

Report on Homeless Housing Gaps in the County of Los Angeles

A Homeless Crisis Response System Model

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

February 2018



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....3
A. OVERVIEW 3
B. OBJECTIVE AND VISION..... 3

II. SYSTEM MODEL3
A. POPULATIONS 3
B. OVERVIEW 4
C. CURRENT HOUSING SYSTEM 5
D. PROPOSED SYSTEM 6
E. GAPS..... 7

III. METHODOLOGY10

IV. POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....11

APPENDIX A: ASSUMPTIONS12

APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY15

APPENDIX C: CURRENT SYSTEM RESOURCES23

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview

This system modeling analysis was conducted by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and technical assistance consultant Abt Associates (Abt). The model estimates how many people experience homelessness over the course of the year, incorporates compiled and analyzed data on the current system resources and how they are being used, and proposes a system with the recommended number and proportion of resources to functionally end homelessness in Los Angeles County. This analysis updates and expands the “Report on Homeless Housing Gaps in the County of Los Angeles” presented in 2015. Analysis specific to City of Los Angeles data will be presented in March 2018.

B. Objective and Vision

This model is intended to provide a resource map necessary to achieve the functional end to homelessness in Los Angeles County. The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) defines functional end to homelessness as the point at which a region has a systematic response in place that ensures homelessness is prevented whenever possible and/or is rare, brief, and non-recurring.

This model is also intended to inform funding priorities and programmatic decisions that will functionally end homelessness in the Los Angeles region. In doing so, it will help policy makers determine the funding allocations for specific populations and program types. Most immediately, this report will inform the second-year budgeting of Measure H funds and will help to advocate for additional resources. Finally, this report provides a new comparison point upon which long-term trends can be measured and progress toward goals can be tracked.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Populations

The analysis described in this report is applied to three distinct populations:

1. Adult-Headed Households (Non-Veterans):

- a) Individuals, age 25+ (non-veterans)
- b) Families with children, head of household age 25+ (non-veterans)

2. Youth-Headed Households (Non-Veterans):

- a) Individuals, age 18-24 (non-veterans); Unaccompanied minors, age 18 or younger (non-veterans)
- b) Families with children, head of household age 18-24 (non-veterans)

3. Households with Veterans:

- a) Individuals, age 18+
- b) Families with children, head of household age 18+

Each of the six populations was further broken down into chronically homeless and short-term homeless subgroups, for a total of twelve population domains. Chronic homelessness is defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as an individual or head of household “with a disability who has been continuously homeless for one year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last three years where the combined length of time homeless in those occasions is at least 12 months” (HUD, 2017 Annual Homeless Assessment Report). For the purposes of this analysis, short-term homelessness refers to any non-chronically homeless household.

B. Overview

This system modeling analysis is designed to answer the question “what resources are needed to functionally end homelessness in Los Angeles County?” The model answers this question by estimating how many people experience homelessness over the course of the year, incorporating compiled and analyzed data on how the system is currently being used, and designing a system with an adequate number of units in each program type to end homelessness in Los Angeles County. A critical component to the system modeling exercise was factoring in assumptions at each level of analysis. A complete list of these assumptions is included in Appendix A.

As captured in Table 1 (see below), the system modeling for individuals and families with children establishes gaps in existing beds/units needed to achieve the inventory in the proposed system. Note that this table displays the data for individuals and families with children within three populations used in the system modeling analysis: adults (non-veterans), youth (non-veterans), and veterans.

The gaps for individuals are larger than the gaps for families with children. For both individuals and families with children, all program types have a gap except for transitional housing (TH; see Appendix B for list of program definitions). The surplus in TH aligns with national best practices recommending that TH be used in a limited manner. The gap in permanent housing is the largest, aligning with the best practice literature which states that permanent supportive housing (PSH) and rapid re-housing (RRH) are the most effective housing interventions for helping individuals exit homelessness and stay housed. The analysis also demonstrates a large gap for diversion/prevention for individuals. These gaps will guide future revenue planning across the system.

Table 1: System Model Overview – Individuals and Families with Children (Los Angeles County)

Program Type (Individuals)	Current System Funded Through June 2018: Individuals (Beds)	Proposed System: Individuals (Beds)	Housing Gap: Individuals (Beds) ¹	Gap - % Change from Current System
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	17,131	38,406	-21,275	↑ 124%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)²	2,003 ³	12,723	-10,446	↑ 535%
Transitional Housing (TH)	4,767	1,795	2,972	↓ 62%
Emergency Shelter (ES)	5,757	8,823	-3,066	↑ 53%
Diversion/Prevention (Div/Prv)	700	3,705	-3,005	↑ 429%

Program Type (Families with Children)	Current System Funded Through June 2018: Families with Children (Units)	Proposed System: Families with Children (Units)	Housing Gap: Families with Children (Units) ¹	Gap as % Change from Current System
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	1,892	3,278	-1,386	↑ 73%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)²	1,288 ³	2,295	-1,281	↑ 78%
Transitional Housing (TH)	812	736	76	↓ 9%
Emergency Shelter (ES)	1,889	2,073	-184	↑ 10%
Diversion/Prevention (Div/Prv)	500 ⁴	2,794	-2,294	↑ 459%

¹ Note that negative values indicate a resource gap relative to the proposed system allocation; positive values indicate a resource surplus.

