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Dear Colleague:

Housing is a basic human need. Without proper housing, children cannot be prepared to learn, health problems inevitably arise and the well being of families is endangered.

Significant strides are being made in the battle to end homelessness. Since the 1980s when homelessness first burst into this nation’s consciousness, we have learned much about what works and what does not. Real solutions exist; nonetheless, philanthropic involvement in redressing homelessness has remained flat. Some attribute this to the failure of past efforts, others to the perception that homelessness is an intractable problem.

For these reasons, just over a year ago, a number of foundations concerned about the growing problem of homelessness began a collaboration to increase the role of Bay Area philanthropy in addressing our part of this national crisis. This initiative is based on the belief that homelessness can be ended, and that foundations must play a significant role in helping to end homelessness.

We have compiled this guide to publicize successful strategies that will inspire a sustained and strategic philanthropic response. It summarizes key recommendations from foundation staff and experts on what philanthropy can do to help end homelessness, and provides concrete examples of involvement by foundations of all sizes in this issue. It highlights renewed energy and plans that are fueling a growing consensus that homelessness can be ended in the next decade.

Many foundations have launched important initiatives tailored to specific homeless populations and their urgent needs. We commend our philanthropic colleagues who are engaged in this work and encourage others to consider homelessness as a part of their grantmaking. Local and national efforts to end homelessness offer opportunities for any foundation involved in human services to make a difference.

We now know how to prevent and end homelessness and have an unprecedented opportunity for decisive action—we hope you will join us.

Sincerely,

Bay Area Advisory Group
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Homelessness became a significant social problem in the 1980s. The number of people experiencing homelessness nationwide has risen steadily to the present level of three to four million annually—more than 1% of the population. Yet there is reason to hope that we can end homelessness within a decade.

Much is known about the causes and effects of homelessness. Field-tested services and programs are available to provide safe, decent affordable housing. Stabilizing support services help people stay housed and provide needed assistance to particularly vulnerable populations. Detailed plans to eradicate homelessness have been developed at local and national levels. Community-based coalitions, governments, and foundations are poised for an unprecedented collaboration, giving us good reason to believe we can end homelessness.

Most foundations do not include homelessness among their funding priorities. Historically, only about 1% of annual giving has gone to homelessness. Most of these grants have gone toward human service programs that only ameliorate the condition of homelessness instead of ending it.

Foundations that do give to homelessness represent all types—large and small, corporate, community, and family.

This guide outlines various strategic contributions that foundations can make to prevent and end homelessness:

- Advocacy and public education to increase the understanding of homelessness, build public will, and make change to local, state, and national policies.
- Community planning to bring all stakeholders to the table with the explicit purpose of ending homelessness.
- Prevention programs and systems change to intervene before people become homeless.
- Housing production, rehabilitation, and preservation to maintain and expand the supply of affordable housing.
- Integration of fragmented systems to provide coordinated and comprehensive services.
- Specialized supportive services to keep formerly homeless people housed.

Hopefully, these exemplary programs will inspire more foundations to realize that ending homelessness is an integral component of their missions and prompt them to accelerate a historically minimal level of funding in this area. If all foundations engaged in human services join forces in local and national efforts, homelessness can be ended before it becomes a permanent feature of the American landscape.
“If foundations join forces in local and national efforts, homelessness can be ended before it becomes a permanent feature of the American landscape.”
HOW This Guide Was Developed

Just over a year ago, a number of foundations from across the country that shared concerns about the growing problem of homelessness began a collaboration to increase the role of philanthropy in addressing this national crisis. Their work inspired a group of concerned Bay Area foundations to follow suit and join forces to engage broad philanthropic support for ending homelessness here in Northern California. This guide is a product of that collaboration. Its purpose is to:

- Understand Bay Area philanthropy’s historical commitment to homelessness.
- Highlight effective grantmaking strategies for preventing and ending homelessness.
- Engage new levels of philanthropic support and collaboration to end homelessness.

To understand Bay Area philanthropy’s historical role in the area of homelessness, the project used national data provided by the Foundation Center on the homeless giving trends of the 1,000 largest foundations between 1990 and 1999. Of this sample, 60 foundations were located in six Bay Area counties (Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara).

We also conducted standardized telephone interviews with staff at 30 Bay Area foundations that currently or previously funded homelessness with the purpose of understanding how to gain, sustain, and increase foundation support. Of those 30 foundations, 24 currently fund in the area of homelessness and 16 are former members of the Northern California Grantmakers (NCG) Task Force on Homelessness.¹

To augment researchers’ understanding of Bay Area philanthropy trends in giving to homelessness, a focus group was conducted with former Task Force members on Homelessness to discuss the history of the Task Force. We also researched case studies of innovative and effective grantmaking in homelessness to highlight strategies that have made a difference.

Finally, we contacted more than 70 experts working directly on homelessness across the country to explore their views on what foundations could support and how best to provide funding. This broad cross-section included providers, advocates, policy-makers, researchers, and homeless and formerly homeless people.

¹The NCG Task Force on Homelessness was a collaborative funding effort of 49 grantmakers that was active from 1989 to 1995.
OVERVIEW: Homelessness & Philanthropy

Homelessness Data

A precise count of homeless people in the United States is elusive. The population is transient, turns over rapidly, and is difficult to locate. Reliable assessments converge on estimates of three to four million people experiencing homelessness annually (Urban Institute, 2000).

Researcher Martha Burt of the Urban Institute reports that at least 800,000 individuals in the U.S. are homeless on any given night. More than 1.35 million children experience homelessness in the course of a year. According to University of Pennsylvania researcher Dennis Culhane, some 200,000 to 250,000 homeless individuals are chronically homeless.

As in the rest of the country, gaining a definitive count of the homeless population of the San Francisco Bay Area is problematic. Nevertheless, we can gain insight into the size and demographics of the local homeless population by looking at estimates developed on a countywide level by government officials and service providers. According to documents obtained by HomeBase, the San Francisco-based regional policy center on homeless issues, the homeless population of the nine-county Bay Area\(^1\) totals approximately 71,400 people at any one time.\(^2\) Therefore, it is estimated that over 200,000 men, women, and children experience homelessness in the Bay Area annually.

Homelessness continues to increase in the Bay Area and every region of the country. Principal causes include a dramatic decline in public investment in the creation of affordable housing, escalating housing costs in the face of stagnant or declining incomes, a rise in female-headed families living in poverty, and drastic reductions in public and private safety-net services that protect against homelessness. A focus on funding emergency shelters rather than systemic solutions allows the problem to persist. Catastrophic personal events such as injury or illness, loss of employment, flight from domestic violence, substance abuse, and mental illness also contribute.

Nationally and locally single adults account for about half of the homeless population. Most are between 25 and 55 years of age, with men outnumbering women by at least three to one. A significant number of homeless single men are veterans. Homeless families—usually consisting of a young mother with two children under the age of six—now comprise about 40% of the homeless population, up dramatically from 5% in 1980. Unaccompanied minors represent between 4% and 8% of the total. Over 40% of homeless people are African American, more than 41% are Caucasian, about 11% are Latino/a, and as many as 8% are Native American. Half are homeless for the first time, with one-third experiencing homelessness three times or more. About 30% of the homeless population experience an episode of homelessness for 90 days or less; for others, homelessness may last for two years or more (Urban Institute, 2000).

---

\(^1\) The nine-county Bay Area consists of San Francisco, Alameda, Marin, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Napa, Sonoma and Solano counties.

\(^2\) In most cases, estimates are derived from Exhibit 1 of the Continuum of Care narrative, a countywide planning document required by the federal government as a condition of receiving federal grants to combat homelessness. HomeBase and other homelessness experts believe that the figures are conservative.
Experiences of extreme poverty and homelessness have devastating effects. Acute and chronic physical and mental illness dominate the lives of many homeless men and women. Women experience high rates of severe violence and abuse. Homeless children are sick more often, go hungry, have high rates of delayed development and mental illness, and have trouble attending school.

