856.30 | 12/21/2018 | 1/30/2019 | 3/1/2019 | 5.0% | 11.4% |
| Mendocino County | \$4,921,967.86 | 12/19/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 3/13/2019 | 5.4% | 3.4% |
| Merced City & County | \$1,338,104.53 | 11/20/2018 | 12/18/2018 | 1/22/2019 | 9.3% | 5.1% |
| Napa City & County | \$1,234,587.94 | 12/20/2018 | 1/18/2019 | 3/6/2019 | 5.0% | 7.3% |
| Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County | \$16,192,049.33 | 12/19/2018 | 1/10/2019 | 2/21/2019 | 5.0% | 17.6% |
| Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County | \$4,857,921.63 | 11/15/2018 | 12/12/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 17.6% | 5.0% |
| Pasadena | \$1,428,216.09 | 12/17/2018 | 1/15/2019 | 3/1/2019 | 5.0% | 6.3% |
| Redding/Shasta, Siskiyou, Lassen Plumas, Del Norte, Modoc, Sierra Counties | \$2,695,571.87 | 12/27/2018 | 1/18/2019 | 4/3/2019 | 5.0%** | 7.3% |
| Richmond/Contra Costa County | \$7,196,770.88 | 12/10/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 2/21/2019 | 14.0% | 3.8% |
| Riverside City & County | \$9,791,805.06 | 12/27/2018 | 1/25/2019 | 3/26/2019 | 5.0% | 10.7% |

| Continuum of Care (CoC) | Allocation Amount | Date Application Submitted to State | Date of Award to CoC | Date of Disbursement to CoC | Percent CoC Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness (this may be a different amount than what was indicated in their application to the State) | Percentage of Youth in Homeless Population Identified in 2017 Homeless PIT Count |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Roseville, Rocklin/Placer, Nevada Counties | \$2,729,084.44 | 12/13/2018 | 12/28/2018 | 1/24/2019 | 5.0% | 6.7% |
| Sacramento City & County | \$12,729,412.12 | 12/3/2018 | 1/3/2019 | 2/13/2019 | 5.0% | 5.6% |
| Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties | \$12,505,250.30 | 12/12/2018 | 12/28/2018 | 1/30/2019 | 6.7% | 18.6% |
| San Bernardino City & County | \$9,389,654.30 | 12/19/2018 | 1/9/2019 | 2/19/2019 | 5.0%** | 8.9% |
| San Diego City & County | \$18,821,668.48 | 11/1/2018 | 12/21/2018 | 1/11/2019 | 5.0%* | 12.7% |
| San Francisco City & County | \$17,107,314.68 | 10/12/2018 | 10/29/2018 | 11/20/2018 | 45.6% (CoC & City together spent 60%) | 18.6% |
| San Jose/Santa Clara City & County | \$17,506,486.54 | 12/20/2018 | 1/16/2019 | 2/19/2019 | 10.0% | 34.2% |
| San Luis Obispo County | \$4,837,814.09 | 12/21/2018 | 1/16/2019 | 3/1/2019 | 5.0% | 17.4% |
| Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County | \$15,568,715.65 | 12/4/2018 | 12/20/2018 | 1/18/2019 | 5.0% | 2.7% |
| Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County | \$9,385,185.96 | 12/10/2018 | 12/21/2018 | 1/18/2019 | 9.6% | 7.8% |
| Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County | \$12,111,291.50 | 12/18/2018 | 1/3/2019 | 1/24/2019 | 17.0% | 18.8% |
| Stockton/San Joaquin County | \$7,148,363.84 | 12/18/2018 | 1/16/2019 | 3/1/2019 | 10.0% | 4.3% |
| Tehama County | \$592,345.73 | 11/15/2018 | 12/12/2018 | 12/28/2018 | 5.0% | 1.6% |
| Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Mariposa Counties | \$1,273,313.57 | 12/10/2018 | 12/18/2018 | 1/11/2019 | 8.1% | 3.5% |
| Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County | \$7,236,985.95 | 12/21/2018 | 1/10/2019 | 2/5/2019 | 13.8% | 6.2% |
| Vallejo/Solano County | \$4,917,499.52 | 12/21/2018 | 1/25/2019 | 3/6/2019 | 13.6% | 17.0% |
| Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties | \$2,635,249.26 | 9/25/2018 | 10/26/2018 | 11/20/2018 | 5.0% | 6.6% |
| Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County | \$9,674,883.45 | 12/12/2018 | 12/28/2018 | 1/30/2019 | 15.0% | 26.1% |
| Yuba City & County/Sutter County | \$2,565,989.96 | 11/21/2018 | 12/18/2018 | 1/10/2019 | 5.0%** | 4.2% |

*These CoCs could not provide the final proportion allocated to youth because the percentage was not pretermineed and their awards were not finalized as of the release of this report so the figure of five percent was used for the purposes of calculating statewide spending on youth services.

**These CoCs did not provide information to JBAY so the figure of five percent was used for the purposes of calculating statewide spending on youth services.

