



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Chief Information Office

Hall of Records
320 West Temple Street, 7th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 253-5600

SACHI A. HAMAI
Chief Executive Officer

TIANA J. MURILLO
Assistant Chief Executive Officer

WILLIAM S. KEHOE
Chief Information Officer

January 6, 2020

Board of Supervisors
HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

JANICE HAHN
Fourth District

KATHRYN BARGER
Fifth District

To: Supervisor Kathryn Barger, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Janice Hahn

From: William S. Kehoe
Chief Information Officer

**TRANSMITTING THE YEAR THREE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF THE
COUNTYWIDE HOMELESS INITIATIVE**

This memo transmits the Year Three performance evaluation of the Countywide Homeless Initiative (HI), which details Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 outcomes and encompasses results produced by both HI-funded services and services provided through Los Angeles County's (LA County's) broader homeless services system. The Year Three report is responsive to directions included with the Board's February 9, 2016 approval of the HI, which mandates independent evaluation of the Initiative's outcomes on an annual basis.

The evaluation was prepared by Public Sector Analytics (PSA) under a contract procured through the Chief Executive Office's (CEO's) delegated authority to execute research-related agreements. PSA's analysis is based on administrative records collected by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and LA County's Departments of Health Services (DHS) and Public Social Services (DPSS), as well as performance measurement data collected by the HI.


A Second Year of Evidence on the Impact of Measure H

Year Three of the HI was the second year for which Measure H revenues were available to the Initiative. The Measure is projected to infuse the HI's coordinated approach to the County's homeless crisis with \$355 Million annually over ten years. The Year Three evaluation, therefore, provided PSA with both an added year of systematic information on the

impact of Measure H and useful comparative perspective, enabling two years of Measure H allocations to be gauged in relation to one another and both years of Measure H-funded activity to be measured against a Year One - Pre-Measure H - baseline.

The Significance of Measure H as Viewed through Housing Placements

Placements of homeless individuals and families into housing, and particularly *Permanent Housing (PH)* placements, offer the most direct measure of homeless services system performance. PSA's evaluation reports that HI strategies and Measure H resources accounted for 9,630 PH placements and 19,688 *Interim Housing (IH)* placements in Year Three of the Initiative, as shown in the figure below.



Permanent Housing

The evaluation report credits the HI with a three-year cumulative total of 20,839 PH placements, which constitute close to 40 percent of the 53,357 placements recorded for LA County's overall homeless services system over this period. Over the first two years of Measure H (Year Two and Year Three of the HI), revenues from the sales tax funded 16,256 cumulative HI placements, accounting for roughly 43 percent of the County's systemwide PH placement total of 37,980. While annual systemwide PH placements were effectively flat between Year Two and Year Three of the HI, the Measure H-funded subset of systemwide placements in Year Three represented an increase of roughly 25.1 percent and effectively offset a 14.6 percent decrease in annual non-H-funded placements.

Interim Housing

A total of 39,628 IH placements over the three years of the Initiative were funded either entirely or partially by HI and Measure H resources, comprising 64.3 percent of the three-year cumulative systemwide total of 61,560 IH placements. A two-year cumulative total of 31,837 Measure H-funded IH placements comprise approximately 71 percent of the 44,802 systemwide total over Year Two and Year Three.

Additional Key Findings


Key findings reported in the Year Three evaluation include the following:

- The 25.1 percent increase in Measure H-funded PH placements during Year Three was specifically driven by significant increases in DHS Permanent Supportive Housing placements affiliated with HI Strategy D7, and Rapid Re-Housing Placements made under HI Strategy B3.
- Systemwide IH placements in Year Three rose by 32 percent, which resulted from a 22 percent increase in LAHSA's Year Three placements and growth of more than 50 percent in DHS IH placements, as well as 1,503 placements made through the Department of Public Health's Substance Abuse Prevention and Control program (DPH/SAPC).
- The number served under HI homelessness prevention strategies A1 and A5 increased significantly in Year Three. More than 90 percent of individuals and roughly 89 percent of family members receiving these services either exited to or retained PH.
- Continuing efforts to develop and deploy a centralized Countywide homeless outreach system, led by LAHSA, DHS, DPH/SAPC, and the Department of Mental Health (DMH) under HI Strategy E6, yielded noteworthy results in Year Three, including a 159 percent increase in referrals and a 102 percent increase in individuals placed in Crisis or Bridge Housing.