Along with the precipitous rise of homelessness in the United States has come a renewed sense that this problem can be solved. The federal government has dedicated more than $1 billion to fund local housing and services and has recently reactivated the Interagency Council on Homelessness. States and communities are crafting detailed plans to end homelessness rather than simply treat it. More than a decade of program and policy development has produced a range of tested and evaluated services to eliminate the effects of being homeless. A cross-section of the community—government agencies, private foundations, businesses, nonprofit service providers, and concerned citizens—are now rallying together to realize the vision of ending homelessness in America.

Philanthropy’s Role in Ending Homelessness in the Bay Area

Bay Area foundations that give to homelessness represent all types of foundations—large and small, corporate, community, and family. For many of these foundations, giving in homelessness is part of a strong commitment to their local community. Others nest homelessness under broader funding priorities such as housing, human services, or self-sufficiency. However, most Bay Area foundations do not include homelessness among their funding priorities.

Throughout the 1990s, homeless giving represented less than 2% of all charitable giving by large foundations in the Bay Area. As overall giving increased towards the end of the decade, the total dollars donated to homeless-focused programs also increased, but the percentage of overall funding toward homelessness remained flat.

However, other types of human services, such as youth development and criminal justice programs, grew at a faster and more consistent pace. Significant fluctuations in total dollars from year to year have compromised planning and stability for organizations that provide services to homeless people.
Broad support for human service initiatives has caused the majority of grants to go toward programs that only ameliorate the condition of homelessness, instead of to those that work to end homelessness altogether. During the 1990s, more than 80% of homelessness funding went to provide direct, temporary human services.

Only a few foundations have aligned with advocates, researchers, and policymakers by funding efforts to address the fundamental systemic social problems that are understood as root causes of homelessness. Addressing the systemic issues requires emphasis on advocacy, policy, public education, and other efforts that work to effect change in the system.

Programs to provide affordable and stable housing are increasingly viewed as a top priority by many grantmakers who give to homelessness. In the past, smaller foundations have seen housing initiatives as overwhelming and costly. Meanwhile, some larger foundations have drawn a distinct line between housing and homelessness, causing them to fund housing initiatives while eschewing homelessness as part of their mission.

If the Bay Area is to realize the vision of ending homelessness within a decade, philanthropic support must increase substantially in both dollars and in the number of participating foundations.

The Northern California Grantmakers (NCG) Task Force represents Bay Area philanthropy’s single largest effort to address the problem of homelessness. The Task Force was a pooled fund of 49 foundations and corporate funders at its peak, and awarded $5.4 million in grants over the life of the project.

In time, the Task Force grew to recognize that “responding to homelessness must address its root causes,” and that its most effective grants were for homelessness prevention advocacy programs. However, by 1995 interest in continued participation in the Task Force had waned, as had funders’ contributions to the pooled fund. The Task Force sunset amid growing numbers of homeless families and individuals in the Bay Area, and growing cynicism among funders in the face of the sheer scope and scale of the problem of homelessness.

As part of the development of this report, a focus group was conducted with funders who had been active members of the Task Force. After discussing the successes of the Task Force, the group was asked what advice it would give to philanthropists addressing this issue in the future.

They recommended that funders:

- Emphasize systemic approaches and policy objectives
- Work in partnership with elected officials and government staff
- Highlight specific models with proven results and outcomes
- Focus on homeless prevention strategies
Grantmakers concerned with homelessness see eye-to-eye with experts outside the foundation world. There is a clear consensus among researchers, advocates, providers, and philanthropy that efforts to end homelessness should:

- Focus on policy and advocacy to address root causes of homelessness.
- Cut across multiple service areas to acknowledge the different causes of homelessness and the varied needs of homeless people.
- Involve multiple community stakeholders—government representatives, business, philanthropy, nonprofit service providers, advocates, and homeless people—in developing solutions.
- Have meaningful decision-making roles for consumers from the earliest point of development and throughout implementation and evaluation.
- Display clearly stated and feasible goals and objectives, and include concrete plans for assessment and evaluation.

Foundations and experts cite funding of advocacy and public education campaigns, community planning, prevention programs, and affordable housing initiatives as the most effective ways to end homelessness.
Building Political Will

Advocacy and public education help people understand the root causes of homelessness, leverage critical public dollars, and develop broad community support for action and systemic change. Foundations can play a pivotal role in generating public action by supporting:

- Organizations and coalitions that advocate for policies to increase public funding, improve services, and address the systemic causes of homelessness.
- Public education campaigns to encourage awareness of the conditions and circumstances of homeless people, while building widespread consensus for political action. Heightened awareness encourages large-scale public investments in initiatives to end homelessness.
- Grassroots organizing to activate communities to make change. Many grassroots organizations put leadership into the hands of homeless and formerly homeless people, empowering those most affected.

Many foundations have traditionally been hesitant about funding advocacy activities, but philanthropic organizations are actually permitted to fund a wide range of policy and advocacy activities. Information about guidelines on funding and lobbying are available from the Alliance for Justice’s Foundation Advocacy Project (see Resources).

Educating the Public: Marin Independent-Journal Special Section

Access to affordable housing is not just an issue for people at risk of homelessness. It is also a major concern of businesses and employers, who count on having a pool of available workers near their facilities. With a deep portfolio in community development, the Marin Community Foundation (MCF) understood this and saw a role it could play in educating the public.

In Marin, most of the housing stock consists of high-priced dwellings; the shortage of affordable “workforce” housing is a major public policy issue. To illuminate the issues, and to provide insight into the people affected by this problem, the Marin Independent-Journal researched and wrote a four-part series in 2001 called “Workforce Housing: Hometown Crisis.”

To further educate Marin residents about the issue, MCF teamed up with the newspaper to produce a free-standing 32-page supplement containing the five-part series. The supplement was circulated in 2001 in copies of the Marin I-J. The supplement cost $50,000 to publish: the newspaper contributed $25,000, while MCF bought $25,000 worth of advertising. The ads featured “the faces of affordable housing”—local residents who need affordable housing. The supplement has had the intended illuminating effect, raising the visibility of affordable housing issues by educating policymakers and the general public.
Public Policy-Making through the Initiative Process: The Passage of Proposition 46

In 2002, California voters approved Proposition 46, The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002, a $2.1 billion dollar bond measure that provides funds for the construction, rehabilitation and preservation of affordable rental housing, emergency shelters and homeless facilities, as well as funds for down payment assistance to low and moderate income first-time homebuyers. The victory of Prop. 46 was in no small part due to the clarity of vision of a number of funders, and their sustained support of the organizations that chased its passage through a number of legislative cycles.

Proposition 46 was the culmination of a five-year, statewide effort that was initially focused on the creation of a permanent source of funding for affordable housing (achieving that goal continues to be a high priority of housing advocates). But this was far from a steady, linear, build-up of support for the Proposition culminating in statewide voter approval. Instead, it is the result of perseverance by housing advocates and their philanthropic partners in the face of competing agendas, changes of political leadership, disappointments and setbacks.

With essential multi-year support from The San Francisco Foundation and the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund, key housing advocates, such as Housing California, the Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California, and the Rural California Assistance Corporation, continued to work year after year with legislators, state officials, nonprofit providers and each other to push for more funds for affordable housing. The breakthrough came when housing advocates agreed that the only successful strategy was the creation of a “big tent” that included not only affordable housing advocates but also players such as the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group and the Building Industry Association. This resulted in additional funding, including support from the corporate foundations of lenders such as Washington Mutual, Fannie Mae, Wells Fargo, and Union Bank.

With the formidable political support of the California Senate President Pro Tem, the proposition passed with 57.5% of the vote statewide. The bond is expected to fund the development of over 130,000 affordable housing units, the creation of over 275,000 full-time jobs, and leverage over $13 billion in private investment and federal funds for affordable housing.

Religious Congregations Turn Up the HEAT for Affordable Housing: Peninsula Interfaith Action

Peninsula Interfaith Action (PIA) is a community organizing collaboration of 27 religious congregations, representing 18,000 families, in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Nearly all of PIA’s member congregations have adopted affordable housing as a primary public policy issue they wish to act on and influence as people of faith. The S.H. Cowell Foundation and Peninsula Community Foundation were among the earliest supporters of PIA’s housing advocacy work. Both funders recognized the potential of a traditional community organizing model to make headway on the affordability issue where other approaches had faltered.