APPENDIX B

HEAP Distribution Amounts and Supplemental Information: Large Cities

| Large City | Allocation Amount | Date Application Submitted to State | Date of Award to City | Date of Disbursement to City | Percent City Reported Spending to Address Youth Homelessness (this may be a different amount than what was indicated in their application to the State) |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Bakersfield | \$1,247,753.53 | 11/20/2018 | 12/12/2018 | 1/4/2019 | 5.4% |
| Long Beach | \$2,869,833.12 | 9/19/2018 | 9/28/2018 | 12/20/2018 | 5.0% |
| Fresno | \$3,105,519.90 | 12/18/2018 | 12/20/2018 | 2/5/2019 | 9.7% |
| Santa Ana | \$3,690,885.84 | 9/28/2018 | 10/26/2018 | 12/14/2018 | 5.0% |
| Anaheim | \$3,690,885.84 | 10/24/2018 | 11/8/2018 | 12/28/2018 | 5.0%** |
| Sacramento | \$5,645,699.61 | 12/4/2018 | 12/20/2018 | 1/11/2019 | 8.0% |
| Oakland | \$8,671,116.82 | 9/5/2018 | 9/28/2018 | 10/31/2018 | 5.0%** |
| San Francisco | \$10,564,313.22 | 10/12/2018 | 10/29/2018 | 11/20/2018 | 85.2% (City & CoC together spent 60%) |
| San Jose | \$11,389,987.16 | 12/13/2018 | 12/27/2018 | 1/24/2019 | 8.8% |
| San Diego | \$14,110,397.95 | 9/5/2018 | 9/28/2018 | 1/18/2019 | 5.0%** |
| Los Angeles | \$85,013,607.00 | 9/12/2018 | 9/28/2018 | 11/11/2018 | 5.8% |

*These cities could not provide the final proportion allocated to youth because the percentage was not pretermined and their awards were not finalized as of the release of this report, so the figure of five percent was used for the purposes of calculating statewide spending on youth services.

**These cities did not provide information to JBAY so the figure of five percent was used for the purposes of calculating statewide spending on youth services.

APPENDIX C - Acknowledgements

John Burton Advocates for Youth would like to thank the individuals from the Continuums of Care, city departments, and service provider organizations who shared information integral to the development of this report. We would also like to acknowledge the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council for the information and assistance they provided, and for administering the Homeless Emergency Aid Program.

CoCs & Large Cities that Provided Information for Report

| Region | Organization or Agency |
|--|--|
| Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties | Inyo/Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) |
| Bakersfield/Kern County | Kern County Homeless Collaborative* |
| Daly City/San Mateo County | San Mateo County Human Services Agency |
| Davis, Woodland/Yolo County | Yolo County Homeless and Poverty Action Coalition (HPAC) |
| Fresno City & County/Madera County | Fresno Madera Continuum of Care* |
| Glendale | Glendale Continuum of Care |
| Humboldt County | Humboldt Housing and Homeless Coalition |
| Imperial County | Imperial Valley Continuum of Care |
| Lake County | Lake County Continuum of Care |
| Long Beach | Long Beach Department of Health & Human Services* |
| Los Angeles City & County | Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority* |
| Marin County | Marin Health and Human Services |
| Mendocino County | Mendocino County Homeless Services Continuum of Care |
| Merced City & County | Merced City and County Continuum of Care* |
| Napa City & County | Napa Continuum of Care |
| Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County | EveryOne Home* |
| Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County | Ventura County Continuum of Care Alliance |
| Pasadena | Pasadena Partnership |
| Redding/Shasta, Siskiyou, Lassen, Plumas, Del Norte, Modoc & Sierra Counties | Central Sierra Continuum of Care |
| Richmond/Contra Costa County | Contra Costa Continuum of Care |
| Riverside City & County | County of Riverside Continuum of Care |

YOUTH HOMELESSNESS IN CALIFORNIA: WHAT IMPACT HAS THE 5% YOUTH SET-ASIDE IN HEAP HAD SO FAR?

| | |
|---|---|
| Roseville, Rocklin, Placer & Nevada Counties | Homeless Resource Council of the Sierras |
| Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties | Coalition of Homeless Service Providers Monterey |
| San Diego City & County | Regional Task Force on the Homeless* |
| San Francisco City & County | San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing* |
| San Jose/Santa Clara City & County | Office of Supportive Housing* |
| San Luis Obispo County | San Luis Obispo Homeless Services Oversight Council |
| Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County | Orange County Homeless, Housing & Community Development* |
| Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County | Santa Barbara Continuum of Care |
| Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County | Sonoma County Community Development Commission* |
| Stockton/San Joaquin County | San Joaquin Continuum of Care |
| Tehama County | Tehama County Continuum of Care |
| Tuolumne/Calaveras/Amador/Mariposa Counties | Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency |
| Turlock, Modesto/Stanislaus County | Stanislaus Regional Housing Authority |
| Vallejo/Solano County | Housing First Solano |
| Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties | Kings/ Tulare Homeless Alliance |
| Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County | Homeless Action Partnership |
| Large City | Agency or Department |
| Bakersfield | Community Development Department* |
| Long Beach | Long Beach Department of Health & Human Services* |
| Los Angeles | Office of the City Administrative Officer* |
| Sacramento | Homeless Services Division, Office of the City Manager* |
| San Francisco | San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing* |
| San Jose | Department of Housing* |
| Santa Ana | City of Santa Ana Community Development Agency* |

