



Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP)

Reporting Periods **Please Select One**

- ☒ September 1, 2018 - September 30, 2019 Report must be submitted no later than January 1, 2020
☐ October 1, 2019 - September 30, 2020 Report must be submitted no later than January 1, 2021
☐ October 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021 Report must be submitted no later than September 30, 2021

Submit this report to the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council by email to hcfc@bcsh.ca.gov

HEAP Contract # 18-HEAP-00013 Administrative Entity: Regional Task Force on the Homeless Inc. Date of Report: 12/31/2019

Select Either Large City or CoC

☐ Large City: _____ ☒ Continuum of Care: San Diego City & County

Contact Person/Title: Jennifer Yost, Director of Grants Management Contact Phone Number: 858-292-7627, x15

Contact Email Address: jennifer.yost@rtfhdsd.org

Section 1: Expenditure Summary

	Total
Total HEAP Award	\$18,821,668.48
Total HEAP Homeless Youth Funds	\$1,966,670.00
Total HEAP Funds obligated during reporting period	\$16,262,042.80
Total HEAP funds expended during reporting period	\$772,017.43
Total HEAP administrative funds expended during reporting period	\$264,004.17
Total interest accrued during reporting period	\$242,450.95



Section 2: Expenditure Detail

For the reporting period, provide the expenditure data for all HEAP allocations (Capital Improvements, Services, Rental Assistance or Subsidies, Homeless Youth Set-Aside and Administrative Costs, Other).

For expenditures in the Other category, please provide details on the type of project.

Note: The expenditures being reported are not for each individual project, but a summary of all projects funded by HEAP.

Capital Improvements

New Projects Funded by HEAP	Total # of Beds	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Short-Term Shelter					\$0.00
Emergency Shelter					\$0.00
Navigation Center					\$0.00
Transitional Housing					\$0.00
Permanent Supportive Housing					\$0.00
Other Types of Permanent Housing					\$0.00
Total	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Expansion Projects Funded by HEAP	Original # of Beds	# of Beds Added	Total # of Beds	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Short-Term Shelter			0				\$0.00
Emergency Shelter			0				\$0.00
Navigation Center			0				\$0.00
Transitional Housing			0				\$0.00
Permanent Supportive Housing			0				\$0.00
Other Types of Permanent Housing			0				\$0.00
Total	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Total Increase in Capacity Funded by HEAP	Homeless Youth Funds			Non-Homeless Youth Funds		
	Original # of Nights	# of Nights Added	Total # of Nights	Original # of Nights	# of Nights Added	Total # of Nights
Short-Term Shelter			0			0
Emergency Shelter			0			0
Navigation Center			0			0
Motel Vouchers			0			0
Host Home Program			0			0
Other Projects: Please list and describe			0			0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Other Projects Funded by HEAP	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Appliances (washer, dryer, A/C, heater, water heater, etc.)				\$0.00
Mobile Hygiene Units (shower, bathrooms, and/or laundry)				\$0.00
Mobile Health Care Service Units (physical and/or behavioral)				\$0.00
Renovations (new roof, patio covering, painting, etc.)				\$0.00
Safe Parking				\$0.00
Other Projects: Please list and describe				\$0.00
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Services

Project Type Funded by HEAP	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Street Outreach		\$154,000.00		\$154,000.00
Day Shelter				\$0.00
Homelessness Prevention				\$0.00
Housing Navigation and Landlord Engagement				\$0.00
Services Only	\$24,783.20	\$43,414.80		\$68,198.00
Motel Vouchers				\$0.00
Rental Assistance (not reported in Rental Assistance/Subsidies)		\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00
Move-in Costs				\$0.00
Host Home Program (not reported in Rental Assistance/Subsidies)				\$0.00
Other:				\$0.00
Total	\$24,783.20	\$203,414.80	\$0.00	\$228,198.00