Mitigating the Impact of a Statewide Affordable Housing Crisis

PSA's evaluation estimates the HI and Measure H have boosted the County's homeless PH placement capacities by roughly 64 percent and have contributed significantly to a 191 percent increase in IH placement capacities over three years. Despite this growth in the homeless services system, LAHSA's 2019 Point-in-Time (PIT) homeless count for LA County increased by 12 percent. However, a comparison with other California counties shows increasing homelessness to be a Statewide problem fueled by an affordable housing crisis, and that the capacity added by the HI and Measure H is the primary reason the increase in the LA County's homeless count was small by comparison with other counties, as shown in the figure below.

Increases in the Most Recent PIT Homeless Counts in Select California Counties



Next Steps: Evidence-Driven Resource Allocation Deliberations

This report is one of six HI evaluations that will be released in the coming weeks. Like PSA's Year Three report, the additional five evaluations were competitively-procured and are being independently prepared by outside researchers. Each of these additional five reports evaluates HI strategies in key areas: Prevention, Interim and Emergency Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and Outreach. Together the six evaluations will provide critical evidence to guide the HI, the HI's partners, homeless policy stakeholders, and the public at large in collective engagements and deliberations over the allocation of Measure H resources in the future.

If you have any questions about PSA's Year Three report or any of the forthcoming HI strategy evaluations, please contact Max Stevens in the Office of the Chief Information Officer, at (213) 253-5630 or mstevens@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WSK:PL:MS:pa

Attachments

- c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
- County Counsel
- Children and Family Services
- Health Agency
- Health Services
- Mental Health
- Public Health
- Public Social Services
- Probation
- Sheriff
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority

LA COUNTY'S HOMELESS INITIATIVE

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: YEAR THREE OUTCOMES

DECEMBER

2019

HALIL TOROS, PHD
DENNIS CULHANE, PHD

PUBLIC SECTOR ANALYTICS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLES AND FIGURES.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xiv
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. OVERVIEW	1
1.1.1. The Performance Measurement Framework	1
1.2. THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF THE HOMELESS INITIATIVE.....	1
1.2.1. HI and Measure H Permanent and IH Placement Increases Over Three Years	1
1.2.2. Systemwide Placements More Generally	1
1.3. MEASURE H	3
1.3.1. Gauging the Impact of Measure H through Permanent and Interim Housing Placements.....	3
1.4. CHALLENGES PRESENTED BY HOMELESS INFLOW	4
1.4.1. 2019 Homeless Counts: LA County and Beyond.....	4
1.4.2. Mitigating the Impacts of a Statewide Affordable Housing Crisis	5
1.4.3. Markets, Rents and Incomes: When Inflow Offsets Homeless Services System Performance.....	5
1.5. DATA SOURCES.....	6
1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT	6
SECTION 2: MACRO-LEVEL SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES	7
2.1. INTRODUCTION	7
2.2. MACRO MEASURE 1: LENGTH OF TIME HOMELESS FROM INITIAL CONTACT WITH HOMELESS SERVICES SYSTEM	7
2.2.1. Overview	7
2.2.2. Findings	7
2.3. MACRO-MEASURE 2: PLACEMENTS IN PERMANENT HOUSING	9
2.3.1. Overview	9
2.3.2. Findings	9
2.4. RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT HOUSING PLACEMENT	12
2.4.1. Overview	12
2.4.2. Findings	12
SECTION 3: MESO-LEVEL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	13
3.1. INTRODUCTION	13
3.2. MESO-MEASURE 1: NUMBER PREVENTED FROM BECOMING HOMELESS OR BEING DISCHARGED INTO HOMELESSNESS.....	13
3.2.1. Overview	13
3.2.2. Findings	14
3.3. MESO-MEASURE 2: NUMBER WHO ARE PLACED IN INTERIM HOUSING.....	14
3.3.1. Overview	14
3.3.2. Systemwide Interim Housing Placements	15