² For the purposes of this analysis, RRH slots are point-in-time. On average, each RRH slot is used about 2.0 times for families and 2.1 times for individuals over the course of the year in the proposed system.

³ RRH resources designated for veterans or youth are not specific for individuals and families with children. For the purpose of this analysis, those resources were shifted between individuals and families with children.

⁴ Current system funds 500 slots for diversion/prevention; however, the HMIS data set that was used for this analysis was not fully representative of these resources.

C. Current Housing System

Table 2 (see below) shows the housing inventory in the current system overall and by population. This inventory consists of resources in the January 2017 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) in addition to new resources committed through June 2018 that were made possible through Measure H and other local funding sources (for list of current system resources, see Appendix C). Table 2 shows that Los Angeles County currently has more PSH units than other program types, reflecting the region’s focus on increasing the inventory of PSH. Most of these locally-funded resources are producing RRH, PSH, and ES. Without this significant infusion of local resources, the gaps identified in Table 1 would be larger.

Table 2: Current System Funded Through June 2018 (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	TOTAL		Adults (Non-Veterans)		Youth		Veterans	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	17,131	1,892	11,089	1,190	113	59	5,929	643
RRH	2,003	1,288	989	727	172	457	842	104
TH	4,767	812	2,423	698	1,223	87	1,121	27
ES	5,757	1,889	5,212	1,873	348	16	197	0
Div/Prv ¹	700	500	621	500	79	0	0	0

¹ Current system funds 500 slots for diversion/prevention, however the HMIS data set that was used for this analysis was not fully representative of these resources.

Table 3 (see below) compares the current systems from the 2015 and 2017 analysis. Since the 2015 analysis did not include veteran resources, for the purposes of this particular comparison, resources targeting veterans were excluded. RRH resources for both individuals and families with children increased dramatically from 2015 through June 2018, largely due to Measure H funds and one-time investments made by local leadership in anticipation of securing ongoing funding. In 2015, there were no locally-funded RRH programs for adults (non-veterans); the large increase in 2017 reflects the new investment in RRH for this population. PSH for individuals also increased by over 2,000 units since 2015, which reflects the region’s investments in this program type.

Table 3: Changes in Current System from 2015 to 2017, Excluding Veterans (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Current System - Excluding Veterans				% Change	
	2015		2017 (Resources Funded Through June 2018)			
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	9,023	1,482	11,202	1,249	↑ 24%	↓ 16%
RRH	157	640	2,003	1,288	↑ 1,176%	↑ 101%
TH	2,946	794	3,646	785	↑ 24%	↓ 1%
ES	3,629	1,093	5,560	1,889	↑ 53%	↑ 73%
Div/Prv	0	0	700	500 ²	N/A ¹	N/A ¹

¹ Percentage cannot be calculated from a 0 value.

² Current system funds 500 slots for diversion/prevention; however, the HMIS data set that was used for this analysis was not fully representative of these resources.

D. Proposed System

The proposed system represents the combination of housing resources needed to functionally end homelessness in Los Angeles County. Table 4 (see below) shows the total system and breakouts for the

three population groups. Resources for adult and veteran individuals comprise the majority of the proposed system for PSH and RRH. TH is the most prevalent resource in the housing inventory for youth.

Table 4: Proposed System by Population (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	TOTAL		Adults (Non-Veterans)		Youth		Veterans	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	38,406	3,278	28,982	2,513	897	88	8,527	677
RRH	12,723	2,295	11,122	2,040	740	202	861	53
TH	1,795	736	131	483	1,426	231	238	22
ES	8,823	2,073	7,519	2,004	404	43	900	26
Div/Prv	3,705	2,794	2,619	2,636	576	104	510	54

Table 5 (see below) shows the changes in the proposed systems from the 2015 to 2017 analysis. Since the 2015 analysis did not include veteran resources, for the purposes of this particular comparison, resources targeting veterans were excluded. Table 5 reflects a number of trends, such as the ability to more adequately fund diversion/prevention through Measure H resources, the demonstrated need for more ES beds for families with children, and the influx of RRH resources. The changes in the proposed system also reflect the changing characteristics and needs of people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County. For example, as evidenced by the 2017 Point-In-Time (PIT) Count, there has been an increase in chronically homeless individuals, which corresponds closely to the increase in the proposed PSH system for individuals.

Table 5: Changes in Proposed Systems from 2015 to 2017, Excluding Veterans (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Proposed System - Excluding Veterans				% Change	
	2015		2017		Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)		
PSH	23,731	2,115	29,879	2,601	↑ 26%	↑ 23%
RRH	8,536	490	11,862	2,242	↑ 39%	↑ 358%
TH	1,463	377	1,557	714	↑ 6%	↑ 90%
ES	6,310	691	7,923	2,047	↑ 26%	↑ 196%
Div/Prv	1,505	1,050	3,195	2,740	↑ 112%	↑ 161%

E. Gaps

Table 6 (see below) shows how the gap has increased or decreased from the 2015 to the 2017 analysis. Since the 2015 analysis did not include veteran resources, for the purposes of this particular comparison, resources targeting veterans were excluded. The largest increases in resource gaps are seen in PSH, RRH, and diversion/prevention for families with children.