Rental Assistance or Subsidies

Project Type Funded by HEAP	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Rental Assistance (not reported in Services)				\$0.00
Rapid Rehousing				\$0.00
Master Leasing				\$0.00
Rental Subsidies				\$0.00
Host Home Program (not reported in Services)				\$0.00
Other: please list and describe. Add a row for each project				\$0.00
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Other Projects

Other Projects Funded by HEAP	Total Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Non-Homeless Youth Funds Expended	Total Accrued Interest Funds Expended	Total Funds Expended
Other Projects: Service Provider Training and Skill Building	\$139,907.63			\$139,907.63
Total	\$139,907.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$139,907.63



Section 3: Outcomes

Outcome data is for project types funded by HEAP. For the tables asking for the numbers of participants in each project or project type, one participant may be counted in more than one column.

The number in the "Total" column, however, should be of the number of unduplicated individuals as opposed to the sum of the numbers in that row.

Capital Improvement Projects (New and Expanded) Outcomes

	Homeless Youth HEAP Funds		Non-Homeless Youth HEAP Funds	
	Number of Days Service Provided	Number of Instances Of Service	Number of Days Service Provided	Number of Instances of Service
Mobile Hygiene Services				
Mobile Healthcare Services				
Other (please describe)				

SHORT-TERM SHELTER							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

EMERGENCY SHELTER							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							

Average length of stay (in days)							
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

NAVIGATION CENTER							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							

Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

OTHER TYPES OF PERMANENT HOUSING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Average length of stay (in days)							

SAFE PARKING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

SERVICES OUTCOMES

STREET OUTREACH							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	39	■	■	0	71	0	71
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”	36	■	0	0	65	0	65
Number of instances of services	122	15	■	0	227	0	227
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	0	0	0	0	■	0	■
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DAY SHELTER							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of instances of services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

HOMELESS PREVENTION							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	■	0	0	0	■	■	13
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	0	■	■	■	35	74	110
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”	■	0	0	0	■	■	■
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	0	0	0	0	0	■	■
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Instances of services	■	■	■	■	38	204	246

HOST HOMES							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of instances of services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average length of stay (in days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	

HOUSING NAGIGATION-LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of services							

SERVICES ONLY							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	16	■	■	■	90	19	113
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	■	■	■	0	34	■	40
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”	13	■	■	■	84	17	105
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	■	■	■	0	19	18	37
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	■	■	0	0	11	0	11
Instances of services	18	■	13	■	124	49	180

OTHER: Rapid Rehousing							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	■	■	0	0	■	0	■
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”	■	■	0	0	■	0	■
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Instances of services	■	■	0	0	■	0	■

RENTAL ASSISTANCE OR SUBSIDIES OUTCOMES

RENTAL ASSISTANCE

Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of Services							
Average length of stay (in days)							

RAPID REHOUSING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of Services							
Average length of stay (in days)							

MASTER LEASING							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of “place not meant for habitation”							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of Services							
Average length of stay (in days)							

MOTEL VOUCHERS

Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Instances of Services	0	0	0	0	11	0	12
Average length of stay (in days)	0	0	0	0	11	0	

RENTAL SUBSIDIES							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of Services							
Average length of stay (in days)							

HOST HOMES							
Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"							
Number of Instances of Services							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Average length of stay (in days)							

OTHER: PLEASE LIST TYPE

Performance Measures by Subpopulation	Chronically Homeless	Veteran	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (18-24)	Unaccompanied Homeless Youth (Under 18)	Households (Without Children)	Households (With Children and Adults)	Total Served (Unduplicated)
Number of homeless persons served							
Number of persons at imminent risk of homelessness served							
Number of persons served with a prior living situation of "place not meant for habitation"							
Number of persons exiting to a permanent housing destination							
Number of persons exiting to a safe exit, other than permanent housing							
Instances of Services							
Average length of stay (in days)							



Section 4: Demographics

Fill in the tables below with the number of individuals served due to HEAP funds by the racial and ethnic categories listed below.

