Report on Homeless Housing Gaps in the County of Los Angeles
Published February 2018

Overview

Who: LAHSA worked with Abt Associates and local stakeholder to develop assumptions and estimates used in the analysis. The analysis provides gaps data for all of LA County, and includes breakouts for individuals and households with children, veterans, youth (non-veterans) and households headed by persons 25 years old and older (non-veterans).

What/Why: The report intends to provide a resource map necessary to achieve the functional end to homelessness in Los Angeles; that is, it is designed to answer the question "what additional subsidized housing and shelter do we need to end homelessness in LA, and what is the resulting cost?" The report's model assumes a number of best practices, including that the Emergency Shelter infrastructure is primarily used as bridge housing to navigate people into permanent housing outcomes.

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.

Where: https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=1865-2018-report-on-homeless-housing-gaps-in-the-county-of-los-angeles.pdf

When: Published February 2018 (a n update from the January 2016 report)

Growth in Resources between January 2015 and June 2018:
Excluding Veteran Resources

| | Current System - Excluding Veterans | | | | % Change | |
| Program Type | 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.

Current System vs. Proposed System:
Including Veteran Resources

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.

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.

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.