Since 2000, PIA has been working to create a housing trust fund for San Mateo County. After much groundwork in congregations and with political leaders, PIA mobilized its membership for a public “action” at the Fox Theater in Redwood City, where they planned to confront San Mateo County’s political leadership to “do something” about the serious gap in affordability in the county. Drawing upon its member congregations, PIA turned out 1,500 people at the event—and two County Supervisors. Sensing the urgency felt by their assembled constituents, the supervisors arrived at the meeting prepared to create a housing trust fund, and further, announced that the County of San Mateo would seed the fund with an initial capitalization of $3 million.

The Fund, now called HEAT (Housing Endowment and Trust) was approved by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors in February 2002 with the goal of generating $100 million over the next ten years. Established as a Joint Powers Authority, HEAT is one of the first city-county collaborative housing trust funds in the country, with eight cities and the county currently on board. Funders and elected officials agree that without PIA’s initiative and ongoing advocacy, San Mateo County would not have a housing trust fund.
Community Planning & Evaluation to End Homelessness

Community planning convenes a broad range of stakeholders to promote a local community’s various goals. Several states, as well as many cities and counties, are now using planning models—including the National Alliance to End Homelessness’ “The Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness”—to chart an end to homelessness (see Resources). The NAHP recently released a new document, “Toolkit for Ending Homelessness,” that provides best practices of the ten essential elements that communities need to address in order to end homelessness. The city of Indianapolis, the city of Chicago, and Columbus and Franklin County, OH, are just some of the regions that have developed community plans to end homelessness.

In developing their ten year plans to end homelessness, many communities are expanding upon their original Continuum of Care planning, which was mandated by the federal government during the 1990s. A requirement for Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding, the Continuum of Care is a local plan that details the continuum of services—from outreach to permanent housing—needed by various homeless populations.

Community collaborations through Continuum of Care and ten year plans offer foundations a variety of opportunities to provide support. Foundations can expand the Continuum of Care process by convening community stakeholders with the explicit mission of ending homeless-

Closing the Information Gap: An Information OASIS

The Roberts Enterprise Development Fund (REDF) is a philanthropic venture providing long-term funding to nonprofits running social enterprises, all of which strive to employ individuals with multiple barriers to employment, including and especially homelessness. Some years ago, REDF found that its portfolio of nonprofits expended a great deal of time struggling to pull reports together for funders. More importantly, these organizations often lacked the in-depth data needed to rigorously judge the effectiveness of their own programs and enterprises.

In response to the portfolio organizations’ need to have access to real-time, accurate data tracking the progress of individuals through their programs, REDF awarded $400,000 in cash grants over two years to four organizations in the Bay Area, along with an in-kind donation of the services of analytical experts BTW Consultants, Inc. These contributions supported the grantees in planning and implementing OASIS—the Ongoing Assessment of Social Impacts. OASIS has also been supported by funding from the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Surdna Foundation, the Phalarope Foundation and the Penney Family Fund.

Rubicon Programs in Richmond, for example, used its grant to build processes and systems to measure success in working with clients across their housing, mental health and employment service programs. After two years of thoughtful planning, Rubicon launched their customized version of OASIS, a database called CICERO. According to Rubicon’s president, “the increase in data transparency has enhanced Rubicon’s ability to assess the suitability of our programs to meet participants’ needs.”

OASIS has proven critical not only in enabling easier and more accurate reporting to funders, but also in adapting and creating programs that are even more effective in helping their clients achieve stability.
ness locally. If a ten year plan effort is already underway, foundations can provide meeting space, funding for staff, translators to broaden the cultural base, and childcare to ensure family participation.

They can also bring businesses, philanthropic organizations, and other groups to the table that might otherwise not participate. Foundation support for drafting, publishing, disseminating, and publicizing planning initiatives builds public knowledge and the will for action. As community plans are implemented, foundations can build institutional consensus among government agencies, businesses, and community organizations to identify resources.

Sound community planning often requires basic research and data analysis. HUD is requiring participating communities to develop a homelessness management information system (HMIS) to track data on local housing, shelter use, and community resources. An HMIS allows communities to better understand the nature of the problem and to plan adequate solutions. Foundations can help communities develop these sustainable information systems.

As community programs are implemented, questions arise about return on investment, benefits, and cost effectiveness. Foundation support for evaluations and cost studies allows providers and funders to demonstrate success and make the case for ongoing investment. Evaluation can be used to refine models that are not working well, understand unanticipated consequences, and identify areas for further investment.

Here in the Bay Area, there are fewer models of best practices launched to address community planning to end homelessness. The following examples, from outside the Bay Area, are included to challenge local funders and providers to emulate best practices from other parts of the country to effectively address the root causes of homelessness on this front.

“Community collaborations through Continuum of Care and ten year plans offer foundations a variety of opportunities to provide support.”
Cross-Sector Collaboration on Chicago’s Continuum of Care

Since the late 1990s, the Chicago metropolitan area has been working to create a comprehensive plan to end homelessness within ten years. “Getting Housed, Staying Housed: A Collaborative Plan to End Homelessness,” is the result of an unprecedented collaboration among area foundations, advocates, providers, and government officials in the region.

By 1998, homelessness had become a controversial and public issue in metropolitan Chicago. Opinions about the severity of the problem differed widely among public officials, advocacy organizations, and foundation board members. However, as eight separate jurisdictions began to prepare for Continuum of Care plans, many agreed that some coordination would be necessary to both understand and solve the problem.

The Grantmakers Concerned with the Homeless, an affinity group of the Donors Forum of Chicago, questioned the lack of data on which to base grantmaking decisions. The Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation and the Gaylord and Dorothy Donnelley Foundation together sponsored a retreat of interested parties, including representatives from the local jurisdictions, area foundations, advocacy groups, and providers. The retreat ultimately led to collaboration on the development of a common regional homeless needs assessment. This process was paid for in part by foundation grants, including $30,000 from the McCormick Tribune Foundation, $20,000 from the Donnelley Foundation, and $150,000 from The Chicago Community Trust.

This unique collaboration led directly to a better coordinated Continuum of Care that is now facilitated by the Partnership to End Homelessness. A Chicago Continuum of Care Governing Council was established to plan, execute, and evaluate the city’s efforts to serve homeless individuals and families. The elected Governing Body includes 54 non-profit providers, government agencies, housing corporations, donors, and health care organizations.

Foundations such as The Chicago Community Trust and Polk Bros. Foundation both serve on the Governing Board and fund the Continuum of Care process. In 2002, The Chicago Community Trust provided $25,000 to the Chicago Continuum of Care, while Polk Bros. Foundation has provided an annual grant of $20,000 over the past three years. Additional funders continue to participate in the plan and examine how the funding community can work together. Furthermore, the plan has shaped how the city makes its decisions to distribute public funds and increased communication between federal, state, and local governments and the providers of homeless and housing services in the community.
Preventing Homelessness

Homeless prevention targets resources to those most likely to become homeless, such as families behind in their rent or facing eviction, people returning to society from incarceration, youth emancipating from the foster care system, or women fleeing domestic violence. Support for prevention strategies is especially important as they seek to avert human suffering, greatly decreasing the societal and financial costs of homelessness. Among the most common strategies:

- **Emergency assistance** provides immediate help in the form of rent or utility payments, legal advocacy during eviction, or in-home services for elderly having difficulty with daily activities.

- **Crisis prevention** targets individuals and families at high-risk of becoming homeless because of rent increases, unemployment, illness, or other personal crises. Intervention begins before a housing emergency occurs.

- **Discharge planning** prevents people who are leaving inpatient health facilities, aging out of foster care, or being discharged from correctional facilities from becoming homeless.

- **Capacity development** expands the supply of affordable housing directly through renovation or new construction, or indirectly by advocating for zoning laws or building codes that support preservation or construction.