One participant may be counted in any of the racial categories and may also be counted separately in the Hispanic/Latino ethnicity column.

Age

Project Type/Age	12 and under	Ages 13-17	Ages 18-24	Ages 25-34	Ages 35-44	Ages 45-54	Ages 55-61	Ages 62+	Doesn't Know/ Refused to Answer
Night by Night Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Navigation Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transitional Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Types of Permanent Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Safe Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Street Outreach	0	0	1	1	16	19	12	17	0
Day Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homelessness Prevention	78	35	15	31	34	19	15	14	1
Housing Navigation/Landlord Engagement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Services Only	26	1	13	30	24	45	22	15	1
Other: please list and describe	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rental Assistance and Subsidies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Gender

Project Type/Gender	Male	Female	Trans Female (M to F)	Trans Male (F to M)	Gender Non-Conforming (not exclusively M or F)	Doesn't know/ Refused to Answer
Night by Night Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0
Navigation Center	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transitional Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Types of Permanent Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Safe Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0
Street Outreach	42	27	1	0	1	0
Day Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homelessness Prevention	101	140	0	0	0	1
Housing Navigation/Landlord Engagement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Services Only	51	52	1	0	0	76
Other: please list and describe	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Assistance and Subsidies	0	0	0	0	0	0

Race

Project Type/Race	White	Black or African American	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Multiple Races	Doesn't Know/ Refused to Answer
Night by Night Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Emergency Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Navigation Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transitional Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Types of Permanent Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Safe Parking	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Street Outreach	44	19	■	0	■	■	0
Day Shelter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homelessness Prevention	157	39	■	■	■	16	18
Housing Navigation/Landlord Engagement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Services Only	41	38	■	0	■	■	84
Other: please list and describe	■	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rental Assistance and Subsidies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Ethnicity

Project Type/Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino	Hispanic/Latino	Doesn't Know/ Refused to Answer
Short-Term Shelter	0	0	0
Emergency Shelter	0	0	0
Navigation Center	0	0	0
Transitional Housing	0	0	0
Permanent Supportive Housing	0	0	0
Other Types of Permanent Housing	0	0	0
Safe Parking	0	0	0
Street Outreach	61	■	0
Day Shelter	0	0	0
Homelessness Prevention	117	122	■
Housing Navigation/Landlord Engagement	0	0	0
Services Only	82	13	85
Other: please list and describe	■	0	0
Rental Assistance and Subsidies	0	0	0



Section 5: Qualitative Assessment

1. Describe how HEAP funds have contributed to your Continuum of Care making progress towards local homeless goals (e.g. additional services provided, capacity created, systems building, investments made, lower waitlists, etc.)

See Attached

2. Describe how HEAP funds have contributed to your Continuum of Care making progress towards local youth homelessness goals (e.g. additional services provided, capacity created, systems building, investments made, lower waitlist, etc.)

See attached.

3. Describe the alignment between HEAP-funded activities and "Housing First" principles (as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 8255).

See attached

4. Please provide any additional feedback on the impact of HEAP funds that you would like to share with the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council. (Optional)

See attached

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Submission Certification

I certify that all information included in this report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: 

Date: 01.01.2020

Name &
Title: Tamera Kohler, Chief Executive Officer

Regional Task Force on the Homeless
Contract # 18-HEAP-00013
September 1, 2018 – September 30, 2019 Annual Report

Describe how HEAP funds have contributed to your Continuum of Care making progress towards local homelessness goals (e.g. additional services provided, capacity created, systems building, investments made, lower waitlists, etc.)

The Regional Task Force on the Homeless (RTFH) leveraged the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) requirement of collaboration as an opportunity to expand our engagement with stakeholders and prioritize regional distribution of funds. San Diego County consists of four regions: North County, East County, South County, and Central County (which includes the City of San Diego) and it was critical that each region receive HEAP funding. Table A demonstrates the regional distribution of funds, and includes the homeless youth set-aside allocations.