*Participated in an in-depth interview

Observation of Local HEAP Application Process: Service Providers Consulted

| Region | Service Provider Organization |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Imperial County | Imperial Valley Regional Occupational Program |
| Los Angeles City & County | Jovenes, Inc. |
| Stockton/San Joaquin County | Lutheran Social Services |
| San Diego County | South Bay Community Services |
| Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County | TLC Child & Family Services |

Communities Where JBAY Attended Meetings Related to Addressing Youth Homelessness

| Region | Organization or Agency |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Sacramento | Sacramento Steps Forward |
| San Diego County | Regional Task Force on the Homeless |
| San Francisco City & County | San Francisco Department of Homelessness & Supportive Housing |
| Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County | Sonoma County Community Development Commission |

ⁱ The Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) was established by Senate Bill 850 (2018).

http://leginfo.ca.gov/legislator/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB850. There is no definition of “at risk of homelessness” included or referenced in Senate Bill 850. The definition of homelessness referenced in SB 850 includes homeless youth. Under this definition, homelessness means:

(3) Unaccompanied youth under 25 years of age, or families with children and youth, who do not otherwise qualify as homeless under this definition, but who:

(i) Are defined as homeless under section 387 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5732a), section 637 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9832), section 41403 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e-2), section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h)), section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012), section 17(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(b)), or section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a);

(ii) Have not had a lease, ownership interest, or occupancy agreement in permanent housing at any time during the 60 days immediately preceding the date of application for homeless assistance;

(iii) Have experienced persistent instability as measured by two moves or more during the 60-day period immediately preceding the date of applying for homeless assistance; and

(iv) Can be expected to continue in such status for an extended period of time because of chronic disabilities; chronic physical health or mental health conditions; substance addiction; histories of domestic violence or childhood abuse (including neglect); the presence of a child or youth with a disability; or two or more barriers to employment, which include the lack of a high school degree or General Education Development (GED), illiteracy, low English proficiency, a history of incarceration or detention for criminal activity, and a history of unstable employment

ⁱⁱ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2018 CoC Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Report – California (2018). https://files.hudexchange.info/reports/published/CoC_PopSub_State_CA_2018.pdf

ⁱⁱⁱ A Continuum of Care (CoC) is a local government agency or nonprofit that has previously administered federal Department of Housing and Urban Development Continuum of Care funds.

^{iv} The Point-in-Time (PIT) count is a count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a single night in January. HUD requires that Continuums of Care (CoCs) conduct an annual count of homeless persons who are sheltered in emergency shelter, transitional housing, and Safe Havens on a single night. CoCs also must conduct a count of unsheltered homeless persons every other year (odd numbered years). Each count is planned, coordinated, and carried out locally.

^v California Government Code Section 50215(b)(1)

^{vi} Measure H was approved by Los Angeles County voters in March 2017, which increased the County’s sales tax by ¼ percent to provide an ongoing revenue stream—an estimated \$355 million per year for ten years—to fund services, rental subsidies and housing. It is designed to fund a comprehensive regional approach encompassing 21 interconnected strategies in six areas to combat homelessness. More information about these strategies can be found here: <http://homeless.lacounty.gov/history/>

^{vii} In California, unaccompanied youth up to age 24 have one of the highest proportions of unsheltered individuals (80%), only third to chronically homeless adults (84%) and domestic violence victims (81%). See HUD’s 2018 CoC Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Report – California, available here:

https://files.hudexchange.info/reports/published/CoC_PopSub_State_CA_2018.pdf

^{viii} The regional breakdown used in this report was derived from the five-region breakdown of the County Welfare Directors Association of California found in “*The Regions of California: Recommended Grouping of the Counties for Regional Studies*” by the California Department of Social Services (2002). View page 3 of this document for more information: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/res/pdf/multireports/RegionsofCalifornia.pdf>

^{ix} The Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP), administered by HUD, supports communities across the U.S. in the development and implementation of a coordinated community approach to preventing and ending

youth homelessness, and sharing that experience with and mobilizing communities around the country toward the same end. More information about YHDP is available here: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/yhdp/>
x 100-Day Challenges are part of HUD's national toolkit to identify and execute innovative practices to end youth and young adult homelessness. Since July 2017, multiple cohorts of communities have engaged in challenges to accelerate efforts to prevent and end youth homelessness through intense collaboration, innovation, and execution of ambitious local goals.

^{xi} An April 2019 report by the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the Hope Center for College, Community and Justice found that nearly one in five (19%) of California Community College students were homeless during the previous year. The report is available at: https://hope4college.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/HOPE_realcollege_National_report_digital.pdf

^{xii} U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2018 CoC Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Report – California (2018). https://files.hudexchange.info/reports/published/CoC_PopSub_State_CA_2018.pdf

^{xiii} United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. Ending Youth Homelessness: Using the Preliminary Intervention Model in your Community's Response (2014).