Breaking the Cycle: Ending Homelessness for the Most Long-Term—and Costly—Populations

The Frequent Users of Health Services Initiative is a five-year, $10 million statewide project jointly sponsored by The California Endowment and the California Healthcare Foundation. The Initiative seeks to improve the care of under- and uninsured, chronically ill Californians by fostering innovative health care delivery systems, coordinated with non-medical support services, that result in improved health outcomes and help reduce costly and inefficient use of emergency rooms and inpatient services. The Initiative has two key goals: to improve healthcare delivery for people who have serious health and psychosocial conditions and use a disproportionate amount of available health services without achieving positive health outcomes; and to support changes in the financing, structure, and delivery of health and related services that break the cycle of repeated and unnecessary use of high-intensity services. Planning grants are awarded for up to $100,000, and three-year implementation grants may be awarded for up to $900,000.

The Initiative defines “frequent users” as chronically ill, under- or uninsured individuals who repeatedly use emergency rooms and hospitals for medical crises that could be prevented with ongoing care. While the program does not explicitly concern itself with the housing status of its patient population, it is well understood that many members of the target population are long-term and repeatedly homeless. The Initiative is a collaborative effort with the California program of the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH).

In 2003, the Initiative awarded its first grants—one for implementation and six for planning across the state. Its success to date is that for the first time, cross-jurisdictional planning to end homelessness is taking place among bureaucracies that have historically communicated poorly with one another and not focused upon housing outcomes.
Safety Net for Foster Youth: the First Place Fund for Youth

In California, 63% of the 2,500 youth who age out of foster care annually become homeless. The First Place Fund for Youth in Oakland provides case management, supportive housing, transportation, life skills training, and loan assistance services to transition these young people safely into society.

In 2002, The San Francisco Foundation awarded $40,000 to the First Place Fund for Youth to expand its overall infrastructure and fundraising capacity. Only four years old, the First Place Fund for Youth has already demonstrated significant success in helping more than 200 young people (ages 17-21) each year become self-sufficient as they moved out of the foster care system. First Place also convenes the Foster Youth Alliance, a coalition of over 15 public and private agencies working to help former foster youth in Alameda County.

The San Francisco Foundation recognized the First Place Fund for Youth’s ability to lead and advocate for emancipated foster youth, and its success in preventing homelessness.

Like many newspapers, the San Francisco Chronicle raises money from its readership annually to distribute regionally to people in need. What sets the Chronicle’s Season of Sharing program apart is its emphasis on providing cash assistance to help people meet critical housing needs, stemming from its origin in 1986 as an extension of the Emergency Family Needs/Housing Assistance Fund administered by Northern California Grantmakers.


In addition, providing specialized services to particularly vulnerable populations—such as adults and children who have experienced trauma, people with a mental illness, and people with substance abuse disorders—can help to keep these people from experiencing, or returning to, homelessness.

Foundations can contribute to prevention efforts by supporting:

- Programs to provide short-term loans or small grants to families and individuals facing eviction for non-payment of rent, or assistance with utility bills and heating expenses and other household expenses.
- Organizations that offer legal counsel to individuals and families in eviction proceedings, or advocates who work with judges and social service agencies to prevent eviction.
- Tenants’ rights advocacy to hold absentee landlords accountable for housing safety.
- Community advocacy to expand single room occupancy (SRO) housing as a cost-effective option for unaccompanied adults.

For many government and non-profit service providers, homelessness prevention is viewed as a secondary strategy. Foundations can promote prevention programs by convening expert panels to develop front-line prevention strategies in their communities, and encouraging programmers to include prevention in all homelessness initiatives.
Expanding Housing Supply

Affordable housing is the centerpiece of any plan to end homelessness. Without sufficient housing, no amount of services or shelters will have a lasting impact. Although housing can be a complex issue, there are multiple points of entry for grantmakers of every size to make thoughtful and strategic investments to expand access to affordable housing and provide necessary supports to keep people housed.

Program Related Investments

Program Related Investments (PRIs) are low- or no-interest loans, equity investments, or loan guarantees made by foundations to further their charitable goals. They are made by foundations of all sizes and types as well as non-foundation charities associated with businesses and religious institutions. They are distinct from grants because they are structured to recover the foundation’s investment.

Foundations frequently use PRIs to fund affordable housing and supportive housing programs. For non-profit housing groups that cannot obtain traditional financing or need loans for pre-development costs before they are eligible for traditional loans, PRIs can jump-start projects. PRIs make housing programs more attractive to funders that might otherwise be cautious of large capital investments.

One of the major benefits of PRIs is their leveraging power—a relatively small strategic loan or loan guarantee can often leverage other sources at ratios of five to one or greater. PRIs are also a great resource in capacity building efforts by helping organizations to develop credit histories, secure other funding, and build assets.

Ultimately, PRIs allow foundations to utilize a great portion of their assets to further their social missions by recycling additional funds from the endowment’s asset base. For foundations without in-house expertise to make such loans, many expert intermediaries are available to facilitate the process (see Resources).

Developing and Maintaining Affordable Housing

Pre-development and bridge financing by foundations alleviate some of the risk that nonprofit developers bear and allow them to qualify for public subsidies when developing affordable housing.

Direct assistance strategies can help families and individuals obtain and maintain rental housing. Foundations can provide code enforcement to improve rental housing safety and quality, training to help tenants understand their rights and responsibilities, and support to community-based organizations that secure master rental leases.

Housing Trust Funds

Housing trust funds are established by legislation or ordinance to capture public revenues from dedicated funding sources (e.g., taxes, fees) to support investment in a broad range of housing activities, including construction, rehabilitation, and rental assistance. For example, a city might pass an ordinance to set aside a portion of local property tax revenues for a housing trust fund earmarked to build affordable housing for low-income residents. More than 275 housing trust funds have been established in the United States at state, city, county, and multi-jurisdictional levels. Because the housing trust fund movement is vibrant and growing, it presents a ripe opportunity for foundation investment.
Strategic Asset Leveraging: The Sobrato Family Affordable Housing Fund

The affordable housing crisis in Silicon Valley is among the most severe in California. San Jose Mayor Ron Gonzalez’s re-election in 2002 turned partly on his commitment to increase the supply of affordable housing. By one estimate, 7,700 new units are needed in Santa Clara County each year just to keep pace with demand.

In 2001, the Sobrato Family Foundation launched a multi-million dollar revolving loan fund aimed at assisting nonprofit housing developers in creating affordable rental, homeless, and transitional housing. The Affordable Housing Fund provides risk tolerant, interest-free loans, specifically for predevelopment and land acquisition costs that are traditionally unavailable to nonprofits.

The Fund is an innovative cross-sector collaboration, strategically designed to leverage the resources of the Housing Trust Fund in Santa Clara County. By providing early, risk-tolerant capital for projects, the Sobrato Affordable Housing Fund increases the likelihood that nonprofit housing development corporations will be able to seize opportunities, and make full use of the County’s Housing Trust Fund and other financing at later stages of development. The Fund is administered by Lenders for Community Development, a community-based nonprofit lending institution, in association with the Sobrato Family Foundation.

The Fund emerged from the Sobrato family’s intimate knowledge of the need for housing in the community. For more than 40 years, Sobrato Development Companies has developed complex facilities and residential properties and currently owns in excess of 7,000 apartment homes. As the Foundation chairman says, “We need homes for teachers and firefighters, for those working in our grocery store and in community service. Housing is about helping people find a place. It doesn’t get more fundamental than that.” As of October, 2003, the Sobrato Affordable Housing Fund has supported local nonprofit housing developers with $2.9 million in program-related investments resulting in the creation of 1,328 units of affordable housing, primarily for households earning less than $26,439 annually for a family of four.
To help establish a housing trust fund campaign, foundations can support efforts to:

- Convene nonprofit developers with housing advocates, public officials, and other potential allies such as the faith community to form a core organizing committee.
- Document community housing costs, resources and affordability standards.
- Educate policymakers and the public about the need for affordable housing.
- Sustain the core organizing committee as it works to establish the housing trust fund.

Foundations can also support local and statewide coalitions working to establish trust funds, media and public education campaigns to publicize need, and groups that monitor how trust fund monies are spent.