From August 2018 – February 2019 RTFH hosted multiple information sessions with local government agencies, service providers, advocates, people with lived experience, community members, and other stakeholders to identify gaps and determine how HEAP funds could be used to meet these needs. The available funding and priorities were included in the Request for Applications (RFA) notice and were also used as part of the scoring process to determine HEAP awardees.

In March 2019, RTFH issued an RFA for the more than \$18 million in available HEAP funds. We received 51 applications from 41 agencies requesting over \$63 million dollars in funding assistance. RTFH issued award notifications in May 2019 and executed 21 contracts with three cities, the County of San Diego, and 15 different agencies. HEAP funded programs began providing services as early as August 2019, with all contracts and programs fully executed by November 2019. Because the intention of HEAP funds was to address emergency needs, RTFH offered to advance a portion of HEAP funds to sub-grantees with quarterly reimbursements. In addition, to ensure providers meet spending requirements and performance measures, RTFH also executed one-year contracts, with an option for renewal in the second year. This gives RTFH the flexibility to re-allocate funds should a subgrantee not meet their contractual obligations.

Table A

Regions	HEAP Funds Awarded by Region		Homeless Youth Funds Awarded by Region		Total HEAP funds Awarded by Region	
North County	\$3,609,425.00	19.2%	\$857,278	4.6%	\$4,466,703.00	23.7%
East County	\$1,923,041.33	10.2%	\$247,832	1.3%	\$2,170,873.33	11.5%
South County	\$1,228,999.33	6.5%	\$575,430	3.1%	\$1,804,429.33	9.6%
Central County	\$4,469,813.34	23.7%	\$286,130.00	1.5%	\$4,755,943.34	25.3%
County Wide	\$5,623,719.48	29.9%	\$0.00	0%	\$5,623,719.48	29.9%
Total	\$16,854,998.48	89.5%	\$1,966,670.00	10.5%	\$18,821,668.48	100%

Funding Priorities

The funding priorities identified are consistent with best practices and included prevention and diversion, street outreach, housing navigation, and a flexible housing subsidy pool. RTFH spent a significant amount of time engaging with stakeholders to determine the services needed within these areas.

Prevention and Diversion

A significant gap identified through this process was the urgent need for a progressive model of engagement to address the inflow into first time homelessness. Prevention and diversion are critical and HEAP funds were used to establish this as a new priority for the region. The flexibility of HEAP funds provided the opportunity for RTFH to fund seven new prevention and diversion programs across all regions and provide best practice training to providers. Over the next two years, nearly 1000 individuals and families are expected to be served in hopes of preventing them from entering the homeless crisis response system.

HEAP also helped to facilitate a dialogue between community service providers with the goal of developing a systems level approach to prevention. The HEAP funded service providers along with non-HEAP prevention program providers worked to develop a Prevention Triage Tool that can be used by all Prevention Programs in the region. This tool is being integrated into the Community Information Exchange.

Street Outreach

In assessing the outreach services in the San Diego region, it was determined that outreach services were extremely targeted and limited in their frequency. It was clear that our region had an urgent need for street outreach to occur at least 5 days week and that outreach services target all unsheltered individuals and families. Prior to HEAP funding, law enforcement provided the majority of outreach in the region, with agencies providing program specific outreach, also known as “in-reach”. For example, a provider would only work with clients that were identified as high utilizers of emergency services and diagnosed with a severe mental illness. If the individual did not meet these criteria, then outreach and case management services were not provided by that agency. This meant that an overwhelming number of people were not receiving outreach services. Part of this work also includes the coordination of outreach activities to limit the duplication of effort and overlapping of services areas. RTFH has invested in the engagement of our high unsheltered population by using HEAP funds to expand street outreach activities across all regions. RTFH awarded 11 outreach service programs, adding over 20 FTE social workers and providing flexible financial assistance for unsheltered individuals and families. RTFH expects providers to engage with and assist over 2,000 individuals during the two-year period. The flexibility of HEAP funds supports our regions efforts to deliver services to any unsheltered individual or family.

