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Since January 2011, the Hilton Foundation has made nearly $18 million in grants to 14 nonprofits through the Initiative.

Grants are focused on:

- Regional systems change
- Targeted programs to serve chronically homeless individuals
- Dissemination of knowledge on evidence-based practices to prevent and end chronic homelessness
Research Question

Is the Chronic Homelessness Initiative an effective strategy to end and prevent chronic homelessness in Los Angeles County?

CHI Five Year Strategic Goals (established in 2010)

- Build demonstrated action by elected and public officials
- $90 million in public and private sector funds allocated to PSH
- 4,000 new PSH units made available
- A system of prioritizing chronically homeless persons for PSH
- 1,000 of the most vulnerable homeless persons housed in PSH and prevent 1,000 people from becoming chronically homeless
- Increased capacity to provide PSH effectively
Data Collection Overview

- First year assessment was based on:
  - Web-based survey: 460 local stakeholders
  - Interviews with 80 people from more than 50 organizations
  - 4 focus groups with formerly homeless PSH residents
  - Analysis of data from grantees – especially Home For Good, the Corporation for Supportive Housing, and Community Solutions
  - Analysis of LAHSA point-in-time count estimates and other third-party documentation
Progress toward CHI Goals

Build demonstrated action by elected and public officials
- Good data  Limited Progress

$90 million in public and private sector funds allocated to PSH
- Limited data  On Track

4,000 new PSH units made available
- Limited data  On Track

A system of prioritizing chronically homeless persons for PSH
- Limited data  Limited Progress

1,000 of the most vulnerable homeless persons housed in PSH and prevent 1,000 people from becoming chronically homeless
- Limited data  Mixed Progress

Increased capacity to provide PSH effectively
- Limited data  Limited Progress
Today’s Agenda

- Understanding the Supply of PSH: Housing Inventory Data
- Addressing Unmet Need: Increasing the Supply of the “right” PSH
- Prioritization: Connecting the Supply of PSH with the Need
Understanding the Supply of PSH

Housing Inventory Data
Create 3,000 units of project-based and 1,000 units of scattered-site PSH (2011-2012)

Total PSH units (including those dedicated to CH)

- Total Goal: 4,000
- Total: 4,980

Total PSH units dedicated to chronically homeless

- All project-based PSH units (including those dedicated to CH)
  - Goal: 3,000
  - Total: 2,805
- Project-based PSH units dedicated to chronically homeless
  - Total: 682
- All tenant-based vouchers (including those dedicated to CH)
  - Goal: 1,000
  - Total: 2,175
- Tenant-based PSH vouchers dedicated to chronically homeless
  - Total: 1,536

Sources: Home For Good and Corporation for Supportive Housing

Made available for occupancy in 2011
In pipeline prior to 2011
Added to pipeline since 2011
## Sources of Tenant-Based Vouchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>All PSH Vouchers (incl. those dedicated to CH)</th>
<th>Vouchers Dedicated to Chronically Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newly Funded and Made Available in 2011</td>
<td>Newly Funded and Anticipated to Come On Line in 2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Plus Care and Serial Inebriate Vouchers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Homeless HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Homeless HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD-VASH</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other PHA HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Home For Good and housing authorities*
Challenges

- Multiple stakeholders maintain separate inventories to track specific data needs
- Unit data varied depending on the source
- Challenges tracking tenant-based vouchers used in project-based developments
- Uniform inventory critical to understanding progress and to a coordinated entry system
- Opportunity to engage existing collaboration between multiple stakeholders working to update housing inventory
Related Recommendations

- Designate central database for project-based and scattered site PSH inventory (existing and pipeline)
  - Status: initial discussions between LAHSA, HACLA, HACoLA, and other key stakeholders supported by HUD TA

- Define methodologies using HMIS to track and report client outcomes for housing placement, retention, and health measures
  - Status: LAHSA standardizing CoC-wide performance measures tracked in HMIS; coordinating with Home For Good on Standards of Excellence
Addressing Unmet Need

Increasing the Supply of PSH Where and For Whom it's Most Needed
Estimated PSH Units Compared to Need

Sources: Home For Good, Corporation for Supportive Housing, and PIT counts
## Sources of Tenant-Based Vouchers

The table below summarizes the sources of tenant-based vouchers, distinguishing between all PSH vouchers (including those dedicated to chronically homeless individuals) and vouchers specifically dedicated to chronically homeless individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>All PSH Vouchers (incl. those dedicated to CH)</th>
<th>Vouchers Dedicated to Chronically Homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newly Funded and Made Available in 2011</td>
<td>Newly Funded and Anticipated to Come On Line in 2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Plus Care and Serial Inebriate Vouchers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Homeless HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Homeless HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD-VASH</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other PHA HCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Home For Good and housing authorities
Supply and Need by Geography