**Permanent Supportive Housing**

Permanent supportive housing joins permanent housing with appropriate services such as health care, addiction treatment, and employment supports. This innovative approach to ending homelessness has been shown to stabilize long-term homeless individuals and families. A strong support system at the housing site helps residents address underlying problems—including mental illness, chemical dependencies, and chronic health challenges—that contribute to repeated experiences of homelessness.

The Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), which works to develop permanent supportive housing with partners across the

---

**Organizational Effectiveness for Housing Trust Funds: Peer Learning for Best Practices**

In 2002, the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation made a grant of $25,000 to the Center for Community Change’s National Housing Trust Fund Project to stimulate the development of housing trust funds (HTFs) in the San Francisco Bay Area. The National Housing Trust Fund Project provides technical assistance to organizations and agencies working to create or implement housing trust funds, and operates as a clearinghouse of information on funds throughout the country. The project also provides technical assistance to execute an effective campaign to create and implement a successful housing trust fund.

In early 2003, the Center arranged a convening of Bay Area organizations interested in creating HTFs. After the meeting, participants overwhelmingly indicated their desire for ongoing technical assistance and networking, and moved to form a cluster of Bay Area groups to learn from one another. The Fannie Mae Foundation agreed to sponsor the cluster and provide funding for meeting costs.

After just six months, two counties, Alameda and Contra Costa, are now working on developing new housing trust fund campaigns. Additionally, in San Francisco and Santa Clara counties, where housing trust funds exist but lack permanent, dedicated public revenue sources, studies and planning efforts are now underway to determine ongoing financing mechanisms. The Fannie Mae and Schwab Foundations have been particularly pleased with the initial results, stating “We couldn’t adequately support individual grants to more than 20 nonprofits engaged in similar advocacy work, but the cluster gives us a way to provide excellent technical assistance and gives them an opportunity to network to increase their chances of success.”
Creating Capital:
Marin Community Foundation’s $10 Million Housing Fund

Marin County faces a chronic shortfall of affordable housing, and by the late 1990s, as housing prices soared higher than ever before, the supply of affordable housing dwindled even further. To address this problem, in 2001 the Marin Community Foundation earmarked $10 million to increase the supply of permanently affordable housing; $9.5 million was set aside for pre-construction, construction or acquisition, with the remaining $500,000 dedicated to supporting policy initiatives and local infrastructure development to address the affordable housing deficit.

To date, $6 million has been invested to create approximately 250 permanently affordable units, with a goal of funding the creation of 500 units in total.

country, has contributed to the development of almost 10,000 units of supportive housing nationally, with 7,000 more units currently in the works. Ultimately, 150,000 to 250,000 units of permanent supportive housing are needed as part of a national strategy to end long-term homelessness in ten years. Permanent supportive housing has proved to be extremely successful with some populations, such as mentally ill people, who benefit from living independently while gaining support as needed. CSH studies show that 80% or more of mentally ill residents remain housed 12 months after entering supportive housing.

Savings from lower utilization of high-cost public services will largely offset the cost of this investment. A 2002 study by Dennis Culhane showed that homeless people in supportive housing significantly reduce their use of shelters, hospitals, and jails, resulting in savings of $16,281 per housing unit per year.

Permanent supportive housing programs present a range of options for foundation support:

- Provide grants and capacity building toward the development, rehabilitation, and maintenance of units for permanent supportive housing.
- Fund policy advocacy activities to increase federal, state, and local funding for supportive housing, especially funding for the services component of these projects.
- Fund public education campaigns to build community consensus around the need and the value of supportive housing.
- Provide funds for on-site health and mental health care, addiction services, and employment supports such as child care, transportation, and work-place advocacy.
- Provide general operating support to supportive housing programs.
Maintaining Housing Through Supportive Services

When people are forced to choose between meeting their basic needs and paying for housing, the result can be homelessness. As such, solutions require not only a place to live, but also an integrated array of support services that help adults and children find housing and stay housed.

Supportive services include a wide range of activities, from programs that help people meet their financial needs to services that address chronic physical and mental health issues that can keep people from staying housed.

Any foundation can make homelessness a funding priority by simply including homeless people in their current mix of human service program areas. For example:

Housing Placement and Retention
- Programs that conduct marketing and outreach to landlords, and those that provide incentives for landlords that rent to homeless people.
- Landlord/tenant mediation.
- Increasing access to housing subsidies and vouchers.
- Shelter and transitional housing that serve special needs populations, such as young mothers and victims of domestic violence.

Long-Term Support to Ensure Stable Housing: Canon Barcus Community House

Canon Barcus is a 48-unit apartment building in San Francisco's South of Market region offering permanent affordable housing with supportive services to formerly homeless families with children.

The building was developed by Episcopal Community Services (ECS), which bought the property in 1998 and tore down the existing commercial structure. ECS has worked closely with the City and County of San Francisco throughout the development of Canon Barcus, and all of the resident families came from the City's Section 8 or Shelter+Care waiting lists. The new building cost $20.5 million to construct, which included $17 million in public funds or tax credits and $3.5 million in private contributions from individuals, corporations and foundations.

In addition to its 48 units, which range in size from one to four bedrooms, Canon Barcus also includes an on-site after school program for children ages 5-12, a childcare program for preschoolers, a part-time health clinic, adult education and family literacy clinics, case managers and vocational specialists. Families are not required to avail themselves of any of the services as a condition of occupancy, but are strongly encouraged to do so. Likewise, services such as the after school and childcare program are open to non-residents.

The development of Canon Barcus was truly a collaborative effort of many government and foundation funders. Canon Barcus services are also funded by The City and County of San Francisco, along with key foundation partners, including: the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, Altria Corporate Foundation, UPS Foundation and the Wood-Kaufman Donor Advised Fund of The San Francisco Foundation.
Learning by Example: Piloting a Housing First Initiative

“Housing First,” developed by the Los Angeles-based non-profit Beyond Shelter, rapidly re-houses homeless families in their own apartments and provides follow-up on-site case management services. This approach, endorsed as a best practice by the National Alliance to End Homelessness and adopted by communities across the country, is widely considered a successful strategy to end homelessness.

The initial success of Housing First led the Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation to convene a collaborative of Santa Clara County agencies to adapt the model for the San Jose area. A planning group of housing authority staff, private foundations, and homeless service providers met for nine months to develop the program. The Schwab Foundation provided $385,000 in grants to the Santa Clara Housing First Collaborative’s participating agencies (Emergency Housing Consortium, InnVision, Santa Clara Housing Authority) along with $25,000 to evaluate the project. The Sobrato Family Foundation and the Housing Industry Foundation contributed $50,000 each toward security deposits and first month’s rent for the families. The Santa Clara Housing Authority committed 100 Section 8 vouchers per year, with a value of over $1.4 million annually.

To date, 55 families have been enrolled into the program, and participants have been able to move into permanent housing in less than two weeks after receiving a Section 8 voucher.

Health, Mental Health, Substance Abuse, and Trauma

- Programs that provide mainstream health care services.
- Programs for uninsured people such as Medicaid and CHIP.
- Community outreach and engagement activities that link homeless people with mental health and addiction treatment.
- Specialized services to meet the needs of subsets of the homeless population, such as victims of domestic violence and veterans.

Education and Employment

- Job training, job creation, and job retention services.
- Vocational, adult literacy and educational services.
- Childcare and transportation.
- Programs that help homeless people demonstrate their eligibility for public assistance.
- Ensure access to supports for homeless people such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and food stamps.

Children and Youth

- Enforcement of federal and state laws regarding homeless children’s right to attend and succeed in school.
- Services that promote healthy growth and development such as enriched day care, early intervention, child development activities, health, nutrition, mentoring, recreation, and youth leadership.
- Services to meet the specialized needs of homeless youth, such as youth aging out of the foster care system and youth experiencing trauma.
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Health, Mental Health, Substance Abuse, and Trauma

- Programs that provide mainstream health care services.
- Programs for uninsured people such as Medicaid and CHIP.

Education and Employment

- Job training, job creation, and job retention services.
- Vocational, adult literacy and educational services.