Housing Navigation and Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool

Expanding Housing Navigation services to allow for earlier interventions and access to flexible funding was an additional need identified during the engagement sessions. Again, the flexibility of HEAP funding allowed RTFH to fund programs and services across all regions and serve individuals and families that may not be eligible for other program specific funding. RTFH funded 8 Housing Navigation programs adding over 35 FTE Housing Navigators/Case Managers, to provide both housing navigation services and

Prevention and Diversion services. These programs are expected to assist more than 1,700 individuals during the two-year period.

In addition to expanding housing navigation services, stakeholders also identified the need to have a flexible housing subsidy pool that would provide funding for landlord mitigation, landlord incentive programs, and other expenses related to securing housing. Like other communities, the County of San Diego has a competitive housing market which can make it challenging for people experiencing homelessness to secure and retain housing. After researching best-practices and consulting with local, state, and federal experts, RTFH will contract with a third-party entity to manage a Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool. This entity will be charged with engaging with property owners and landlords to secure vacant units as they become available. They will also maintain a centralized housing inventory that homeless service providers will then be able access and locate available housing for program participants.

Describe how HEAP funds have contributed to your Continuum of Care making progress towards local youth homelessness goals (e.g. additional services provided, capacity created, systems building, investments made, lower waitlists, etc.)

RTFH was intentional in our community outreach and engagement with youth, advocates, and other stakeholders when determining how to use HEAP funds. Youth specific needs were identified and included housing stability, lack of adequate education, lack of employment and job training, problems with physical health, behavioral health and general well-being, lack of access to healthcare, justice system involvement, and lack of social connections. RTFH continued to be consistent with the priorities identified in the stakeholder engagement process and funded programs and services in each of the regions of the County of San Diego: North, East, South and Central. HEAP funds were awarded to four providers who specialize in serving youth experiencing homelessness or who are at-risk of experiencing homelessness. Recognizing the importance of addressing youth homelessness as a precursor to chronic homelessness, RTFH exceeded the HEAP mandate of 5% and awarded 10.5% of its HEAP funds to youth dedicated projects.

RTFH was also awarded a HUD Youth Homeless Demonstration Program (YHDP) grant and it was determined that HEAP funds would be used to compliment YHDP funds that were distributed across the regions and are consistent with HEAP program requirements. The RTFH developed a Coordinated Community Plan (CCP) to End Youth Homelessness in the San Diego region. This plan outlined strategies that will move the Continuum of Care forward in creating appropriate system capacity and full implementation of a youth coordinated entry system. The YHDP funding, supports a wide range of programs, including rapid rehousing, transitional housing, host homes; while emphasizing prevention and diversion. The HEAP funding aligned with the CCP and YHDP by providing funding for Prevention and Diversion, Youth Housing Navigation, Rapid Rehousing and Host Homes specifically targeted to address the needs of youth.

Both HEAP and YHDP funding helped to catalyze community collaboration through dialogue between community organizations who work on different components of an interconnected challenge. For example, the youth program funded in the South region works directly with the school district and the local community college to connect youth and their families with HEAP funded Prevention and Diversion services and Rapid Rehousing program.

Describe the alignment between HEAP-funded activities and “Housing First” principles (as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 8255).

RTFH requires all programs funded by HEAP align with the Core Components of Housing First as defined in Welfare and Institution Code Div. 8 Ch. 6.5 Sec. 8255(b) and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 25 8409(b). To ensure this, the requirements were included in the sub-grantee contracts and are included in part of the program monitoring and compliance reviews. The RTFH has experience in program monitoring and compliance reviews as the Continuum of Care for the San Diego region. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requires all Continuum of Care funded programs to align with the Core Components of Housing First. The three cities and the County of San Diego are working with subrecipients to help implement their programs; these subrecipients also receive Continuum of Care funding. Additionally, 10 of the 15 difference agencies also are recipients of Continuum of Care funding and have experience with compliance with the Housing First model.

