

## Memorandum

To: Regional Steering Committee on Housing and Homelessness

From: HomeBase

Date: July 23, 2010

Re: Bay Area HPRP Program Implementation and Operations Through June 2010

---

### **Introduction**

Since the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) funding was announced in the spring of 2009, the Regional Steering Committee has dedicated a portion of each quarterly meeting to discussing how the program has rolled out in the Greater Bay Area. This memo picks up where the April 16, 2010 meeting left off, focusing on program operations and taking a first glance at early program outcomes. We have gathered information from eleven counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma) in the attached matrix to illustrate some of the distinctions and commonalities among HPRP programs throughout the region.

### **Key Challenges/Opportunities Presented by HPRP**

As discussed at prior RSC meetings, the introduction of the HPRP program has presented a number of new opportunities, along with some new challenges, including: effectively ending and preventing homelessness among the households served, and demonstrating that success; building the necessary infrastructure that can support prevention services beyond the term of the Stimulus Bill; and manage the day-to-day complexities of getting HPRP up and running, incorporating HUD regulations, and addressing new challenges that arise.

As each community continues to operate its HPRP program(s), we hope that the Regional Steering Committee can provide useful information to share among jurisdictions, convene providers from throughout the region to highlight common challenges and successes, and keep providers focused on all of these overarching opportunities as we build and expand upon our regional prevention systems.

### **HPRP Matrix: The Latest Quarterly Data (through June 2010)**

The attached matrix includes information gathered from eleven Northern California counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma. The matrix should be understood as the latest iteration of a living document that is likely to expand and change as time goes on. This quarter, we clarified a few of the questions and added a few new rows and, as always, some of the numbers are estimates and/or subject to change. We expect to fill in blanks as we go along in order to provide information that is most useful to providers and agencies directly involved in HPRP implementation, add communities and/or additional data categories, and provide any other updates or additions as requested.

When the RSC examined the data from the previous quarters for which data was collected, a number of trends were revealed. In the first quarter examined (October 1, 2009 – December 31, 2009), many of the jurisdictions had structured their HPRP programs differently, and virtually all were facing demand even greater than they anticipated. The types of assistance varied across jurisdictions, both in terms of length of time for which assistance was needed, as well as the amounts and types of assistance requested. There was significant demand for assistance among both individuals and larger households across the jurisdictions and, in many cases, the breakdown of household type was more of an indication of how the funds were being targeted. In general, most jurisdictions were focused intently on program implementation and ironing out any problems that presented themselves at the outset.

For the next quarter (January 1, 2010 – March 31, 2010), a few new issues arose from the information provided by the HPRP providers and grantees. Information released by HUD after program launch required some jurisdictions to modify intake and screening to ensure compliance with eligibility. Demand remained high and few of the communities were conducting outreach. Although all of the programs are tracking Housing Stability as required by HUD, others have incorporated other outcomes, such as employment and income (Monterey), self-sufficiency indicators (Santa Clara), shelter diversion (Sacramento and Santa Clara), and others. As many clients are still enrolled – or very recently graduated – it was still early to assess long-term housing stability or other key indicators of program success.

The most recent quarter (April 1, 2010 – June 30, 2010) yields the following information:

- **Spend-down may be an issue for some communities.** HPRP regulations require that, by the end of Year 2, 60% of grant funds be expended and that 100% of funds be expended by the end of Year 3. While some communities (like Marin) have reported that their funds will be spent before those milestones, others report that eligibility criteria have made it challenging to serve all of the households that they would like to serve. Some communities, like Santa Clara County, have reported that they prioritized TANF ECF spending, which led to slightly slower HPRP spending rates in Year 1.
- **Many households need assistance beyond the initial term granted.** Although a number of counties provide mostly one-time assistance, some of those communities offering multiple months' of assistance (such as Napa, Sonoma, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara) report that some of the assisted households have required extensions past their initial term of assistance. Others, like San Francisco, report that some households have received assistance more than once.
- **More funds are being spent on Prevention than on Rapid Re-Housing.** At the outset of the program, most communities were not sure how much funding to allocate to Prevention (for at-risk households) versus to Rapid Re-housing (for homeless households). Virtually all of the communities reporting indicated using more funds for Prevention (the only exception being the Salinas grant in Monterey County).

**Questions for Discussion**

- Are we able to assess outcomes yet? It may be too early to evaluate for households receiving several months' of assistance, but what do we know about those households who received one-time assistance?
- Are there transition issues your community is thinking about with respect to HEARTH implementation?
- Other information to add to the matrix?

*For more information, please contact Stacey Murphy, Policy Analyst:  
[stacey@homebaseccc.org](mailto:stacey@homebaseccc.org) or (415) 788-7961 x302*