Children and Youth

- Enforcement of federal and state laws regarding homeless children’s right to attend and succeed in school.
A CALL To Action

Homelessness has been the proverbial elephant in the room for philanthropy—undeniably there and troubling, but seemingly too monolithic to confront. With foundations historically allocating only 1% of annual giving to homelessness, we have not devoted sustained attention or resources to this nation-wide problem. It is past time for us to acknowledge the reality and pervasiveness of homelessness in America, and take forceful steps to help end it.

The philanthropic community can serve as a linchpin of local and national efforts. We can help to galvanize political will by making homelessness a high-profile public issue. We can guide and motivate dispersed providers of human services to leverage each other’s contributions by coordinating their efforts. We can fund research to document preventive approaches and support services that succeed. We have the flexibility and the resources to develop new strategies to create and sustain affordable housing.

The main task at hand is to summon our own will to act. Each of us can contribute immediately, as the range of needed programming is sufficiently broad to meet the current funding priorities of most any foundation. Great opportunities exist in traditional funding areas of housing, health, human services, community development, education, and services for children, youth, and families. More important than the magnitude of engagement is the unanimity of our action.

The stories told here make it clear that any foundation concerned with human suffering and alleviating poverty has a role to play—whether it is formulating policy, developing model programs, integrating human services for homeless clients, or leveraging resources to build affordable housing. Many of our communities are hard at work on concrete, feasible plans to end homelessness. It is time for us to join them.

Homelessness has not always been a significant feature of American life. Research and model programs give us the knowledge of what to do and the confidence that our efforts will be effective. This nation can rise to the challenge of ending homelessness and the philanthropic community can lead the way. We invite your support, participation, and leadership. To become involved or for further information, please go to www.homelessphilanthropy.org.
RESOURCES
Contact Information for Giving Profiles

Building Political Will

Educating the Public
Marin Community Foundation
5 Hamilton Landing, Suite 200
Novato, CA 94949
(t) 415-464-2500
www.marincf.org

Public Policy Making Through the Initiative Process
Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund
One Market, Landmark, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(t) 415-856-1400
www.haasjr.org

The San Francisco Foundation
225 Bush St., Suite 5
San Francisco, CA 94104-4224
(t) 415-733-8500
www.sff.org

Housing California
926 J Street, Suite 1400
Sacramento, CA 95814
(t) 916-447-1867
www.housingca.org

Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
369 Pine Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94104
(t) 415-989-8160
www.nonprofithousing.org

Religious Congregations Turn Up the HEAT for Affordable Housing
S.H. Cowell Foundation
120 Montgomery Street, Suite 2570
San Francisco, CA 94104
(t) 415-397-0285
www.shcowell.org

Peninsula Community Foundation
1700 South El Camino Real, Suite 300
San Mateo, CA 94042
(t) 650-358-9369
www.pcf.org

Peninsula Interfaith Action
1336 Arroyo Avenue
San Carlos, Ca 94070-3913
(t) 650-592-9181
www.piapico.org

Community Planning & Evaluation to End Homelessness
Closing the Information Gap
The Roberts Enterprise Development Fund
PO Box 29566
San Francisco, CA 94129
(t) 415-561-6677
www.redf.org

Rubicon Programs, Inc.
2500 Bissell Avenue
Richmond, CA 94804
(t) 510-235-1516
www.rubiconpgms.org

Cross Sector Collaboration on Chicago’s Continuum of Care
The Chicago Community Trust
111 East Wacker Dr., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60601
(t) 312-616-8000
www.cct.org

The Gaylord and Dorothy Donnelley Foundation
35 East Wacker Dr., Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60601
(t) 312-977-2700
www.gddf.org

The Robert R. McCormick Tribune Foundation
435 North Michigan Ave., Suite 770
Chicago, IL 60611
(t) 312-222-3512
www.rrmtf.org

Polk Bros. Foundation, Inc.
20 West Kinzie St., Suite 1110
Chicago, IL 60610
(t) 312-527-4684
www.polkbrosfdn.org

City of Chicago Continuum of Care
1111 North Wells, Suite 500
Chicago, IL 60610
(t) 312-573-8819
www.chicagocontinuum.org
**Preventing Homelessness**

*Breaking the Cycle*

The California Endowment  
21650 Oxnard Street, Suite 1200  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
(t) 818-703-3311  
www.calendow.org

California Healthcare Foundation  
476 Ninth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
(t) 510-238-1040  
www.chcf.org

Corporation for Supportive Housing  
1330 Broadway, Suite 601  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(t) 510-251-1910  
www.csh.org

*Prevention in Collaboration with the Press*

San Francisco Chronicle Season of Sharing  
901 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(t) 415-777-7120  
www.seasonofsharing.org

*Safety Net for Foster Youth*

The San Francisco Foundation  
(See previous listing)

First Place Fund for Youth  
1755 Broadway, Suite 304  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(t) 510-272-0979  
www.firstplacefund.org

**Expanding the Housing Supply**

*Strategic Asset Leveraging*

Sobrato Family Foundation  
10600 N. De Anza Boulevard, Suite 225  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
(t) 408-996-9500  
www.sobrato.com/foundation

Lenders For Community Development  
111 West St. John Street, Suite 710  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(t) 408-297-0204  
www.l4cd.com

*Organizing Effectiveness for Housing Trust Funds*

Fannie Mae Foundation  
Western Regional Office  
135 N. Los Robles Ave., Suite 300  
Pasadena, CA 91101-1707  
626-396-5310  
www.fanniemaefoundation.org

Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation  
1650 South Amphlett Blvd., Suite 300  
San Mateo, CA 94402-2516  
(t) 650-655-2410  
www.schwabfoundation.org

Center for Community Change—National Housing Trust Fund Project  
1000 Wisconsin Ave. NW  
Washington DC 20007  
(t) 202-342-0519  
www.communitychange.org

*Creating Capital*

Marin Community Foundation  
(See previous listing)

**Maintaining Housing through Supportive Services**

*Long-Term Support to Ensure Stable Housing*

Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation  
(See previous listing)

Wood-Kaufman Foundation  
(See previous listing)

Canon Barcus Community House  
Episcopal Community Services  
165 Eighth Street, 3rd floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(t) 415-487-3700  
www.ecs-sf.org

*Learning by Example*

Housing Industry Foundation  
1845 South Bascom Avenue, Suite A-33  
Campbell, CA 95008  
(t) 408-369-9900  
www.housingindustryfoundation.org

Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation  
(See previous listing)

Sobrato Family Foundation  
(See previous listing)

Emergency Housing Consortium  
2011 Little Orchard St.  
San Jose, CA 95125  
(t) 408-294-2100  
www.homelessness.org
For More Information on Homelessness and Affordable Housing

The following organizations can provide background information, current public policy issues, and contacts for local organizations dealing with homelessness:

**Beyond Shelter**
520 South Virgil Ave., Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90020
(t) 213-252-0772
(l) 213-480-0846
www.beyondshelter.org

**Corporation for Supportive Housing**
1330 Broadway, Suite 601
Oakland, CA 94612
(t) 510-251-1910
(l) 510-251-5954
www.csh.org

**Health Care for the Homeless Information Resource Center**
c/o Policy Research Associates
345 Delaware Ave.
Delmar, NY 12054
(t) 888-439-3300 ext. 247
(l) 518-439-7612
www.bphc.hrsa.gov/hcrirc

**Homebase**
870 Market Street, Suite 1228
San Francisco, CA 94102
(t) 415-788-7961
(l) 415-788-7965
www.homebaseccc.org

**HUD USER**
P.O. Box 23268
Washington, DC 20026
(t) 1-800-245-2691
(l) 202-708-9981
www.huduser.org

**National Alliance to End Homelessness**
1518 K St., NW, Suite 206
Washington, DC 20005
(t) 202-638-1526
(l) 202-638-4664
www.naeh.org

**National Center for Homeless Education**
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro, NC 27435
(t) 800-308-2145
(t) 336-315-7400
(l) 336-315-7457
www.serve.org/nche

**National Center on Family Homelessness**
181 Wells Ave.
Newton Centre, MA 02459
(t) 617-964-3834
(l) 617-244-1758
www.familyhomelessness.org

