City-funded Homeless Services System

First Quarter Performance 2018

05/17/2018 Human Services

City of Seattle

Outreach and Case Management

City of Seattle

What does the City Invest in?

PREVENTION: Keeping people housed

EMERGENCY: Shelter and connection to housing

HOUSING: Permanent housing

Considerations

- HMIS holds information about how people interact with the homeless services system
  - Enrollments and exits from all programs
  - Households may interact with multiple programs at any given time
  - When reporting, households may be counted differently depending on question asked
- HMIS does not capture the number of people experiencing homelessness
  - Point-in-time Count and McKinsey Report

HSD Invests $71M in Homeless Services in 2018

Emergency $30.9M
Shelters, Villages, Hygiene, Outreach*

Housing $22.4M
Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing, Diversion

Prevention $6.5M
Homelessness prevention

Access to Services $5.9M
211 Referral Service, Community Connectors in Food Banks, Healthcare for the Homeless*

Operations $5.3M
Staffing, Administrative Services

*does not include all programs

PREVENTION

A person exits to permanent housing when she maintains housing without becoming homeless

Year	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exit to PH
2017	$3.1M	615	193	182	**94%**
2018	$6.5M	678	169	151	**89%**

Q1 Takeaway:

- Rate of people maintaining housing has decreased in 2018

Why?

- New programs are ramping up in 2018
- Clients participate in prevention programs for up to 90 days meaning the outcomes of Q1 performance will not show up until Q2

SHELTER

A person exits to housing when he leaves a shelter program and moves into permanent housing

Type	Year	Beds	Investment (annual)*	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
Basic	2017	964	$19.8M	3257	2045	103	5%
Enhanced	2017	749		1815	1153	194	16.8%
Basic	2018	588	$21M	3396	1325	50	**3.8%**
Enhanced	2018	1185		2800	1457	299	**20.5%**

*Investment in all Shelter/Day/Hygiene in 2017 and 2018

Q1 Takeaways:

- Our investment in enhanced shelter is moving more people to housing
- 67% of shelter beds provide enhanced services, an increase of 23% over 2017

CITY-PERMITTED VILLAGES

A person exits to housing when they leave a village to enter permanent housing

Year	Beds in Q1	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	133	$1.5M	224	60	11	**18%**
2018	306	$2.3M	354	106	18	**17%**

Q1 Takeaway:

- Licton Springs – the only village with intensive services – has the highest rate of movement to housing and the hardest to serve population
- CBO is exploring funding to enhance the villages

Why?

- We added 173 safe spaces in 2018 and 5 villages do not offer intensive services

DAY AND HYGIENE CENTERS

A person exits to housing when he leaves a day/hygiene program and moves to permanent housing

Year	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	6883	2576	81	**3%**
2018	6228	1537	90	**6%**

Q1 Takeaways:

- The purpose of day center and hygiene centers is to meet the basic needs of people staying in overnight shelters or living unsheltered
- Case management can assist with bringing people indoors and helping them transition to housing but that is not the primary goal of day/hygiene centers
- Beginning in Q2, day/hygiene will not be expected to contribute to the rate of exit to PH

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING

A person exits to housing when she leaves TH within 2 years and moves to permanent housing

Year	Units	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	833	$2.9M	775	196	110	**56%**
2018	717	$3M	672	175	103	**59%**

Q1 Takeaways:

- HSD successfully transitioned TH to serve youth and young adults
- The rate of success has already improved

Why?

- TH is more effective for youth and young adults than it is for other populations

DIVERSION

A person uses one-time funding or services to bypass shelter and move directly to housing

Year	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	$1M	314	259	159	61.5%
2018	$2M	374	275	221	**80.5%**

Q1 Takeaways:

- More people are being diverted from entering the services system
- Rate of success has increased by 19%

Why?

- HSD supported training on best practices in Diversion
- Diversion is integrated into shelter and outreach programs in 2018

RAPID REHOUSING

A person exits when she is living in permanent housing without subsidy

Year	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere)	Total Exits to PH	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	$4.2M	605	165	120	73%
2018	$7.2M	629	194	161	**83%**

Q1 Takeaways:

- Increased the number of households served and the rate of success
- RRH remains the most cost-effective program area

Why?