Table 6: Changes in Gaps - 2015 to 2017, Excluding Veterans (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Gaps - Excluding Veterans				% Change			
	2015		2017		Ind. (Beds)		Fam. (Units)	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Gap/Surplus	Change	Gap/Surplus	Change
PSH	-14,708	-633	-18,677	-1,352	Gap	↑ 27%	Gap	↑ 114%
RRH	-8,379	0	-10,446	-1,249	Gap	↑ 20%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
TH	1,483	417	2,089	71	Surplus	↑ 41%	Surplus	↓ 83%
ES	-2,681	402	-2,364	-158	Gap	↓ 12%	Gap ²	↑ 139%
Div/Prv	-1,505	-1,050	-2,495	-2,240	Gap	↑ 66%	Gap	↑ 161%

¹ Percentage cannot be calculated from a 0 value.

² ES inventory for families with children was a surplus in 2015 and a gap in 2017.

Table 7 (see below) shows the resource gaps for adults (non-veterans). The adult (non-veteran) gap comprises the largest portion of the total system-wide gaps which re-emphasizes the fact that adults represent the largest share of the homeless population in Los Angeles County.

Table 7: Gaps for Adults (Non-Veterans) - 2017 (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Current System Funded Through June 2018: Adults (Non-Veterans)		Proposed System: Adults (Non-Veterans)		Housing Gap: Adults (Non-Veterans) ¹	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	11,089	1,190	28,982	2,513	-17,893	-1,323
RRH²	989	727	11,122	2,040	-10,133	-1,313
TH	2,423	698	131	483	2,292	215
ES	5,212	1,873	7,519	2,004	7	-131
Div/Prv	621 ³	500	2,619	2,636	-1,998	-2,136

¹ Note that negative values indicate a resource gap relative to the proposed system allocation; positive values indicate a resource surplus.

² For the purposes of this analysis, RRH slots are point-in-time. On average, each RRH slot is used about 2.0 times for families and 2.1 times for individuals over the course of the year in the proposed system.

³ Current system funds 500 slots for diversion/prevention, however the HMIS data set that was used for this analysis was not fully representative of these resources.

Table 8 (see below) demonstrates the gap in resources for youth. The most significant resource gaps for youth are for PSH and diversion/prevention.

Table 8: Gaps for Youth - 2017 (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Current System Funded Through June 2018: Youth		Proposed System: Youth		Housing Gap: Youth ¹	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	113	59	897	88	-784	-29
RRH ²	172 ³	457 ³	740	202	-313	0
TH	1,223	87	1,426	231	-203	-144
ES	348	16	404	43	-56	-27
Div/Prv	79 ⁴	0	576	104	-497	-104

¹ Note that negative values indicate a resource gap relative to the proposed system allocation; positive values indicate a resource surplus.

² For the purposes of this analysis, RRH slots are point-in-time. On average, each RRH slot is used about 2.0 times for families and 2.1 times for individuals over the course of the year in the proposed system.

³ RRH resources designated for veterans or youth are not specific for individuals and families with children. For the purpose of this analysis, those resources were shifted between individuals and families with children.

⁴ Current system funds 500 slots for diversion/prevention; however, the HMIS data set that was used for this analysis was not fully representative of these resources.

Table 9 (see below) demonstrates the gap in resources for veterans. By far, the largest need for this population is for PSH.

Table 9: Gaps for Veterans - 2017 (Los Angeles County)

Program Type	Current System Funded Through June 2018: Veterans		Proposed System: Veterans		Housing Gap: Veterans ¹	
	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)	Ind. (Beds)	Fam. (Units)
PSH	5,929	643	8,527	677	-2,598	-34
RRH ²	842 ³	104 ³	861	53	0	32
TH	1,121	27	238	22	883	5
ES	197	0	900	26	-703	-26
Div/Prv	0 ⁴	0	510	54	-510	-54

¹ Note that negative values indicate a resource gap relative to the proposed system allocation; positive values indicate a resource surplus.

² For the purposes of this analysis, RRH slots are point-in-time. On average, each RRH slot is used about 2.0 times for families and 2.1 times for individuals over the course of the year in the proposed system.

³ RRH resources designated for veterans or youth are not specific for individuals and families with children. For the purpose of this analysis, those resources were shifted between individuals and families with children.

⁴ Veteran diversion/prevention resources through Supportive Services for Veteran Families could be used for div/prv or RRH. For purposes of this analysis, resources are allocated for RRH.

III. METHODOLOGY

Abt developed the system modeling framework and worked closely with LAHSA to: compile data on homelessness and the current system in Los Angeles County, estimate need based on the proposed system, develop a proposed system to functionally end homelessness in Los Angeles County, and adjust the estimates based on expert stakeholder feedback. An overview of the steps completed in the analysis follows. A complete description of these steps, along with data sources, limitations, and changes from the 2015 analysis can be found in Appendix B.

