

COC ADVISORY BOARD MEETING: FUNDING PRIORITIES AND GAPS ANALYSIS RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

On March 12, 2019, the CoC Advisory Board came together for a special meeting regarding funding priorities. The goal of the meeting was to provide guidance to the PRC on the following questions:

1. Which homeless subpopulations have the greatest need for resources in the Sacramento region in 2019?
2. What types of housing or services for homeless people are most needed in the Sacramento region in 2019?

Key data related to homeless populations, subpopulations, inflows and outflows, and available resources was presented by SSF, the County, and the City of Sacramento. This data provided the basis for priority discussions, small group work, and final consensus on funding priorities for 2019.

FUNDING PRIORITIES 2019

Renewal Projects: No specific subpopulation or housing/service type emerged. Renewal projects should be scored according to project performance, with consideration for population/project variation.

New Projects: Permanent Supportive Housing with Services for Seniors or Youth

CONSIDERATIONS FOR PRC

Outside of the established priorities, Advisory Board and audience members raised a variety of concerns/considerations that may inform PRC discussions/decisions:

- RRH/TH-RRH was also seen as a high need, either for all populations or for TAY/Youth
- RRH programs need time to ramp up, especially given the low inventory in the housing market; concern about recent loss of RRH funding for youth
- Need for rental subsidy opportunities (without services, or lower level services) to promote flow through PSH where possible
- Need for support to locate/braid funding streams to support homeless services/housing projects (CoC funding is restrictive)
- TAY aren't showing up in the chronically homeless population because they aren't old enough, but this doesn't mean they aren't among the highest needs; given time in the system, they will become chronically homeless

- CoC programs need to evidence a bigger commitment to cultural competency and services for specific subpopulations – LGBT, women, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF CONSIDERATIONS FOR GAPS ANALYSIS

- There is reported duplication in the inflow and outflow data. What is its impact?
- Can inflow and outflow data be broken out to show demographic statistics?
- 45% of people on the Master List are lost. What can we know about them with reasonable effort? Can we look historically? Can we ask more questions at intake about their plans? Can we engage in data sharing that might fill in some gaps?
- We need a local version of the HIC that includes all homeless-relevant units and beds, not just the ones that meet HUD's definitions, and that provides an accurate record of the RRH units/beds available at a point in time.
- Use updated youth data from 100 day challenge
- The Master List is intended to be inclusive, but does not capture the full homeless population. What can we know about what percentage of the homeless population is on the Master List?
- We need the statistics for veterans with verified status, self-report data doesn't show the full picture.
- LGBT data is not accurately reflected in the current statistics (artificially low). LGBT folks are hesitant to self-identify with service providers with whom they do not have a relationship of trust.
- Is it possible to capture why folks have become homeless for the first time, and where they lived prior to first time homelessness?
- Behavioral health resources need to be integrated into HMIS.