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Key Findings

This summary highlights the key findings from the 2013 Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, compares results to those of the 2011 Count, and reflects on the trends over the last decade since the first Homeless Count and Survey in 2003. Two other resources accompany these Key Findings: the Policy Implications found at the end of this document which discusses implications for future efforts to reduce and end homelessness and the Alameda Countywide Homeless Count & Survey Report found online and available for download at www.everyonehome.org.

The overall number of people who are homeless in Alameda County is essentially the same as in 2011. This count of 4,264 homeless people follows a period of decline, most notable between 2007 and 2009. On one hand, these static results are encouraging in the context of the severe effects of recession, its impact on the housing and job market, the increase in the population of Alameda County, and its rate of poverty. Homeless-serving programs continue to keep pace with assisting those who become homeless for the first time and are already being served by programs - and still move many people to permanent housing each year. Some groups, like families who are homeless with children, have shown a significant reduction in number over the last several years.

On the other hand, the results are troubling. Programs are helping move nearly 2,000 homeless people to permanent housing each year, but just as many people are becoming homeless each year. The number of people living on the streets or in places not meant for habitation has increased for the second count in a row. New or time-limited housing resources over the last two years have not produced a marked reduction in the number of homeless, including for homeless veterans. Progress has slowed in reducing the number of individuals who are homeless living with serious mental illness or chronic substance abuse.

While intentional and strategic investments of resources have achieved promising results, Alameda County must accelerate the rate at which people access permanent housing, reduce the flow of people into homelessness, replicate successful programs on a larger scale, ensure the most efficient use of existing resources, and garner new resources and partnerships to create a significant reduction in the number of people who are homeless at a point in time.

Overall Count in 2013

The 2013 Homeless Count and Survey estimates that 4,264 people were homeless in Alameda County on January 29, 2013. This slight 2.1% increase (86 people) from the 4,178 estimated in the 2011 count is not a statistically significant change. The net result is a reflection that people experiencing homeless are leaving the streets, shelters, and transitional housing programs at essentially the same rate as people with housing crises are becoming homeless.
To be counted as homeless, a person must either be sheltered (living in an emergency shelter or in a transitional housing program for the homeless) or be unsheltered (living outdoors or in a place not meant for habitation). The table below notes the household type and newly-required age categories of people who are homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People in households with at least one adult and one child under age 18*</td>
<td>People age 17 and under</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People age 18-24</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People 25 and older</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in households without children under age 18</td>
<td>People age 18-24</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People 25 and older</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,264</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 10 people age 17 and under who are in households without an adult.

**Transition Age Youth:** When considering all transition age youth (persons age 18 through 24) who are sheltered and unsheltered, in households with or without children under age 18, this age
group comprises 10% of the total homeless population (435 people). The way that transition age youth are accounted for and reported was changed in the 2013 count, yielding data that may be considered a new baseline for future analysis. This age group is frequently considered to require specialized services to reach them. For example, the majority of unsheltered 18-24 year olds are age 18 – 21, which may warrant a unique outreach approach.

Transition age youth are a notable portion within two broad types of households who are homeless, those without children under age 18 and those with children under age 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of persons in households without children:</th>
<th>Of persons in households with children:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 – 24: 9% (269 people)</td>
<td>Age 17 and under: 55%, (743 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 and older: 91% (2,643 people)</td>
<td>Age 18 -24: 13% (166 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age 25 and older: 32% (433 people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race and Ethnicity of Unsheltered Homeless:** Among people who are unsheltered homeless, disproportionately more people identify as African American and American Indian/Alaskan Natives than in the total population of Alameda County. Hispanics and Asians are represented as unsheltered at a much lower rate than in the county populous.

**Looking Through Two Years And A Decade of Data: 2003 – 2013**

Since Alameda County has used the same methodology for all five counts over the last ten years, this is also an opportunity to reflect on the key findings of past two years and the past decade, giving a larger picture of the trends relevant to the efforts to reduce and end homelessness in Alameda County. The arrow to the left denotes the impact since 2011; the arrow on the right reflects the impact over the decade of 2003 through 2013.

**Count Similar to 2011, But Homelessness Is Less Prevalent In The County**

The number of people who are homeless in 2013 is similar to 2011; however, when examining ten years of data from 2003 to 2013, there is both a 16% reduction in the number of homeless people and a reduction in the rate of homelessness in Alameda County.

- Homelessness increased by 2% (86 people) over the last two years, an amount that is not statistically significant.
- Sixteen percent fewer people are homeless than in 2003.