STEP 1: Estimate Annualized Number of People Experiencing Homelessness

Abt and LAHSA used key local homeless system usage information, inventory data, and population statistics to estimate the number of people who used substantive homelessness system resources in Los Angeles County over the course of 2017.¹ The annualized estimate accounts for each population group and distinguishes between short-term and chronically homeless households. The estimate is further separated into two groups: people who have already accessed homeless services during the year, and those who have not accessed such services during that same time period.

STEP 2: Compile Data on Current Inventory & System Utilization

With the assistance of LAHSA, Abt compiled data on the current resources available to people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County. The inventory consists of the 2017 HIC as well as fully-funded housing resources that opened or are scheduled to open through June 2018, such as beds funded by Year 1 Measure H revenues (see Table 2). In addition to the number of beds/units that are currently available, data on current system utilization were collected and analyzed, such as length of stay and program performance.

STEP 3: Develop Recommended Service Pathways

By applying best practices, program effectiveness, and local conditions to the current system's inventory and utilization, Abt developed combinations of programs that each population would use to rapidly exit to permanent housing (i.e., recommended service pathways). Abt then estimated the percentage of each population group that would need each pathway, and the length of stay at each program in the pathway.

Input from subject-matter experts informed the recommendation of service pathways and assumptions about their utilization, by population group. The list of assumptions can be found in Appendix A.

STEP 4: Determine Inventory for Proposed System

By applying the recommended service pathways percentages to the annualized number of people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County, the model estimates housing resource needs in a proposed system.

¹ For the purposes of this analysis, substantive homelessness system resources included emergency shelter, transitional housing, safe havens, rapid re-housing, and permanent supportive housing.

Abt worked with LAHSA and other key local stakeholders to develop the assumptions used to shape the proposed system’s inventory. The list of assumptions can be found in Appendix A.

STEP 5: Identify Gaps

Abt contrasted the inventory in the proposed system with the current inventory and the fully-funded housing resources that opened or are scheduled to open after the release of the 2017 HIC (February 2017 – June 2018) to identify system gaps. Gaps are categorized by population group and program type. This report also compares gaps from the 2015 analysis to show how needs and resources have changed.

STEP 6: Incorporate Feedback from Subject-Matter Experts

Throughout the system modeling development process, Abt consulted with subject-matter experts to verify that the modeling accurately considered the unique needs of Los Angeles County. Abt incorporated feedback on its modeling from a variety of experts, including LAHSA staff, homeless service providers from all three population areas for the Coordinated Entry System (adults, families with children, and youth), City and County of Los Angeles homelessness policy staff, and a variety of technical assistance providers.

The subject-matter experts also drew upon best practices identified by the National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) and the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH). Additionally, local HMIS utilization data (as detailed in Step 2), system performance measure reports, data dashboards, academic studies, and other information were used to refine recommendations.

IV. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This homeless crisis response system modeling analysis provides direction on where resources should be focused to be most effective at making homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring. The analysis acknowledges the considerable resources that have been added to the system since the 2015 report, and also identifies the need for continued investment. The 2017 system modeling clearly identifies a significant need for PSH and RRH, which should continue to drive resource allocation decisions.

An examination of the gaps must be placed within the context of the housing environment in Los Angeles County. High rents and an overall shortage of affordable housing of all types underpin the analysis as a whole. While there may be debate over the nuances of what housing type and population should receive particular resources, such debate exists within the general assumption that substantial progress will not be achieved without a significant increase in the county’s housing stock. More affordable housing is essential to address the existing population’s needs, and most importantly, reduce the inflow of households entering homelessness. RRH and tenant-based PSH require access to more units in which to use those subsidies.

Fortunately, the financial resources of Measure H, Proposition HHH, and other local efforts, coupled with the demonstrated commitment of local leaders and community members to prevent and end homelessness, will make it possible to address the considerable gaps outlined in this report.

APPENDIX A

Assumptions

In developing the homeless crisis response system model analysis, Abt incorporated a variety of assumptions based on input from LAHSA and the subject-matter experts. These assumptions affected all levels of the modeling, including the recommended service pathways, system utilization by population group, and the proposed system's inventory.

OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS

- Turnover in each program is factored into the model, and reduces the overall gap in that resource.
- Resources built into the proposed system are for every chronically or short-term homeless individual/household that has used the current system (i.e., ES, TH, RRH, PSH) within one year. Additionally, the model anticipates that some of these entries could be avoided through the strategic use of homelessness diversion/prevention resources.
- Additional resources are built into the proposed system for the chronically homeless not currently using ES, TH, RRH, and/or PSH. Annualized PIT Count and HMIS data are used to determine how many additional households should be modeled from this group.
- This model does not include households experiencing short-term homelessness who are not using the system and thus does not include a build-out of resources (e.g., PSH) for this group. Once built out, the proposed system will meet needs of this group through its improved efficiency and turnover capacity.
- Non-population specific resources (e.g., resources that can be accessed by multiple populations) were included in the 25+ adult household (non-veteran) inventory.