**National Coalition for the Homeless**
1012 Fourteenth St., NW, #600
Washington, DC 20005-3410
(t) 202-737-6444
(l) 202-737-6445
www.nationalhomeless.org

**National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty**
1411 K St., NW, Suite 1400
Washington, DC 20005
(t) 202-638-2535
(l) 202-628-2737
www.nlchp.org

**National Network for Youth**
1319 F St., NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20004
(t) 202-783-7949
(l) 202-783-7955
www.nn4youth.org

**National Resource Center on Homelessness and Mental Illness**
345 Delaware Ave.
Delmar, NY 12054
(t) 800-444-7415
(l) 518-439-7612
www.nrchmi.com

**Technical Assistance Collaborative**
535 Boylston St., Suite 1301
Boston, MA 02116
(t) 617-266-5657
www.tacinc.org
The following organizations can provide background information, current public policy issues, and contacts for state and local organizations dealing with affordable housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Justice</td>
<td>11 Dupont Circle, NW, 2nd Floor Washington, DC 20036</td>
<td>(t) 202-822-6070</td>
<td>(f) 202-822-6068</td>
<td><a href="http://www.afj.org">www.afj.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Budget Project</td>
<td>921 11th Street, Suite 502 Sacramento, CA 95814-2820</td>
<td>(t) 916-444-0500</td>
<td>(f) 916-444-0172</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbp.org">www.cbp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Community Change</td>
<td>1000 Wisconsin Ave. NW Washington DC 20007</td>
<td>(t) 202-342-0519</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitychange.org">www.communitychange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enterprise Foundation</td>
<td>10227 Wincopin Circle, Suite 500 Columbia, MD 21044</td>
<td>(t) 410-964-1230</td>
<td>(f) 410-964-1918</td>
<td><a href="http://www.enterprisefoundation.org">www.enterprisefoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assistance Council</td>
<td>1025 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 606 Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td>(t) 202-842-8600</td>
<td>(f) 202-347-3441</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ruralhome.org">www.ruralhome.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing California</td>
<td>926 J Street, Suite 1400 Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
<td>(t) 916-447-0503</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.housingca.org">www.housingca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Housing and Community Development KnowledgePlex</td>
<td>c/o The Fannie Mae Foundation 4000 Wisconsin Ave., NW North Tower, Suite One Washington, DC 20016-2804</td>
<td>(t) 877-363-PLEX (f) 202-274-8100</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.knowledgeplex.org">www.knowledgeplex.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)</td>
<td>369 Pine Street, Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94104</td>
<td>(t) 415-397-7322 (f) 415-397-8605</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bayarealisc.org">www.bayarealisc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Housing Investment Fund</td>
<td>1330 Broadway, Suite 600 Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>(t) 510-893-3811 (f) 510-893-3964</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.lihf.org">www.lihf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Investment Fund</td>
<td>1330 Broadway, Suite 600 Oakland, CA 94612</td>
<td>(t) 510-893-3811 (f) 510-893-3964</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.liifund.org">www.liifund.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Housing Law Project</td>
<td>614 Grand Ave., Suite 320 Oakland, CA 94610</td>
<td>(t) 510-251-9400 (f) 510-451-2300</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.housinglaw.org">www.housinglaw.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Low Income Housing Coalition</td>
<td>1012 Fourteenth St. NW, Suite 610 Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td>(t) 202-662-1530 (f) 202-393-1973</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nlihc.org">www.nlihc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California</td>
<td>369 Pine Street, Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94104</td>
<td>(t) 415-989-8160 (f) 415-989-8166</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nonprofithousing.org">www.nonprofithousing.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California Community Loan Fund</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 677 San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
<td>(t) 415-392-8215 (f) 415-392-8216</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ncclf.org">www.ncclf.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This guide is the product of a collaboration between the Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness and the National Center on Family Homelessness. First launched as a national initiative, this project was designed to educate the philanthropic community on issues of homelessness and increase their involvement in addressing this crisis. The goal of this guide is to:

- Understand Bay Area philanthropy’s historical commitment to homelessness.
- Highlight effective grantmaking strategies for preventing and ending homelessness in the Bay Area.
- Engage new levels of philanthropic support and collaboration to end homelessness in the Bay Area.

In order to meet this goal, the National Center on Family Homelessness used multiple strategies to gather comprehensive data on the role of Bay Area foundations in homelessness. Data collection strategies included key informant interviews, a focus group, an analysis of data on philanthropic giving trends, and a national survey.
Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were conducted by telephone with staff members at 30 foundations that are located in—or fund organizations in—the Bay Area, and that currently fund or have previously funded in homelessness. These structured interviews lasted approximately one hour. Questions addressed how giving in homelessness and affordable housing fit within foundations’ priority areas; the nature of foundations’ giving in the areas of homelessness and housing; effective and beneficial funding strategies; and challenges and barriers to funding in homelessness and housing. For those foundations that have reduced or stopped funding in homelessness, additional questions addressed the reasons for reducing or eliminating such funding and what would cause them to fund in these areas in the future. Foundations were also asked about the impact of the Northern California Grantmakers’ former Task Force on Homelessness. The foundations that were interviewed as part of this study are listed here:

Atkinson Foundation, San Mateo, CA
Bothis Foundation, San Francisco, CA
The Butler Family Fund, Washington, DC
The California Endowment, Woodland Hills, CA
The California Wellness Foundation, Woodland Hills, CA
C.A.W. Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Community Foundation of Silicon Valley, San Jose, CA
Mary A. Crocker Trust, San Francisco, CA
East Bay Community Foundation, Oakland, CA
Friedman Family Foundation, San Mateo, CA
The Carl Gellert and Celia Berta Gellert Foundation, San Francisco, CA
The Fred Gellert Family Foundation, San Rafael, CA
William G. Gilmore Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund, San Francisco, CA
Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund, San Francisco, CA
Walter and Elise Haas Fund, San Francisco, CA
The James Irvine Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Walter S. Johnson Foundation, Menlo Park, CA
Kimball Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Louis R. Lurie Foundation, San Francisco, CA
McKesson Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Bernard Osher Foundation, San Francisco, CA
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA
Peninsula Community Foundation, San Mateo, CA
Philanthropic Ventures Foundation, Oakland, CA
Roberts Enterprise Development Fund, San Francisco, CA
Rossi Family Foundation, Portola Valley, CA
The San Francisco Foundation, San Francisco, CA
Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, San Mateo, CA
United Way of the Bay Area, San Francisco, CA

An analysis of the key informant interviews provided a number of effective philanthropic strategies in helping to prevent and end homelessness in the Bay Area. Further research was then conducted to highlight specific innovative and effective grantmaking practices for the giving profiles.
Focus Group
The Northern California Grantmakers Task Force on Homelessness was a collaborative of Bay Area foundations interested in solving the problem of homelessness. The Task Force was in existence from 1989 to 1995. To learn more about the role of the Task Force, the National Center on Family Homelessness conducted a focus group with former members. The following people participated in the focus group:

Marcia Argyris, McKesson Foundation
Sandy Edwards, Koret Foundation
Joe Brooks, Policy Link
Nick Bowman, California Center for Regional Leadership
Nancy Shillis, Evelyn and Walter Haas Foundation

Topics discussed included the impetus for creating the Task Force, the management of funds, the decision-making process, the challenges faced by the Task Force, and the reasons for the Task Force’s dissolution.

Trends in Philanthropic Giving in Homelessness
The National Center on Family Homelessness also conducted an analysis of philanthropic giving trends in the area of homelessness between 1990 and 1999, using data from the Foundation Center. The Foundation Center sample includes approximately 800 of the 1,000 largest foundations in the United States. In addition, 200 other foundations of varying size are included to provide depth and diversity to the sample. In 1998-1999, this group of foundations awarded $11.6 billion in grants, which represented about half of the total grants (dollars) awarded by all independent, corporate, and community foundations in the United States.