- RRH is a best practice nation-wide
- HSD is leading training for providers on best practices for RRH

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

A person exits a PSH unit to other housing or is living in a PSH unit

Year	Units	Investment (annual)	Served in Q1	Total Exits (anywhere) or maintain housing	Exits to PH and maintain	Rate of Exits to PH
2017	1107	$9.3M	1711	1712	1684	98%
2018	1922	$13.2M	1833	1905	1881	99%

Q1 Takeaways:

- Increased the number of households moving to and maintaining housing and the rate of success
- 31 exits to housing from PSH and 1850 households who have maintained their housing in PSH

Why?

- PSH is the most effective housing program and the most expensive

Q1 2018 Program Level Data

Q1 performance supports that it is possible for all types of programs serving all populations to be successful in their performance outcomes

Programs that are performing well are adhering to best practices and have appropriate staff to client ratios

Slide Notes

Slide 2:
The Homeless Services System

What do we mean when we say system?
Programs that receive funding from Seattle, King County and United Way of King County to address the needs of people experiencing homelessness
Today we are only discussing programs that have received HSD funding per your request
What is an exit to housing?
An exit to housing is a household leaving the services system to enter permanent housing
We calculate an exit to PH by dividing the number of exits to PH by the number of total exits anywhere
When we cover program areas today we will include more specific definitions
In the prevention and permanent supportive housing programs we count maintenance of permanent housing as a successful outcome

Slide 3:
Three primary investment areas:
Prevention
Emergency
Housing

Today, we are going to discuss exits to permanent housing for specific program areas.

In Q1, there were 2665 exits to permanent housing and maintenance of permanent housing.

We are not going to cover the Outreach and Engagement program area today because:
A number of new programs are ramping up and not yet contributing to housing exits
Time constraints – want to cover the most impactful information in our time together
We are happy to return and discuss outreach and engagement progress another time
The rate of exits to PH is very low for this quarter (3%)

Slide 4:
I want to discus HMIS upfront.

The constraints of the data base are very frustrating.

We want to know how many people are homeless and what conditions are keeping them homeless – HMIS does NOT have those answers

HMIS was designed to track program performance and system activity

It can track the number of households that are in our services system for a specific period of time

It does not allow us to de-duplicate by household across programs – so if one household enrolls in three programs, that one household represents three enrollments

Count Us In 2018 – Seattle has 4499 unsheltered (up from 3857) and TBD sheltered (12K County wide)

McKinsey Report – 21,700 households experiencing homelessness in 2017, 13,400 didn't get housed

Slide 6:

Served in Q1 is de-duplicated households

The exits represent the activity of some of those households, they are not de-deduplicated by household, some households may exit, return, and exit the program again

Cost per exit from prevention:

Top Performing Programs:

4 programs have an exit rate of 100% to PH (Chief Seattle Club, El Centro de la Raza, Refugee Women's Alliance, Solid Ground)

Low Performing Programs:

5 programs have no exits to PH at all because they are still ramping up

Cost per households -3k

Slide 7:
The statement at the top describes an exit to permanent housing for a person in the shelter system

Enhanced shelters are 24/7 or have extended hours and include case-management and housing navigation services, and amenities such as meals, showers and laundry

Key Takeaway: Our investment in enhanced shelter is moving more people to housing than our investment in basic shelter

2017 Total Beds: 1713

2018 Total Beds: 1773 (includes 86 winter weather beds)

Top performing programs:
St. Martin de Porres has a rate of exits to PH of 79%

Low performing programs:
DESC Main Shelter has a rate of exits to PH of 4%

Slide 8:
Licton Springs – Rate of Exit to PH 25%
Interbay – Rate 22%
Othello – Rate 17%
Georgetown – Rate 13%
Myers Way – Rate 8%
Ballard – Rate 7%

Slide 10:
Transitional H app for youth and young adults because of their developmentam needs

And lack of ability to secure housing on the market

Cost – typical 24K per household per year

Slide 11:
Top Performing Programs:
2 programs have a rate of 100% exits to housing – International District Alliance and YWCA – KC

Lowest Performing:
5 new programs have no exits yet

Typical Cost - $1,200

Slide 12:
Rapid Rehousing is working

Top Performing Programs:
7 programs have a rate of 100% of exits to PH (Catholic Community Services, Chief Seattle Club, El Centro, ID Housing Alliance)

Typical cost – 12K per household

Slide 13:
Typical cost – 30K in services and operating per year, per household

Slide 14:
There isn't a clear correlation between performance and the population served or between performance and the type of program

This indicates that programs are performing well when they have appropriate staffing and are adhering to the best practices of their programs area

If system factors were the primary barriers to performance (CEA and lack of affordable housing) outcomes would be more consistently poor

There are programs that are meeting and exceeding in every area – tells us that it is more about the program

Hand out program rank lists