

HPRP Implementation Matrix – A Look at the Second Quarter
(data in italics is from Q1; updated information was not available at this time)

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
Overall structure	<i>County/cities lead w/ 8 N-P Housing Resource Centers as subgrantees; HUD, TANF and HCD funding</i>	<i>Nonprofit agency lead and 7 providers as subgrantees; HUD and HCD funding</i>	County lead and 5 providers as subgrantees; HUD funding	County lead for HCD funds; City of Salinas lead for HUD funds. 5 providers as subgrantees	County lead; 5 subgrantees; HCD funding	City/County lead; 3 HPRP providers, Legal Services, Dept of Human Assistance, and 2-1-1; HUD funding, combined with ARRA (CDBG, CSBG, TANF-ECF) and private funds	City HSA lead, 6 providers as subgrantees; HUD funding	Nonprofit agency lead and 13 providers as subgrantees; HUD and HCD funding	City/County joint lead with 6 providers as subgrantees; HUD and HCD funds
Initial Point of Contact	<i>2-1-1</i>	<i>Various service providers make referrals to 7 subgrantees</i>	Various service providers make referrals to 5 subgrantees	Various service providers make referrals to 4 subgrantees	Various service providers make referrals to 5 subgrantees	Legal Services, 2-1-1 and Dept. of Human Assistance make referrals to grantees, grantees assess at shelters	Various service providers make referrals to 6 subgrantees	Various service providers make referrals to 13 subgrantees	Various service providers make referrals to 6 subgrantees
Initial Intake	<i>2-1-1 operators do eligibility screening</i>	<i>7 subgrantees</i>	5 subgrantees	4 subgrantees	2 subgrantees do most, but all 5 have capacity	3 subgrantees, plus 2-1-1, Legal Services, and County; shelter clients assessed at shelters	6 subgrantees	12 subgrantees	6 subgrantees
Entry into HMIS	<i>Starts at 211 completed at HRCs</i>	<i>Upon provision of a service</i>	Upon provision of a service	Following full assessment	Initial Intake	Assessment – still working this out	Initial Intake if considered eligible	Centralized	During eligibility determination process

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
Full Assessment	<i>Housing Resource Center case manager</i>	<i>Case manager at subgrantee agency</i>	Staff at one of subgrantee agencies	Case manager at subgrantee agency	Case manager at subgrantee agency	Staff at subgrantee agency or CMs at shelters for shelter clients	Case manager at subgrantee agency	Case manager at subgrantee agency	Case manager at subgrantee agency
Timing of Assistance	<i>Varies</i>	<i>Not tracking this</i>	Approx. 1-2 days	Varies	1-2 weeks	Can be same-day; next day latest	Varies – minimum of 2 days	2-3 days	2 days is the target
Case Management Protocols	<i>Countywide protocols and forms/tools</i>	<i>Countywide protocols and forms/tools</i>	Common screening; case management varies provider-by-provider	Countywide protocols and forms/tools	County-wide conferencing to create common practice	No set protocols but whole team meets bi-weekly to address implementation issues, services, etc. Recently developed common Housing Stabilization Plan template and procedures.	Common screening and assessment tools and User Group Meetings	Monthly Oversight Committee meetings, ongoing trainings on forms, updates, and HUD clarifications	County-wide protocols and tools (Self-Sufficiency Matrix)
Follow-up and Reassessment	<i>Formal reassessment every 3 months, plus regular CM as needed</i>	<i>At least monthly</i>	At least monthly, often more, depending on services provided	2 case management meetings per month, 90-day reassessment	At least monthly	Formal reassessment every 3 months, plus regular CM as needed	At 3 and 9 month marks for 1-time assistance, 6 and 12 for subsidy, plus regular CM	Formal reassessment every 3 months, plus regular CM as needed	Quarterly reassessments plus regular follow-up as CM requires

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
Outcomes	<i>Housing Status</i>	<i>HUD Housing Status</i>	HUD Housing Status	Housing stability, income status, sources of income, employment status	HUD Housing Status	Housing status, time to find housing, % stably housed after 6 months, % returned to shelter system, costs per client. Plan to collect more, too.	Housing Stability tracked at each of the follow-up/assessment interactions listed above	Housing stability, income status, sources of income, employment status	Housing stability, self-sufficiency matrix scores, shelter diversion
Customized HMIS Reports	<i>Extensive customization for data collection working on report designs</i>	<i>Not at this time</i>	Canned HPRP reports for the QPRs	Working on them	Not at this time	HMIS not yet operational – will have customized report when it is.	City rolling out, should have customized HMIS reports soon	Extensive customization for data collection working on report designs	Yes
Managing Demand	<i>Tremendous demand; limiting intakes at 4 HRCs until initial demand can be met</i>	<i>Demand has been high, but eligibility criteria set by HUD limits the number served</i>	Demand is high; case management has increased to meet capacity	Demand has been high, prioritize those most in need to manage demand	Very high demand. Have hired Intake Specialist to help manage it.	Very high demand that exceeds capacity. Have modified screening to address but is still difficult.	Small drop in demand, perhaps due to tightened HUD guidance.	Demand has been high, but eligibility criteria set by HUD limits the number served	Very high, particularly in combination with CalWorks
Conducting Outreach	<i>Not at this time</i>	<i>Have a brochure for informational and self-screening purposes</i>	Initial outreach to providers and information sheets available.	Half-time outreach worker, fliers and brochures developed	Information sessions to help people understand eligibility	Have contacted certain entities: homeless service providers, CoC, County HHS, etc. Private fundraising efforts led to a lot of “outreach	Not at this time; have a brochure but it is more for informational and self-screening purposes. May ramp this up moving forward for spend-down.	Developed outreach flyers (Span/Eng), created homepage link, established a message line for inquiries, developing PSA	Not at this time