Over 800 fewer people are homeless than in 2003, from 5,081 to 4,264. In the past ten years, the population of Alameda County has grown by 6% while the homeless population has declined by 16%. For every 1,000 residents in this county, 2.8 are homeless in 2013, down from 3.5 in 2003.
While the change of 800 seems large, even this change is not significant enough to be statistically meaningful given the confidence intervals of this methodology. In other words, homelessness has decreased steadily over ten years by 16%, but that change is insufficient to determine that the homeless population is smaller now than it was in 2003.

Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is lower than expected given its rate of poverty. In Bay Area communities, there appears to be a relationship where higher rates of poverty are associated with higher rates of homelessness. Alameda County has homelessness rates similar to the more affluent counties of San Mateo and Marin. Despite having a poverty rate that is almost twice that of San Mateo and Marin, Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is practically equal to these two communities. The research did not examine what contributes to or is the cause of this dynamic.

People Who Are Sheltered and Unsheltered

The number of unsheltered persons increased by 6%, from 2,212 in 2011 to 2,337 in 2013. This is the second count in a row showing an increase in the number of unsheltered people. The vast majority of the unsheltered (91%) are persons in households without minor children. The 2,337 unsheltered people exceed those living in emergency shelters and transitional housing combined, but the proportion is comparable to 2011.

While the proportion of the homeless who are unsheltered is now at 55%, the number of people has declined over the last ten years by almost 12%, from 2,642 people in 2003 to 2,337 people in 2013. Unsheltered persons hovered at or slightly above 50% of the homeless population for the decade, with only one year less than 50%.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey 2013.
Unsheltered Women: The proportion of unsheltered people who are women has declined quite significantly over the past decade. In 2003, women comprised 41% of the unsheltered population. In 2013, women comprise 13% of the unsheltered population. Conversely, men have increased from 59% to 84% of the unsheltered population.

Homeless Families With Children

In 2013, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development added a new requirement to report on the age categories of each homeless person by their household type. This addition required extensive modification of the survey tool and the questions used to determine household type as well as adding new questions about age categories of the other family members. As a result, the 2013 data regarding household type is considered a new baseline and cannot be compared to prior years. The majority of households are those without children under age 18 (68%) although 1,342 are people in families with children who are homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Persons In Households With Children &amp; Without*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households without children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32%  68%

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey 2013. *10 persons (0.2%) are in households with only children, and excluded from this chart.

Homeless families with children are 32% of the overall homeless population, down from 56% in 2003. While a new baseline of household data restricts comparisons of counts of people in families, this significant decrease over the decade results in 462 homeless families with children in 2013.
Chronically Homeless Persons

The total number of chronically homeless single adults decreased by 185 persons (17%), from 1,116 in 2011 to 931 in 2013. They constitute 22% of Alameda County’s homeless population, down nearly 5 percentage points from 27% in 2011. 82% of the chronically homeless are unsheltered. The prevalence (22% of the total homeless population) is the lowest since reporting began in 2003.

Chronically homeless people – people who on the night of the Count are residing in a emergency shelter or are unsheltered and are disabled and homeless for 12 consecutive months or longer or at least four times in the past three years.

The number of chronically homeless people has declined by 350 people since 2003 from 1,280 to 931. As shown below, the proportion has consistently hovered at roughly one-quarter of the homeless population.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, Focus Strategies, 2013, Figure 9, p. 40.
Homeless Veterans

The total number of homeless veterans is 492, about 12% (11.5%) of all homeless people. This closely mirrors the 2011 results of 488 homeless veterans constituting 11.7% of all homeless people. Additionally, the proportion of veterans who are sheltered and unsheltered is essentially unchanged from 2011, with 72% unsheltered. Female veterans (a new data field for 2013) are four percent of the veteran population, and less than half of one percent of the overall homeless population. Just over half of female veterans are unsheltered (55%) compared to nearly three-fourths of the entire veteran population.

Over the past decade, the number of homeless veterans declined by over 200 people (694 to 492). They have consistently comprised between 10 and 14% of the homeless population.