**Project-based Units**

- **SPA 1**
- **SPA 2**
- **SPA 3**
- **SPA 4**
- **SPA 5**
- **SPA 6**
- **SPA 7**
- **SPA 8**

**Sources:** Home For Good, Corporation for Supportive Housing, and PIT counts

- **CH-dedicated PSH units (2011 and pipeline)**
- **CH-dedicated PSH units (pre-2011): 15% turnover**
- **All other PSH units (pre-2011): 15% turnover**
- **Unmet need (chronically homeless individuals)**
No consensus about how to define, document, or measure “capacity”

Developers: Two thirds of survey respondents said it has become more difficult to develop PSH
  – Cited funding loss as the reason rather than a lack of skills
  – Need to cultivate capacity to produce PSH in underserved areas

Operating and services: funding was also cited as the major barrier, but team also identified capacity gaps related to:
  – Prioritization strategies
  – Shortening housing placement processes
  – Housing first philosophy
  – Addressing client social connectedness and landlord relations
  – Capacity for measuring tenant health outcomes over time
Related Recommendations

- Engage PHAs to designate more vouchers for CH and prioritize CH individuals for other vouchers.
- Continue to address funding gaps through the Funders Collaborative.
- Facilitate mentor matches between PSH providers to expand capacity and reach.
Prioritization

Connecting the Supply of PSH with the Need
Coordinated Entry and Prioritization

**Prioritization practices among Surveyed PSH providers (n=85)**

- **34%** do not have a community list, but do conduct their own assessment to determine priority
- **29%** have a community registry/priority list, but conduct their own assessment to determine priority
- **22%** percent select clients for placement from the community registry/priority list
- **9%** do not have a community registry/priority list, but clients referred have been prioritized by another program or outreach team

*Source: Abt Associates Inc. Stakeholder Survey, June and July 2012, n=85, all PSH operators and service providers using a prioritization tool*
Tools used by PSH providers for prioritization processes

1. HUD Definition of Chronically Homeless: 42.4%
2. Vulnerability Index Service Registries (Community Solutions): 21.2%
3. Housing readiness criteria (such as presence of income, clean criminal...): 12.9%
4. Not sure, but we do use a standard tool: 11.8%
5. Internal (included in "other"): 9.4%
6. FUSE Frequent Users (Crisis Indictor or 10th Decile): 9.4%

Source: Abt Associates Inc. Stakeholder Survey, June and July 2012, n=85, all PSH operators and service providers using a prioritization tool
Challenges

- Funding source restrictions (e.g. MHSA resources limited to SMI, DHS for people served by county hospitals, etc.)
- Regional restrictions – communities and providers targeting housing opportunities and resources to people identified in local registries and outreach
- Provider control over program enrollment – sometimes using housing to engage vulnerable people in services
- Reconciling eligibility requirements and priorities
Related Recommendations

- Establish coordinated placement system(s) to prioritize and expedite placement for CH
  - Status:
    - Need for broader agreement to prioritize vulnerable populations
    - Skid Row pilot initiative represents an opportunity to learn and provide input into the process

- Match CH registry(ies) and prioritization data with housing placement data
  - Status: Under consideration
Next: Table discussions (25 min)

Then: Panel discussion and report-out (1 hour)
Panel

- Los Angeles County
  - Elizabeth Boyce, LCSW, Homeless Coordinator

- Weingart Foundation
  - Fred Ali, President

- Los Angeles Housing Department
  - Mercedes Marquez, Deputy Mayor for Housing & General Manager

- Los Angeles Homeless Service Authority
  - Michael Arnold, Executive Director

- LA Family Housing
  - Stephanie Klasky-Gamer, President & CEO
Discussion Topics

- Understanding the Supply of PSH: Housing Inventory Data
  - How do we make progress toward a shared inventory of PSH that is accurate, useful, and accessible?

- Addressing Unmet Need: Increasing the Supply of the “Right” PSH
  - What are the biggest gaps in the supply of PSH to meet the needs of people experiencing chronically homelessness and what are we going to do to address them?

- Prioritization: Connecting the Supply of PSH with the Need
  - How do we align PSH supply and needs to maximize the impact on the most vulnerable people? How can we create a coordinated entry system that respects priorities and restrictions of housing providers, funders, and other key stakeholders?
Panel Introductions

(15 minutes)