3.3.3. Persons Placed in HI/H Interim Housing	15
3.4. MESO-MEASURE 3: NUMBER PLACED IN PERMANENT HOUSING	17
3.4.1. Overview	17
3.4.2. Findings	17
3.5. MESO-MEASURE 4: RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT HOUSING PLACEMENT	18
3.5.1. Overview	18
3.5.2. Findings	19
SECTION 4: MICRO-LEVEL STRATEGY PERFORMANCE MEASURES	20
4.1. INTRODUCTION	20
4.2. TOPIC A: PREVENT HOMELESSNESS	20
4.2.1. Strategy A1: Homelessness Prevention for Families	20
4.2.2. Strategy A5: Homelessness Prevention for Individuals	20
4.3. TOPIC B: SUBSIDIZE HOUSING	20
4.3.1. Strategy B1: Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing SSI	21
4.3.2. Strategy B3: Partner with Cities to Expand Rapid Re-Housing	21
4.3.3. Strategy B4: Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies	21
4.3.4. Strategy B6: Family Reunification Housing Subsidy	22
4.3.5. Strategy B7: Interim/Bridge Housing for those Exiting Institutions	22
4.4. TOPIC C: INCREASE INCOME	23
4.4.1. Strategy C1: Enhance CalWORKs Subsidized Employment Program for Homeless Families	23
4.4.2. Strategy C2 and Strategy C7: Increase Employment for Homeless Adults	23
4.4.3. Strategy C3: Targeted Recruitment and Hiring to Increase Homeless Access To County Jobs	23
4.4.4. Strategy C4, C5 and C6: Countywide Supplemental Security/Social Security Disability Income and Veterans Benefits Advocacy	23
4.5. TOPIC D: PROVIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES	24
4.5.1. Strategy D2: Expand Jail In-Reach	25
4.5.2. Strategy D6: Criminal Record Clearing Project	25
4.5.3. Strategy D7: Permanent Supportive Housing	25
4.6. TOPIC E: CREATE A COORDINATED SYSTEM	25
4.6.1. Strategy E4: First Responders Training	26
4.6.2. Strategy E6: Countywide Outreach System	26
4.6.3. Strategy E7: Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System	26
4.6.4. Strategy E8: Enhance the Emergency Shelter System	27
4.6.5. Strategy E14: Enhanced Services for Transition Aged Youth	27
4.7. TOPIC F: INCREASE AFFORDABLE/HOMELESS HOUSING	27
4.7.1. Strategies F2 and F5: Linkage Fee Nexus Study and Incentive Zoning/Value Capture Strategies	28
4.7.2. Strategy F3: Support inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Rental Units	28
4.7.3. Strategy F4: Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System	28
4.7.4. Strategy F6: Use of Public Land for Homeless Housing	28
4.7.5. Strategy F7: Affordable Housing for Homeless Households and Establish a One-Time Housing Innovation Fund	28

SECTION 5: CONCLUSION.....29

5.1. SUMMARIZING THE THREE LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT
IN YEAR THREE 29

 5.1.1. Systemwide Performance 29

 5.1.2. HI Programmatic-Level Performance 29

 5.1.3. Individual Strategy Performance 30

5.2. POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOMELESS INFLOW PROBLEM..... 31

 5.2.1. Looking at inflow from within the Homeless Services System 31

 5.2.2. Reconciling a Stable Services Gap with an Expanding
Homeless Population 32

 5.2.3. Creating Stability Amidst Crisis 32

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLES

Table 2-1: Median Days between Household Assessments and PH Placements	8
Table 2-2: Unduplicated Counts of Individuals and Family Members Placed in PH	10
Table 2-3: Rates of Return to Homelessness	12
Table 3-1: Households Prevented from Becoming Homeless.....	14
Table 3-2: IH Placements	15
Table 3-3: Persons Using HI-Affiliated IH Services, by Program	16
Table 3-4: Persons Placed in HI-Affiliated PH, by Program.....	17
Table 3-5: HI-Affiliated PH Placements and Returns to Homelessness	19
Table 4-1: Strategy B3: Key Outcomes Over Three Years	21
Table 4-2: Strategy B4: Key Outcomes Over Three Years	22
Table 4-3: Persons Enrolled in and Served by Strategy B7 Programs.....	22
Table 4-4: Strategy E4: Summary Outcomes	26
Table 4-5: Strategy E6 Summary Outcomes	26
Table 4-6: Summary Outcomes for CES under Strategy E7	27
Table 4-7: Strategy E8: Key Outcomes.....	27
Table 5-1: Homeless Services Enrollees and Exits Recorded in HMIS in Successive Fiscal Years	32

FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Annual HI PH and IH Placements and Year-over-Year Increases in the First Two Years of Measure H	2
Figure 1-2: Annual Systemwide PH and IH Placements and Year-over-Year Increases In Year Two and Year Three of the HI:	2
Figure 1-3: Measure H and Non-Measure H Shares of Year Two and Year Three Cumulative Total Systemwide PH Placements	3
Figure 1-4: Measure H and Non-Measure H Shares of Year Two and Year Three Cumulative Total Systemwide IH Placements	3
Figure 1-5: PIT Homeless Counts in Select California Counties	5
Figure 2-1: Median Days between Assessments and PH Placements	8
Figure 2-2: Unduplicated PH Placements, by Year, Agency and Housing Type	11
Figure 3-1: IH Placements. by Agency and Fiscal Year	15
Figure 3-2: Persons Using HI-Affiliated IH Services, by Program	16
Figure 3-3: Persons Placed in HI-Affiliated PH, by Program.....	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LA COUNTY'S HOMELESS INITIATIVE Annual Performance Evaluation: Year Three Outcomes

BACKGROUND

In February 2016, the LA County (LA County) Board (Board) formally approved a comprehensive set of strategies to combat the County's homeless crisis. Coordinated by the CEO's Homeless Initiative (HI), the HI strategies are the product of a collaborative process that involved not only County but also non-County stakeholders, including cities, municipal leaders, community organizations, advocates, and concerned citizens. The strategies are grouped into six focus areas seeking to (a) prevent homelessness, (b) expand subsidized housing, (c) increase income among those who are homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless, (d) enhance homeless case management and supportive services, (e) create a coordinated homeless services system, and (f) expand affordable and homeless housing.

EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE IN THE CONTEXT OF AN EXPANDING HOMELESS POPULATION

This report evaluates HI outcomes produced during Year Three of the HI, from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019, LA County's 2018-19 Fiscal Year (FY). Despite a 12 Percent year-over-year increase in the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA's) 2019 Point-in-Time (PIT) homeless count for the County, the HI's Year Three performance, as measured by results detailed in this report, was effective and successful. The PIT count was driven higher by the continuation of an upward trend in the housing market, which has pushed rents to levels increasingly out of alignment with incomes. The forces driving this dynamic are largely outside the policy purview of the homeless services system and should not obscure the HI's important Year Three accomplishments.

Amidst an expanding homeless population, the HI placed 9,630 individuals and family members in Permanent Housing (PH) in Year Three.¹ While non-HI-affiliated PH placements over the same period decreased by 14.6 Percent, the HI's Year Three PH placements represent an increase of close to 25.1 Percent over the Initiative's Year Two placements. Moreover, whereas the Year Two rate of persons returning to homelessness six months after a PH placement was 9.2 Percent, the rate in Year Three decreased to 5.9 Percent. The HI also placed 19,688 individuals and family members in Interim Housing (IH) in Year Three, which is roughly 27 Percent higher than the Initiative's IH placements in the previous year. Three.¹ Additionally, the number of individuals and family members served by HI homelessness prevention strategies increased in Year Three and their aggregate outcomes represented significant improvement over outcomes observed among those served during Year Two.

THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF THE HOMELESS INITIATIVE

While the primary purpose of this report is to evaluate the HI's Year Three, the historical perspective offered by three full years of the HI is critical to the Year Three assessment. In approving the HI's strategies to combat the County's homeless crisis in February 2016, the Board allocated \$100 million to this

¹ HI-funded PH and Interim Housing placements shown in this evaluation are higher than those reflected in Year Three quarterly reporting for two reasons: The 9,630 Year Three PH placements shown in this report include 253 placements not previously reported in Year Three quarterly reporting because the appropriate service records were not yet available. Similarly, the 19,688 Year Three IH placements shown here include 1,503 placements administered by the Department of Public Health's Substance Abuse Prevention and Control program, the data for which were not available at the time the quarterly public reports were prepared.

countywide effort. These funds were deployed to implement the strategies and to initiate new or enhanced services to homeless and at-risk subpopulations at what was then a partial scale.


Measure H

In March 2017, the County’s electorate approved Measure H, a quarter-cent sales tax, which is projected to yield \$355 million *per annum* for ten years to fund the HI strategies to combat the homeless crisis. Measure H revenues first became available in Year Two. In this Year Three report on HI outcomes, as well as in the Year Two performance evaluation, our analysis examines outcomes associated with HI- and Measure H-funded services in the context of a larger set of outcomes for the County’s overall homeless services system, which include both HI/H and non-HI/H-funded services.