Homeless People With Chronic Substance Abuse

The proportion of the homeless with chronic substance abuse remains at approximately one-third of the homeless population (30%), equating to 1,289 people. Looking further back, the proportion has risen and fallen over the decade with a low of 28% and high of 40%. The 2013 proportion is on the lower end of the range over the past decade. In 2013, about three-quarters of homeless people with chronic substance abuse are unsheltered.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, Focus Strategies, 2013, Figure 12, p. 48.
Homeless People With HIV/AIDS

Although the total sub-population of homeless people living with HIV/AIDS is small and did have an increase to 97 people, the proportion remained fairly consistent with 2011 at just above 2% of the homeless population. The 2011 data noted a shift from mostly sheltered to mostly unsheltered. This trend continues in 2013 with 74% of people homeless with HIV/AIDS being unsheltered. As noted in 2011, this may warrant continued monitoring to examine potential correlations to chronic substance abuse or reduced funding for targeted residential beds. For the decade, the rate of HIV/AIDS among homeless people has remained between one and three percent of the overall homeless population.

Homeless People with Severe Mental Illness

A substantial increase in the number of people with severe mental illness, entirely in the unsheltered population, reverses the progress shown in 2011. 1,106 homeless persons are living with severe mental illness, up significantly from 818 persons in 2011 and also exceeding the 1,007 persons in 2009. The proportion of people with serious mental illness is practically identical within the sheltered population (25%) and unsheltered (26%). Nearly 60% of the severely mentally ill homeless are unsheltered (57%). This is the opposite of 2011 when nearly 60% of the severely mentally ill homeless were sheltered and only 40% unsheltered.

Over the past decade, the prevalence of severe mental illness has nearly doubled from 14% to 26% of the overall homeless population. In some years, the proportion of sheltered persons with severe mental illness has closely matched the proportion of unsheltered persons with severe mental illness. It is unclear why there are fluctuating increases and decreases between the prevalence among those sheltered and unsheltered.
Policy and System Design Implications

Alameda County views data as essential to the efforts to end homelessness - one source to understand the needs of homeless people and the context in which services are delivered and thereby measure progress, adjust services and program design, and create a bigger impact. While high standards exist locally for reducing and ending homelessness, additional scrutiny from the state and federal government is being given to homeless count results. Alameda County and communities across the country are rated annually on the progress made toward the federal United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH)\(^1\) initiatives of ending veteran and chronic homelessness by December 2015. With this deadline fast approaching, increased attention is being given to how successful communities are reducing the number of people who are chronically homeless and veterans who are homeless, eventually reducing them to a very small number of people that get rehoused within thirty days of becoming homeless. The USICH initiative also calls for ending family and youth homelessness by 2020, while the EveryOne Home Plan calls for ending all homelessness by 2020.

To successfully meet the goals of ending homelessness, Alameda County must:

1) accelerate and finish the job for families with children, chronically homeless, and veterans;
2) develop new resources and new partners to accelerate and reach the end of homelessness;
3) effectively use existing resources; and
4) coordinate more effectively to better streamline access to critical housing and services.

The Context

Change in the number of people who are homeless at a point in time count is a combination of the number of people who become homeless through the year and the number of homeless who move to permanent housing. The number of people who are homeless decreases when the number of people becoming housed exceeds the number who became homeless. This is referred to as the net change, the end result at the point in time, taking into account all those people who became homeless and all those who ended their homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Change Over 10 Years</th>
<th>Average Net Change Per Year</th>
<th>Number Of Years To End Homelessness At Current Pace</th>
<th>Average Change Per Year Needed to End Homelessness by December 2020 (8 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-817</td>
<td>-81.7</td>
<td>52.2 Years</td>
<td>533 additional people annually plus those currently exiting to permanent housing (1,961 in 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net decrease of 817 people homeless over the span of ten years is equivalent to an average net reduction of 82 people per year. At this pace, it would take 52 years to end homelessness assuming the current rates of people becoming homeless and leaving to permanent housing.
end homelessness by 2020 as adopted in the EveryOne Home Plan, an additional 533 people would need to acquire permanent housing each year, a 28% increase from the 2012 rate (if the current rates of people becoming homeless and moving out to housing remain the same).

While the point in time count and the net change are appropriate tools to evaluate the reduction of people who are homeless, they neglect to articulate the external factors that can excel or hinder the efforts to rehouse people such as vacancy in the rental market or fair market rents relative to disability income or minimum wage. It also neglects to articulate the changes within the programs that serve the homeless that may contribute to the success or challenges of the efforts to end homelessness. Other key contextual information is presented below.