HEAP funding also prompted RTFH and its partners to review existing programs for compliance with Housing First policies. For example, the City of Oceanside introduced the Housing First model as part of their city-wide strategic plan to address homelessness. The City worked with local service providers to assess their current homelessness programs and identify barriers to obtaining permanent housing. This resulted in the City streamlining the process for using Section 8 Vouchers with the goal of decreasing the length of time homeless and assist the most vulnerable population secure housing more quickly.

Please provide any additional feedback on the impact of HEAP funds that you would like to share with the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council. (Optional)

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

RTFH is the HMIS Administrator for the County of San Diego and the County of Imperial. HEAP funded contracts required 76 individual programs being setup in HMIS. To date there have been eight (8) HEAP dedicated programs setup in HMIS for the City of San Diego HEAP allocation. The RTFH has held training sessions on HMIS usage for the new staff being hired by the agencies funded with HEAP.

These HEAP programs will help with the collection of better data to be able to identify and shape interventions that meet the needs of this population. The more programs that are entered into HMIS the better we can understand the system as a whole and the individuals that are experiencing homelessness.

System Impacts

Many programs funded with HEAP are new, resulting in the need for additional time to hire and train new staff. The competition for new staff impacted the ability of these new programs to be fully operation until the end of September. This can be seen in the preliminary numbers for October 2019 – December 2019, in which 950 unduplicated individuals have been served, almost doubling the 502 unduplicated individuals served during the period of June 1 – September 30, 2019.

The RTFH has also been working on the establishment of Unsheltered Policy Guidelines to provide overall guidance on a shared vision and approach for San Diego County, including all 18 cities and the

unincorporated areas, for addressing the needs of individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness, including those living in vehicles, and those residing in encampments. The Unsheltered Policy Guidance document was developed based on local input, best practices from other communities and guidance from HUD TA and USICH staff. Input sessions were held to solicit input from those with lived experience, homeless service providers and outreach professionals.

These guidelines serve to guide all necessary stakeholders - including the County of San Diego and effected departments, local municipalities and respective departments, other local government agencies that interact with unsheltered individuals such as transportation entities, homeless services organizations, faith-based organizations, and public and private funders - in a shared vision and approach grounded in research and best practices for effectively addressing unsheltered individuals and encampments across the region. These guidelines provide a set of policies for shaping future efforts, guiding funding and resource allocation decisions, and can be used to inform implementation activities.

We have also started Communities of Practice where practitioners and national experts come together to contribute experiences and best practices to implement strategies tailored to address San Diego's needs. These Communities of Practice include the Rapid Rehousing Learning Collaborative, Outreach and Diversion. These Communities of Practice offer structured training opportunities as well as collaborative engagement between service providers to implement evidence based best practices in their programs. During this reporting period, the RTFH has facilitated 6 separate Diversion training sessions to 117 practitioners and supervisors. Additionally, we have facilitated 2 train-the-trainer sessions resulting in 16 local trainers that can continue to provide on-going training to new practitioners and help to reinforce the practices learned during the training sessions.

Summary

HEAP funding catalyzed community collaboration through dialogue between community organizations who work on different components of an interconnected challenge. Conversations between diverse partners around a common goal has unearthed new ways of delivering services. Organizations have worked hard to bring their services together and assist more individuals than would normally be assisted without the extra funding to do so.

HEAP funds will have a long-lasting impact as the flexibility of funds has provided an opportunity to more quickly assist individuals and families experiencing homelessness, who were either unaware or unable to access services. With the increase in prevention and diversion, street outreach, and housing navigation services, more individuals will be engaged and assessed for both short-term and long-term services, including access to mainstream services and housing. RTFH is confident that the impact of HEAP funds in our region will be fully demonstrated over the next year.