BY HOUSING INTERVENTION:

Diversion/Prevention

- Diversion/prevention is a new program and should be monitored before being substantially expanded.
- Prevention is not an appropriate intervention for chronically homeless persons.

Emergency Shelter (ES)

- ES is being used in more service pathways into permanent housing than in the 2015 model.
- National recommendations on lengths of stay in ES are not realistic for Los Angeles County given this area's tighter affordable housing rental market.
- Some people experiencing short-term homelessness will only access ES.

Transitional Housing (TH)

- The inventory of TH is expected to serve youth and domestic violence survivors.

- LAHSA wants to preserve existing TH inventory (no increases or decreases) for domestic violence survivors.
- LAHSA wants to expand TH usage for youth.
- TH is often appropriate for survivors of domestic violence because safety is an issue and they have more intensive services needs and more specific housing location needs than an ES environment can provide.
- National recommendations on lengths of stay in TH are not realistic for Los Angeles County given this area's tighter affordable housing rental market.
- Locally, HMIS data shows that TH success rates for youth adults were higher than for the 25+ adult population.

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)

- RRH is an effective permanent housing model and can represent a pathway to PSH for those who need it and can be transferred through a progressive engagement model.
 - RRH has been the most successful project type for the placement of non-chronically homeless persons into permanent housing (as compared to ES and TH).
- The model assigns some RRH placements to some chronically homeless adults. National and local data has shown success for some chronically homeless persons.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

- PSH is a proven local and national solution for many chronically homeless households.

BY POPULATION GROUP

Families with Children

- Diversion/prevention is effective for families with children.
- Families with children should use diversion/prevention at a higher proportion than single adults.
- The proposed system provides resources for families with children who engage with any aspect of the system (e.g., ES, TH, RRH) to be immediately offered shelter or hotel/motel vouchers.
- There are more families with children who will need PSH than the number of chronically homeless families with children (i.e., high acuity families with children who do not meet the federal definition of chronic homelessness).
- RRH is an effective intervention for families with children.

Veterans

- There is a shorter length of stay for veteran adults in ES compared to non-veteran adults, according to local HMIS data.
- TH for veterans can be (and is) used functionally as shelter while remaining classified as TH. Therefore, surpluses in TH and deficits in ES need for veterans could help to balance each other

out in working towards the proposed system. Non-chronic veterans (individuals and families with children) receiving RRH achieved more success in housing placement compared to TH.

Adults (25+ Households)

- There is a higher rate of individuals in the adult population who are able to resolve their homelessness without substantive system resources compared to other population groups.
- Adults should use diversion/prevention at a lower proportion than families with children.
- The proposed system expects that some adults will not use shelter in advance of receiving a more substantive intervention. Therefore, there will not be an ES bed available for every single adult experiencing homelessness over the course of a given year.
- There are proportionally fewer resources for the adult population, so there will be longer lengths of stays for ES, TH, and RRH.
- For adults, RRH has highest permanent housing placement rate, TH has lowest permanent housing placement rate.
- PSH has lowest attrition rates for adults.

Youth

- The proposed system expects that some youth will not use shelter. Therefore, there will not be an ES bed available for every youth experiencing homelessness.
- There is a shorter length of stay for youth in ES compared to adults.
- To achieve better outcomes, many youth and youth families with children should spend time in youth-specific ES or TH before entering into RRH or PSH.
- TH has been a particularly effective housing intervention for short-term homeless youth with higher service needs and produces a higher percentage of exits to permanent housing compared to other population groups.
- Youth have longer lengths of stay in TH and RRH than other population groups.
- RRH is an effective permanent housing intervention for short-term homeless youth with low to moderate service needs.
- The vast majority of chronically homeless youth need PSH, and a minority of chronically homeless youth would be successful in RRH.
- There are more youth who will need PSH than the number of chronically homeless youth (i.e., high acuity youth who do not meet the federal definition of chronic homelessness).

APPENDIX B

Methodology

The Methodology Appendix provides a detailed overview of the various steps in the system modeling analysis, provides detail on the sources of data used for the analysis, reviews limitations with the analysis, and describes the changes made from the 2015 analysis.

A. Analysis Steps

Abt developed the system modeling framework and worked closely with LAHSA to compile data on homelessness and the current system in Los Angeles County, estimate need based on the proposed system, and adjust the estimates based on expert stakeholder feedback. The methodology for this analysis is as follows:

STEP 1: Estimate Annualized Number of People Experiencing Homelessness

Key local homeless system usage information, inventory data, and population statistics were used to estimate the number of people who used substantive homeless system resources in Los Angeles County during 2017.² The estimate accounts for each population group and distinguishes between short-term and chronically homeless households. The number of people experiencing homelessness was calculated using several sources of data: the PIT Homeless Count, the HIC, HMIS, and the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR), each of which is explained further in Section B below.