- The fair market rent for a two bedroom in the Alameda County and the Oakland metropolitan area is the 17th most expensive in the nation\(^{\text{ii}}\). At $1,361 per month, the fair market rent is Oakland is well above the $977 national average and has risen steeply over the last year, making it unaffordable to someone working full-time at a minimum-wage job.
- Even the fair market rent of an efficiency/studio apartment is $892, outstripping the Supplemental Security Income benefits of $866 for someone who is disabled.
- Job growth has primarily been in higher wage sectors, creating competition for increasingly expensive rental units.
- Housing development continues to be at an insufficient pace – and lack the affordability – to meet the housing needs of all Alameda County residents.
- 5,289 people received homeless or prevention services for the first time in 2011\(^{\text{iii}}\), 4,323 in 2012, tapering down due to the full expenditure of Priority Home Partnership funds.
- 1,961 people moved from homelessness to permanent housing in 2012.
- An average of 38% of all people served by homeless programs exited those programs to permanent housing in 2012.
- Rapid Rehousing programs exited an average of 89% of participants to permanent housing.
- Alameda County has several streets-to-housing programs that successfully work with people living in encampments or on the streets and support their move to permanent housing with housing subsidies and services that help them retain that housing.
- Over the last decade, a variety of programs were added to serve homeless people. Some no longer exist; others are at maximum capacity.
  - The Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63) program in the mid 2000’s added significant housing and service capacity for people with mental illness, but are now full and have had no increase in resources.
  - The Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program though federal stimulus dollars infused nearly $10 million dollars from late 2009 through mid 2012 to create Alameda County’s program known as the Priority Home Partnership. This funding helped stave off the effects of the recession, and was targeted to assist homeless people to move into permanent housing and to prevent those with temporary or rental housing from becoming homeless. Most of these funds were spent on prevention.
Foster care was extended in 2012 via Assembly Bill 12 to continue providing critical housing and support services to foster youth through age 21.

Over the last two years, veteran-specific programs have added housing subsidies and services for homeless and at-risk veterans, including 150 Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) certificates and $2 million from the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program.

- The Affordable Care Act and Veteran Affairs are possible sources for additional or expanded resources in the future, beginning with $5 million dollars awarded in 2013 for four SSVF programs in Alameda County.

In a sample of fifteen California counties for which Homeless Count data from 2011 and 2013 was available, Alameda is one of four that experienced static or very small increases. The other eleven of the fifteen California counties experienced decreases in the proportion of the population who are homeless. These promising results throughout the state help propel Alameda County’s quest to learn, innovate, re-strategize, and ensure the most effective programs to rapidly end homelessness on scale.

**In light of these realities and the determination to end homelessness as it exists today, four strategies will be implemented.**

1. **Accelerate and finish the job.**

   There has been an impact where the community has invested and targeted resources, utilized best practices, and launched innovative approaches. Ending homelessness is within reach for homeless veterans, families with children, and chronically homeless. Yet if we continue at the pace of the last decade, Alameda County will take at least eight times longer than the federal timeline to end veteran and chronic homelessness. To end homelessness for these three populations, the system of care will need to aggressively invest in the strategies that have worked to rapidly house these populations and to accelerate the rate at which people move to permanent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Sub-Population</th>
<th># People (Families) Currently Homeless</th>
<th>Net Change Over 10 Years</th>
<th>Average Net Change Per Year</th>
<th>Number Of Years To End Homelessness At Current Pace</th>
<th>Average Change Per Year Needed to End Homelessness by December 2015 (3 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families with Children</td>
<td>462 Families</td>
<td>-307</td>
<td>-30.7</td>
<td>15.0 years</td>
<td>154 additional families annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Veterans</td>
<td>492 People</td>
<td>-202</td>
<td>-20.2</td>
<td>24.4 Years</td>
<td>165 additional people annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>931 People</td>
<td>-349</td>
<td>-34.9</td>
<td>26.7 Years</td>
<td>310 additional people annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The USICH deadline for ending family homelessness is 2020, but is within reach in three years due to the relatively low number of homeless families with children.

Alameda County’s efforts to prioritize those with multiple barriers to housing and long periods of time living outdoors or in shelters is the type of targeted and innovative use of existing resources that could reduce and end homelessness for veterans and chronically homeless people. New or reassigned VASH vouchers should continue to be targeted to unsheltered veterans or chronically homeless veterans for greatest impact. New and expanded rapid rehousing funding should be explored for families with children on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families as other states have done with great success.