HI AND SYSTEMWIDE PERMANENT AND INTERIM HOUSING PLACEMENTS OVER THREE YEARS

In the first three years of the initiative, HI strategies account for cumulative and unduplicated totals of 20,839 PH placements and 39,628 IH placements. Figure 1 shows PH and IH placements for all three years.

Figure 1. Annual HI PH and IH Placements and Annual Increases in the first Two Years of Measure H*



*Measure H resources were not available in Year One


Figure 2 expands to a systemwide perspective in looking at PH and IH placements over three years, i.e., inclusive of both HI/H and non-HI/H placements. Cumulative Systemwide PH placements totaled to 53,357 after three years, while systemwide IH placements total to 61,560.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MEASURE H

The HI and Measure H funded close to 39 Percent of total PH placements. In addition, HI/H either completely or partially funded roughly 6 4 Percent of IH placements over three years. The significance of H is observed in the following developments between Year One and Three:

- HI-funded PH placements increased by 4.5 times (from 4,583 to 20,839);
- IH placements increased by more than five times (from 7,791 to 39,628);

Figure 2. Annual Systemwide PH and IH Placements and Annual Increases in the First Two years of Measure H*



*Measure H resources were not available in Year One

MEASURING YEAR THREE PERFORMANCE

THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND DATA SOURCES

The Year Three outcomes examined in this report are reported within a framework consisting of the same three levels of performance measurement used to evaluate Year One and Year Two (Table 1).

Table 1. The Three Levels of Measurement within the HI Performance Evaluation Framework

Macro-Level System Metrics	These measures gauge the performance of LA County’s overall homeless services system, inclusive of HI’s strategic activity, i.e. Measure H-funded services, as well as services and benefits not directly associated with the HI, but which are nevertheless important components in the overall range of support and care available to the County’s homeless population.
Meso-Level Program Metrics	The meso program measures are aggregations of strategy-specific outcomes section and are largely focused on HI activities and services.
Micro-Level Strategy Metrics	Micro performances measures were developed for each of the individual HI strategies and provide the foundation for the higher order macro- and meso-level results.

The data used for this report are administrative records collected by three of the largest agencies serving homeless clients in the County, which are the LAHSA, the LA County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) and The LA County Department of Health Services (DHS).

MACRO-LEVEL SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

MACRO MEASURE 1: LENGTH OF TIME HOMELESS FROM INITIAL CONTACT WITH HOMELESS SERVICES

Results for this Measure are measured in median days between assessments and placements. Three types of placements are assessed in producing the annual result for this measure: placements in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH); residential move-ins with Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) assistance (people who moved into PH with or without an RRH subsidy); and other exits to PH through self-resolution and other means (private market rental, stable arrangements with family or friends, etc.). The data for this measure came from homeless services provided through LAHSA and recorded in the Homeless


Management Information System (HMIS). The results indicate significant improvement on a systemwide basis.

- The results indicate significant improvement on a systemwide basis in Year Three by comparison with Year Two:
 - The length of time from assessment to housing placements declined by 7.5 Percent for all placements from 93 days to 86 days;
 - The sharpest decline was observed for PSH placements at 20.5 Percent.

MACRO MEASURE 2: PLACEMENTS IN PERMANENT HOUSING

One of the most basic measures of progress in the provision of homeless services is the number of exits to PH made from the homeless services system over a given year. The *placements* macro-measure tallies the number of PH placements in Year Three compared to the same macro-metric for Years One and Two. Figure 3 shows unduplicated systemwide counts of placements in PH by year, agency and housing type.

Figure 3. Unduplicated Systemwide PH Placements by Year, Agency, and Housing Type



- The 20,262 Systemwide PH placements in Year Three were slightly higher but essentially flat relative to the Year Two placement tally of 20,153.ⁱⁱ However:
 - H-funded placements grew by 25.1 Percent in Year Three compared to Year Two.
 - Much of the flatness in Year Three PH placements relative to Year Two resulted from the commitment of all General Relief (GR) Housing Subsidies administered by DPSS.
 - An increase of more than four Percent in systemwide PH placements is observed in Year Three if the DPSS housing subsidies are excluded from the comparisons in Year Three.