Separately, LAHSA and the University of Southern California developed a formula to estimate the annualized number of people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County in 2017 based on the PIT Count's totals and demographic survey data, as the PIT Count estimate is based on a snapshot. To refine that estimate for specific chronically homeless populations, LAHSA used data from the local AHAR and HMIS to extrapolate annualized totals for chronically homeless populations. Both data sources were used because they offered useful supplementary information on system usage throughout the year by the chronically homeless compared to the short-term homeless population. The HIC data cover those programs that are publicly- and privately-funded at the time of the PIT Count. In contrast, HMIS offers longer-term service usage data within programs, but includes only programs that are funded by LAHSA or other public agencies that require HMIS utilization, and other programs that voluntarily opt into the system.

The annualized number of people experiencing homelessness in this model can be separated into two groups, people who have already accessed homeless services during the year and those who have not accessed those services during the year:

² For the purposes of this analysis, substantive homeless system resources included emergency shelter, transitional housing, safe havens, rapid re-housing, and permanent supportive housing.

- Current users of the system: Households who accessed ES, TH, RRH, safe havens, or PSH resources over the course of October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016.³ This data was taken from HMIS.
- Non-system users: People experiencing chronic homelessness who did not use ES, TH, RRH, safe havens, or PSH. This information was derived by subtracting the annualized PIT Count’s chronically homeless total from the total number chronically homeless “current users of the system.” This group’s estimates were based on PIT Count, HIC, HMIS, and AHAR data.

This step combines “current users of the system” and “non-system users” to include in the system model a full picture of people experiencing homelessness over the course of a year. In doing so, this model goes beyond the January 2017 PIT Count by incorporating all people who experienced chronic homelessness throughout the year and short-term homeless users of the system.

STEP 2: Compile Data on Current Inventory & System Utilization

With the assistance of LAHSA, Abt compiled data on the current resources available to people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County. Information was collected on the following resources:

- Diversion/Prevention: Diversion is a strategy that prevents homelessness by helping people experiencing a housing crisis and seeking shelter to preserve their current housing situation or make immediate alternative arrangements without having to enter shelter or the homeless system. This may include staying with friends, returning to their community of origin if deemed safe, or providing mediation to reunite with family. Prevention includes providing resources to ensure participants either stabilize in their current housing or stabilize in another permanent housing placement to ensure they do not enter the homeless system.
- Emergency Shelter (ES): A facility with the primary purpose of providing temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness, including crisis housing (24-hour, short-term beds), bridge housing (24-hour reserved beds), winter shelter (overnight seasonal beds), hotel/motel vouchers, and other interim housing models.
- Transitional Housing (TH): Provides people experiencing homelessness with a place to stay combined with supportive services for up to 24 months in order to help them overcome barriers to moving into and retaining permanent housing.
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH): A crisis intervention model designed to provide temporary financial assistance and supportive services to people experiencing homelessness, moving them quickly out of homelessness and into permanent housing.
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH): Designated to provide housing and supportive services on a long-term basis for people experiencing homelessness who have disabilities. PSH offers tenant-based housing solutions that allow clients to locate housing and assist in covering the cost of rent through income-based subsidies, as well as project-based assistance, which are income-based subsidies tied to a specific service project location.

³ This excludes persons who used PSH throughout the year as they were counted as formerly homeless.

Information on the current inventory was extracted from the 2017 HIC, which details the resources in operation in the County as of January 2017. LAHSA also collected information on fully-funded housing resources that opened or are scheduled to open after the release of the 2017 HIC (February 2017 – June 2018). These resources include newly-issued Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers and Year 1 Measure H revenues for the following Los Angeles County Homeless Initiative Strategies:

- Strategy B7 - Interim/Bridge Housing for Those Exiting Institutions
- Strategy D7 - Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for Permanent Supportive Housing
- Strategy B3 - Expand Rapid Re-Housing
- Strategy E8 - Enhance the Emergency Shelter System
- Strategy E14 - Enhance Services for Transition Age Youth

Although these resources are included in the current inventory, they are broken out separately in the report (Table 4).

In addition to the number of beds/units that are currently available, data on current system utilization were collected and analyzed:

- Percentage of Population Group Accessing Program: What percentage of each population group is accessing each program type (X percent of veterans use ES).
- Combination of Program Types Used: The combination of program types used by each population group on the way to placement into permanent housing (e.g., from TH to RRH; from ES to PSH).
- Length of Stay: The average length of stay for each population group in each program type (homeless adults stay in ES for X months).
- Program Performance: How successful the program type is at placing the population group into permanent housing (e.g., X percent of youth exit from TH into permanent housing); the rate of returns to homelessness after exit from program (e.g., X percent of youth return to homelessness after exiting TH).

STEP 3: Develop Recommended Service Pathways

By applying best practices, program effectiveness, and local conditions to the current system's inventory and utilization, Abt developed combinations of programs that each population would use to rapidly exit to permanent housing, i.e., recommended services pathways. Abt then estimated the percentage of each population group that would need each pathway, and the length of stay at each program in the pathway.