2. New resources and new partners are essential to accelerate and reach the end of homelessness.

Quite simply, new money, partnerships, and resources are needed to help homeless people access and maintain permanent housing while also overhauling the prevention system to help people avoid becoming homeless. New and expanded opportunities include:

A. **Affordable Care Act (ACA).** Over one-third of those connected to services are uninsured, which can be reduced or eliminated while providing health care for acute and chronic illnesses. In addition, the care coordination available through ACA may make it possible to repurpose some existing service funding into housing if the services can be paid for by ACA. Staff training, sophisticated billing abilities, and solid internal accounting and protocols will be necessary to utilize this funding.

B. **the California Homes and Job Act (SB 391).** California needs to make a permanent investment in creating and sustaining affordable housing to meet the need. This has been exacerbated by the loss of local redevelopment funds. The Homes and Jobs Act will create a permanent, dedicated source through which to fund the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of affordable housing and create tens of thousands of jobs.

C. **former redevelopment set-aside.** Redirecting of former redevelopment tax increment provides a potential source of funding to rehouse homeless people across the county. Under former redevelopment law, redevelopment agencies were required to set aside 20% of revenues for affordable housing. Because this funding would be controlled locally, Alameda County could dedicate the equivalent share of former redevelopment agency property tax revenues to supportive housing (with a preference for homeless individuals) along with a factor that incorporates property tax growth over time.

D. **criminal justice realignment dollars.** As responsibility for criminal justice shifts from the state to local county officials and superior courts, some of those sentenced to probation instead of prison will be homeless and require permanent housing. Other legal barriers of this population may further inhibit their abilities to independently secure permanent housing. County funding to care for probationers can be allocated to providing rapid rehousing services.
It will be essential to deepen and expanded partnerships (such as using TANF funding through Social Services Agency on an on-going basis to rapidly rehouse families with children) and develop new, well-coordinated partnerships (such as with departments of education, transitional age youth planning efforts, and more landlords and housing operators).

3. The effective use of existing resources is equally essential.
Current and future planning must address and ensure utilization of existing resources as effectively as possible to rapidly rehouse those who are homeless. To create a dramatic reduction of the overall number of homeless people, more concentrated efforts and strategies will be needed to:
   A. increase the rates at which people exit homeless services to permanent housing for most types of homeless programs;
   B. reduce lengths of stay in programs while maintaining or increasing the exits to permanent housing;
   C. target key populations – particularly the unsheltered homeless and the three subpopulations that are within reach;
   D. invest new resources in the programs with low costs per permanent housing exit;
   E. explore reallocation from programs with high cost per housing outcome to those programs with lower costs per permanent housing exit;
   F. implement promising and best practices; and
   G. revamp programs where there is interest and/or possibility to convert to more effective interventions.
Individual programs and the system of care must implement these strategies. A thoughtful roadmap is needed to assist the system of care in identifying and transitioning to the most effective use of existing resources for homeless people.

4. Coordinate more – and more effectively.
The objectives of the system of care are to quickly identify the current needs of homeless persons, match the person with the best solutions to their homelessness, assist with quick access to the most appropriate type of permanent housing for each individual, and prevent future homelessness. A coordinated assessment and intake system is central to effectively accomplishing each of these objectives and to quickly transition out of homelessness. As a collective system, each program will need to effectively promote short stays in homeless services and the quickest access to permanent housing. The system design needs to be created and shared over the next year, and must include:
   A. creation and implementation of a coordinated assessment and intake system that efficiently matches and connects people with the most appropriate rehousing resource;
   B. diversion and prevention of people with a housing crisis from needing a shelter or becoming unsheltered; and
   C. programmatic conversion to serve unsheltered, singles, and other targeted populations as success is made reducing homelessness in specific sub-populations, such as families with children.
Conclusion

Alameda County is committed to using data to plan, implement, evaluate, and refine our service delivery system for homeless and at risk people. The information contained in the 2013 Homeless Count and Survey Report informs not only our understanding, but our actions as we seek to improve outcomes for people who have lost their homes. We will use this information to target resources and refine programs, believing that we can continue to reduce homelessness for families, veterans, and persons living with serious mental illness while simultaneously achieving reductions in the numbers of homeless adults, particularly those who are unsheltered. We will continue to work together to innovate, replicate effective strategies, and maximize the use of our resources. Together we can and will end homelessness.

For questions regarding the data or trends in Alameda County, contact Elaine deColigny, Executive Director, at Elaine.decoligny@acgov.org or 510.670.5944.

---

1 USICH Opening Doors (Federal Plan For Ending Homelessness) can be found at www.usich.gov.
2 Center for Housing Policy, Paycheck to Paycheck 2013 Rankings: Most to Least Expensive Metro Areas for Renting.