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
How Many Initial Contacts?	<i>2,194 phone screenings</i>	<i>967 contacts</i>	Not tracking this	211+ contacts	Don't have this information right now	Thru March – 1,259 assessed	Not tracking	Not tracking	They are tracking this but don't have the total for all programs at this time
How Many Intakes?	<i>560 assessments</i>	<i>144 intakes</i>	Not tracking this, only intakes for those eligible	211 intakes	95 intakes	Thru March – 1,259 assessed	Not tracking intakes until people are deemed eligible	Approximately 270-280	They are tracking this but don't have the total for all programs at this time
How Many Deemed Eligible?	<i>342 households</i>	<i>114 persons, 39 households</i>	389 persons, 172 households	156 persons/78 households served; 65 in CM, 78 households have received financial assistance so far	Approximately 193 persons/95 households	Thru March – 922 households were eligible	628 persons, 437 households	Approximately 175	1,113 persons, 503 households
How Many Households Assisted in Q2 (Jan – Mar 2010)	<i>293 households</i>	<i>114 persons, 39 households</i>	389 persons, 172 households to date	156 persons/78 households served; 65 in CM, 78 households have received financial assistance so far	Approximately 186 persons/91 households to date	508 households assisted through March	628 persons, 437 households to date	158 applicant households, 459 household members to date	1,113 persons, 503 households to date
% Families/ % Individuals	<i>52% households with children, 48% individual adults</i>	<i>Not available at this time</i>	Not available at this time.	58% individuals in CM, 42% families	Don't have this information right now	57% of 922 eligible households were families.	Between 30/70 and 40/60 breakdown between families and individuals, but skewed based on # of individuals	57-64% households w/ children, 36-43% adults only	Don't have this information right now

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
							receiving legal assistance. Families likely receiving more assistance in terms of \$ amount		
% Households Needing 3 months or less in assistance	<i>Too early to tell</i>	<i>Too early to tell. Targeting short term (3 or fewer months) for Prevention. RRH targets those needing 4+ months</i>	100%: Program targets those need very short term assistance	Too early to tell but suspect that most will need more than 3 months	Too early to tell.	Too early to tell, however 42 households have graduated as of March.	Too early to tell. Majority are requests for one-time assistance	100%	55% of assisted households are on 2 nd or 3 rd month and likely to receive more
Average Amount of Assistance	<i>Unknown; has varied widely</i>	<i>Average: \$940</i>	Varies: \$900 - \$2,500	Average: \$1,773	3 months rent – varies by household	Unknown at this time – the initial estimate was \$3,200	Amount varies by household	Varies \$628-\$2000	Varies. Rents tend to be \$800-\$1,000; utilities tend to be \$250 or so
% of Budget Spent Down in Q2	<i>Don't have yet because we have 9 grants</i>	<i>3%</i>	45%	6.3% (one grant delayed in execution)	Approximately 10%	Through March, have expended 14% of HPRP funds. Have prioritized other funding sources with shorter timeframes (TANF, CSBG), so 14% is only HPRP	Approximately 12%	18%	Approximately 7% (not all subgrantee expenditures are included)

	<i>Alameda</i>	<i>Contra Costa</i>	Marin	Monterey	Napa	Sacramento	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara
Anticipated 100% Spend-Down	<i>Under consideration</i>	<i>Estimating 2 years</i>	Estimating 2 years	Estimating 2 years	Estimating 2 years	2 years	Estimating 3 years	Estimating 1-2 years	County funds likely to be spent in Year 1. City funds will last 2-3 years
% of Budget Spent on Rapid Re-Housing versus Prevention			70% prevention, 20% RRH (10% admin and data)	56% prevention, 32% RRH. 12 admin/	Of non-admin/data funds, approximately 63% is prevention and 37% is RRH		Initially 18% RRH and 85% Prevention (not including admin/data) but may change this.	Not available at this time.	50%/50% breakdown of non-admin/data funds