The recommended service pathways identified were:

- Diversion/Prevention
- Emergency Shelter Only
- Transitional Housing Only
- Rapid Re-Housing Only
- Rapid Re-Housing through Emergency Shelter
- Rapid Re-Housing through Transitional Housing
- Permanent Supportive Housing from Streets
- Permanent Supportive Housing through Safe Havens
- Permanent Supportive Housing through Emergency Shelter
- Permanent Supportive Housing through Emergency Shelter and Rapid Re-Housing
- Permanent Supportive Housing through Rapid Re-Housing

Input from subject-matter experts informed the recommendation of service pathways and, assumptions about their utilization, by population group. The list of assumptions can be found in Appendix A.

STEP 4: Determine Inventory for Proposed System

By applying the recommended services pathways percentages to the annualized number of people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County, the model estimates housing resource needs in a proposed system.

Abt worked with LAHSA and other key local stakeholders to develop assumptions used to shape the proposed system's inventory. The list of assumptions can be found in Appendix A.

STEP 5: Identify Gaps

Abt contrasted the inventory in the proposed system with the current inventory and the fully-funded housing resources that opened or are scheduled to open after the release of the 2017 HIC (February 2017 – June 2018) to identify system gaps. Gaps are categorized by population group and program type. This report also compares gaps from the 2015 analysis to this analysis of 2017 data.

STEP 6: Incorporate Feedback from Subject-Matter Experts

Throughout the system modeling process, Abt consulted with subject-matter experts to verify that the modeling fit for Los Angeles County. Abt incorporated feedback on its modeling from a variety of experts, including LAHSA staff, homeless service providers from all three population areas (Adults, Families with Children, and Youth) for the Coordinated Entry System, City of Los Angeles and County homelessness staff, and a variety of technical assistance providers.

The subject-matter experts also drew upon best practices identified by national advocacy organizations such as the NAEH and federal agencies such as the USICH. Additionally, local HMIS system utilization data (as detailed in Step 2), system performance measure reports, data dashboards, studies, and other information were used by the subject-matter experts to refine their recommendations.

B. Data Sources

This system modeling analysis incorporates data from a variety of sources.

Point-in-Time (PIT) Homeless Count

Each year in January, Continuum of Care (CoCs) conduct a PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness in their regions using HUD's national methodology. Los Angeles County consists of four CoCs which each conduct their own PIT Count: the Los Angeles CoC (LA CoC) administered by LAHSA, the Glendale CoC, the Long Beach CoC, and the Pasadena CoC.

LAHSA's PIT Count is comprised of four components (not all CoCs conduct all four components):

- Street Count: A visual tally of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness, including people living in their vehicles and in make-shift shelters.
- Shelter Count: A count of everyone experiencing homelessness in shelters, with emergency motel vouchers, safe havens, and TH.
- Demographic Surveys: A survey and HMIS data collection of demographic information of those experiencing homelessness, including age, gender, ethnicity, length of time homeless, and other key characteristics.
- Youth Count: A survey-based count of unaccompanied and unsheltered youth and young families with children under the age of 24 who are experiencing homelessness.

This analysis aggregates the January 2017 PIT Count data from all four CoCs in the County.

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

HMIS is a computerized data collection system designed to capture system performance and client-level data, including the characteristics, service needs, and services utilization trends of the homeless population. HMIS participation is required for HUD-funded programs.

HMIS data from October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016 from the Los Angeles, Glendale, and Pasadena CoCs were included in this analysis.

Housing Inventory Count (HIC)

The HIC is a point-in-time inventory of the housing and shelter resources dedicated to homeless or formerly homeless populations conducted at the same time as the PIT Count. The HIC includes shelter resources (i.e., ES, emergency motel vouchers, TH, and safe havens) and permanent housing resources (i.e., PSH, RRH, and other permanent housing) funded by LAHSA and other sources.

The HIC is required by HUD and used in the annual application process to determine federal funding for homeless services throughout the country. The data is also used to produce the AHAR.

The data used for this analysis came from the HIC conducted in January 2017 by all four local CoCs.

Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR)

The AHAR is a HUD report presented to Congress annually on the status of homelessness in the United States, including estimates on the number of people experiencing homelessness nationally, demographic information, service use patterns and the capacity of localities to prevent and end homelessness in their communities.

The data used for this analysis comes from the 2016 AHAR for the Los Angeles CoC only.

C. Limitations

While utilizing multiple data sources results in a more robust analysis, there are limitations to these data sources that must be considered.

HMIS Data Quality

The data obtained from HMIS has several limitations, specifically:

- a) Overall HMIS coverage across Los Angeles County;
- b) Clients who were not exited from HMIS in the 2015-2016 Program Year;
- c) Undercounting of placements into permanent housing; and
- d) Lack of comprehensive outreach data.

HMIS Coverage

HMIS coverage is low for ES and TH programs, largely due to the quantity of programs in these categories that are not funded by LAHSA and choose not to participate in HMIS. Further, there is uneven HMIS coverage for programs dedicated to various populations. For example, the percentage of programs serving youth not participating in HMIS is different from the percentage of non-participating programs serving veterans. To address the coverage issues, Abt extrapolated for missing data based on the HIC, and cross-referenced data sources to account for the use of non-population specific beds/units by each population group.