Data on each foundation are derived from a variety of different sources. The majority of the information comes from 990-PF forms reported to the IRS. The remaining information comes from Foundation Center surveys, foundation annual reports and other public documents, electronic files and web lists.
**Survey of Experts in the Field of Homelessness**

We sent letters to a large number of national experts working directly on issues of homelessness, including providers, advocates, policymakers, researchers, and homeless and formerly homeless people. Each respondent was asked to answer a single question: “What can foundations do to help end homelessness in America?” in whatever way they felt comfortable. While some people wrote lengthy responses on recent efforts to end homelessness, others provided one or two focused points. Feedback was solicited from 94 people and 72 responses were received. The respondents are listed here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policymakers</th>
<th>Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolt, Dona</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benson Forer, Elizabeth</strong> Chief Executive Officer, Venice Family Clinic, Venice, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Specialist, Oregon Department of Education, Salem, OR</td>
<td><strong>Butzen, Jean</strong> President and CEO, Lakefront SRO, Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DiBianco-Eik, Marie</strong> PATH and Housing Coordinator, New Mexico Department of Health, Santa Fe, NM</td>
<td><strong>Ehrlich, Risa</strong> New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisher, Sally</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fleetwood, Martha</strong> Executive Director, HomeBase/Center for Common Concerns, Inc., San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office for Emergency Shelter and Services, Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td><strong>Fox, Elaine</strong> VP, Special Health Services, Philadelphia Health Management Corp., Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hess, Rob</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goldfinger, Steve</strong> Vice Chair, Dept. of Psychology, State University of New York (SUNY) Health Science Center, Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Managing Director, Special Needs Housing, Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td><strong>Greer, Joe</strong> Medical Director, Camillus Health Concern, Miami, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hochron, Jean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Griffin, Shaun</strong> Executive Director, Community Chest, Inc., Virginia City, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Health Care for the Homeless Branch, Health Resources and Services Administration, United States Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD</td>
<td><strong>Hannigan, Tony</strong> Executive Director, Center for Urban Community Services, New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James, Barbara</strong></td>
<td><strong>Heilman, Sue</strong> Executive Director, Horizons Initiative, Dorchester, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator, Office for Education of and Youth, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX</td>
<td><strong>Helfgott, Kim</strong> Director, Program Services, Volunteers of America, Alexandria, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leginski, Walter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kopke, Jodi</strong> Development Director, Boulder Shelter for the Homeless, Boulder, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Advisor of Homelessness, Office of Asst. Secretary Planning and Evaluation, United States Department of Health and Human Services, Bethesda, MD</td>
<td><strong>Leonard, Sister Margaret</strong> Executive Director, Project Hope, Worcester, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Randolph, Fran</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lozier, John</strong> Executive Director, National Health Care for the Homeless Council, Nashville, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Chief, Homeless Programs Branch, Center for Mental Health Services, United States Department of Health and Human Services, Rockville, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raynor, Robin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Specialist, Office of Special Needs Housing, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wasmer, Dan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago MetroNorth Network Manager, Chicago-Read Mental Health Center, Chicago, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nilan, Diane  Program Director, PADS, Inc., Chicago, IL  
Pappas, Phil  Executive Director, Community Human Services, Pittsburgh, PA  
Phillips, Walter  Executive Director, San Diego Youth and Community Services, San Diego, CA  
Scullion, Sister Mary  Executive Director, Project H.O.M.E., Philadelphia, PA  
Sherman, Peter  Medical Director, NY Children’s Health Project/Children’s Hospital at Montefiore, New York, NY  
Singer, Jeff  President and CEO, Baltimore Health Care for the Homeless Project, Baltimore, MD  
Tull, Tanya  President and CEO, Beyond Shelter, Los Angeles, CA  
Weinreb, Linda  Director of Research, Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Massachusetts Medical Center, Worcester, MA  
White, Andrea  Chief Program Officer, Center for Urban Community Services, New York, NY  
White, Ruth  Director, Housing and Homeless, Child Welfare League of America, Washington, DC  

Dahl, Michael  Director, Minnesota Coalition for the Homeless, Minneapolis, MN  
Davis, Brian  Executive Director, Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless, Cleveland, OH  
Diotte, Kip  Executive Director, Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness, Lansing, MI  
Donahue, John  Executive Director, Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, Chicago, IL  
Erlenbusch, Bob  Executive Director, LA Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness, Los Angeles, CA  
Faith, Bill  Executive Director, Coalition on Homelessness and Housing in Ohio, Columbus, OH  
Farrell, Brenda  Worcester, MA  
Foscarinis, Maria  Executive Director, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, Washington, DC  
Glasser, Nicole  Public Education Specialist, Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, Boston, MA  
Herring, Robin  Consumer Panel Vice Chair, Pan Lutheran Ministries of Wake County, Raleigh, NC  
Housley, Donna  President, Warriors for Real Welfare Reform, Hartford, CT  
Javits, Carla  President, Corporation for Supportive Housing, New York, NY  
Lewis, Lynn  Co-Director, Picture the Homeless, New York, NY  
McKee-Huger, Beth  Executive Director, Greensboro Housing Coalition, Greensboro, NC  
Mott, Andrew  Executive Director, Center for Community Change, Washington, DC  
Noll, Gretchen  Acting Executive Director, National Network for Youth, Washington, DC  
Radnor, Nancy  Executive Director, Partnership to End Homelessness, Chicago, IL  

Advocates  
Boden, Paul  Executive Director, San Francisco Coalition for the Homeless, San Francisco, CA  
Boone, Linda  Executive Director, National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, Washington, DC  
Bowman, Diana  Director, National Center for Homeless Education Greensboro, NC  
Brosnahan Sullivan, Mary  Executive Director, Coalition for the Homeless, New York, NY  
Buchenholz, Gretchen  Executive Director, Association to Benefit Children, New York, NY  
Crowley, Sheila  President, National Low-Income Housing Coalition, Washington, DC
Reid, Kathy  Executive Director, Texas Homeless Network, 
	Austin, TX
Rhoades Clarke, Nelda  Vice Chair, St. Paul Area Coalition for the 
	Homeless, St. Paul, MN
Rogers, Diana  Coordinator, Family Housing Solutions, Trenton, NJ
Roman, Nan  President, National Alliance to End Homelessness, 
	Washington, DC
Verrier, Christine  Executive Director, Blueprint to End 
	Homelessness, Philadelphia, PA
Watlov Phillips, Sue  Acting Executive Director, National Coalition 
	for the Homeless, Washington, DC
West Blank, Angela  Director of the Annual Fund, Chicago 
	Coalition for the Homeless, Chicago, IL

Researchers
Breaky, William  Professor of Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins Hospital, 
	Baltimore, MD
Burt, Martha  Principal Research Associate, Urban Institute, 
	Washington, DC
Culhane, Dennis  Associate Professor of Social Work, University of 
	Pennsylvania, School of Social Work, Philadelphia, PA
Dennis, Deborah  VP of Technical Assistance, Policy Research 
	Associates (PRA)/National Resource Center On Homelessness and 
	Mental Illness, Delmar, NY
Haig Friedman, Donna  Director of the Center for Social Policy, 
	McCormack Institute for Public Affairs, Boston, MA
Morse, Gary  Executive Director, Community Alternatives, 
	St. Louis, MO
Rees, Susan  Director, Policy and Research, McAuley Institute, 
	Silver Spring, MD
Shinn, Marybeth  Professor of Psychology, New York University, 
	New York, NY
Homelessness can be ended.

Homelessness, particularly among families, has become a significant social problem only within the last 20 years. There is growing research, evidence and consensus that we can end it within the next decade.

We now know how to end homelessness.

More than a decade of research, as well as program and policy development, has identified the causes and effects of homelessness. We now have proven approaches that can prevent homelessness before it starts and end homelessness where it now exists.

There is a significant role for philanthropy in ending homelessness.

Historically, only about 1% of philanthropic funding has been directed toward homelessness, most of it for programs that only ameliorate the conditions of homelessness. With new research and approaches available, foundations can now make strategic contributions that have real impact in preventing and ending homelessness.

Philanthropy must partner with government, business and nonprofit sectors to eliminate homelessness from our national landscape.

Local and national efforts to end homelessness offer opportunities for foundations to achieve significant and lasting impact on this issue that deeply affects a wide range of human services that foundations support.