Domestic violence programs do not participate in HMIS due to confidentiality concerns. However, the inventory of domestic violence beds was included in the model through use of HIC data.

Un-Exited Clients

Through analysis of HMIS, it was determined that some clients were not properly exited from their programs by the service providers. Spot checks were conducted with agencies to confirm that outliers (e.g., an adult staying in ES for five years) should have been exited, and then addressed these improperly un-exited clients in the model by applying maximum activity stays per housing type for those outlier clients with extreme lengths of stay.

Undercounting Permanent Housing Placements

Placements into permanent housing from programs, especially emergency shelters, are likely underreported in HMIS. For example, the shorter lengths of stay and less intensive services in emergency shelters sometimes make it difficult for staff to track when a client is placed into permanent

housing. Abt, LAHSA, and the subject-matter experts took this issue into consideration when analyzing the data.

Lack of Comprehensive Outreach Data

In comparison to the PIT Count total of unsheltered persons, the scope of data entered into HMIS from outreach services is inadequate to accurately extrapolate the number of unsheltered homeless people who did not access substantive homelessness system resources (e.g., ES, PSH). To account for this absence of data, Abt examined prior living situation data for system resources and consulted PIT Count and AHAR data to extrapolate for unsheltered non-system users.

PIT Count

While the PIT Count serves as a critical data source, some inherent limitations include:

- Demographic surveys were completed during the winter season. This limits our knowledge of the characteristics of the unsheltered homeless population throughout the year.
- Self-response to chronic homelessness-related questions, especially in terms of length of time homeless. This makes it difficult to truly ascertain the number of unsheltered chronically homeless people.
- Total homeless population estimates apply only to one snapshot of January 2017, and thus did not reflect seasonal changes to the homeless population. This is only a point-in-time census and does not reflect inflow into and flow through the homeless crisis response system.

Abt, LAHSA, and the subject-matter experts took these limitations into consideration when analyzing the data.

Data Collection Timeframes

By using multiple data sources, this analysis uses data from different timeframes, and thus cannot be compared simultaneously:

- PIT: January 2017 (point-in-time count)
- AHAR: FY 2015-16 (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016)
- HIC: January 2017 (point-in-time count)
- HMIS: FY 2016 (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016)

Analysis Does Not Address Future Trends

This analysis does not address future changes in rates of or related solutions to homelessness (e.g., changes in PIT Count or major increases in affordable housing or employment). The analysis does not incorporate future inflow into the homeless population estimates, and thus cannot predict how service pathways or inventory recommendations in the proposed system will need to be adjusted.

D. Changes from 2015 Gaps Analysis

LAHSA conducted a Gaps Analysis in 2015. Several changes were made to strengthen the 2017 analysis:

Inclusion of Veterans

Homeless veterans and the shelter, service, and housing resources dedicated solely to homeless and formerly homeless veterans have been included in the 2017 analysis but were not included in the 2015 version.

Youth Subpopulations

The 2017 analysis breaks out youth as its own subpopulation, which allows for more precision in resource distribution and planning.

Expanded Use of HMIS Data

More extensive HMIS data was generated for modeling purposes, and at a higher coverage level (for example, the adult ES beds on HMIS in the LA CoC rose from 1,299 in 2015 to 1,821 in 2017). Specifically, analysis tables on three measures of system effectiveness (i.e., length of stay, placements into permanent housing, and returns to homelessness) were generated for each program type by population and were incorporated into the assumptions that define the proposed homeless crisis response system.

Chronic Homelessness Definition

The 2017 analysis uses the HUD definition of chronic homelessness, rather than the “long-term” homeless status used in the 2015 report.

Infusion of New Local Resources

The influx of new resources since 2015 has increased the system’s inventory, the capacity to administer programs, and the amount of data collected for performance analysis. One-time investments combined with Measure H funds have significantly increased housing resources. This infusion of resources – thanks to the significant efforts of local leadership – has also allowed Abt and LAHSA to envision a more robust system.

Additional Service Pathways

Three service pathways, following the new resources mentioned above, were added to the 2017 model to more accurately reflect how people move through the system and into permanent housing:

- Permanent Supportive Housing through Emergency Shelter and Rapid Re-Housing
- Permanent Supportive Housing through Rapid Re-Housing
- Rapid Re-Housing through Transitional Housing

APPENDIX C

Current System Resources (February 2017 Through June 2018)

The table below shows fully-funded housing resources that opened or are scheduled to open from February 2017 – June 2018, after the release of the 2017 HIC. It illustrates the significant new growth in system resources that were generated due to local leadership and public investment in addressing homelessness. These resources were added to the HIC inventory to arrive at the Current System Funded Through June 2018 inventory (Table 2 in report).

Table: Current System Resources (February 2017 Through June 2018)

Program Type	Adults	Families	Youth	Veterans	Total
PSH	2,467	25	0	180	2,672
RRH	550	113	150	0	813
TH	0	0	124	-20	104
ES	1,411	191	152	-29	1,725
Div/Prv	621	500	79	0	1200