MACRO MEASURE 3: RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT HOUSING PLACEMENT

The third and final macro performance measure is the degree to which individuals and families tallied in the system-level metric as exiting to PH subsequently returned to homelessness. We measured the proportion of exits to PH for homeless households in which they did not subsequently re-enter the homeless services system within six months of the placement, as recorded in HMIS.

- Despite systemwide PH placements that have increased by 2.4 times between Year One and Year Three, Year Three (FY 2018-19) results for the return to homelessness measure represent a significant improvement over Year Two and Year One:
 - Between Year Two and Year Three (FY 2017-18) the rate decreased from 8.9 Percent to 3.7 Percent.

MESO-LEVEL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

MESO-MEASURE 1: NUMBER PREVENTED FROM BECOMING HOMELESS OR BEING DISCHARGED INTO HOMELESSNESS

Prevention programs saw a growth at both the family and individual levels. The number of families served grew from 858 in Year Two to 1,003 in Year Three, an increase of almost 17 Percent. Individuals served through Strategy A5 increased by a factor of five, from 257 in Year Two to 1,221 in Year Three. This large increase is mostly due to implementation of HI Strategy A5 late in Year Two (February 2018). Table 1 provides the Year Three prevention results with Year One and Year Two shown for comparative perspective.

Table 1. Families and Individuals Prevented from Becoming Homeless

Year (FY)	LAHSA A1 (Families) Served	LAHSA A1 (Families) Exits	LAHSA A1 (Families) Exits to PH	% PH Exits
Three: 2018-19	1,003	800	709	88.6
Two: 2017-18	858	470	341	72.6
One: 2016-17	547	349	287	82.2
Year (FY)	LAHSA A5 Served	LAHSA A5 Exits	Exits to PH	% PH Exits
Three: 2018-19	1,221	848	788	92.9
Two: 2017-18	257	91	82	90.1

- Prevention outcomes in Year Three improved significantly by comparison with Year Two:

ⁱⁱ These 20,262 Systemwide PH placements include 253 Measure H-funded placements not reported in Year Three quarterly reporting because the appropriate service records were not yet available.


- The proportion of HI Strategy A1 families that exited into PH increased from approximately 73 Percent in Year Two to 89 in Year Three.
- Almost ninety-three Percent of the individuals who exited the A5 program retained (or made the transition into other) PH.

MESO-MEASURE 2: NUMBER PLACED IN INTERIM HOUSING

HI strategies B7 and E8 are aggregated in this measure and Figure 4 shows the number of persons who were served through them over three years.

- A total of 19,688 unduplicated individuals were placed in IH facilities funded in whole or part by Measure H in Year Three: ⁱⁱⁱ
 - This represents an increase of 26.7 Percent over Year Two.
 - LAHSA placements in IH grew 17.9 Percent.
 - The DPH B7 program added 1,503 placements.

Figure 4. Number of Persons Using HI-affiliated IH Services over Three Years by Strategy and Agency



MESO-MEASURE 3: NUMBER PLACED IN PERMANENT HOUSING


At the HI program level, this measure aggregates individuals and family members placed in PH across the PH HI strategies and enables assessment of the effectiveness of HI-related efforts to end homelessness for individuals and families through placements in RRH, PSH, and other subsidized and unsubsidized PH. Three HI strategies focused on PH - B1, B3, and D7 - are consolidated in Figure 5.

- A total of 9,630 unduplicated family members and individuals were placed in HI PH in FY 2018-19, a 25 Percent increase over the Year Two total.

ⁱⁱⁱ These 20,262 Systemwide PH placements include 253 Measure H-funded placements not reported in Year Three quarterly reporting because the appropriate service records were not yet available

- The largest increase was observed in placements by the DHS PSH program (Strategy D7), which increased by 141.1 Percent between Year Two and Year Three.^{iv}
- LAHSA RRH (Strategy B3) placements also increased significantly, by 23.6 Percent.
- To create better system alignment and support the need for increased targeting of families in the provision of RRH services, DHS tapered enrollments in Strategy B3 during Year Three and will be making no new enrollments in B3 in Year Four.

Figure 5. Number of Persons Using HI-affiliated PH Services Over Three Years, by Strategy and Agency



MESO-MEASURE 4: RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT HOUSING PLACEMENT

Just as the meso-level PH placement measure allows for an assessment specifically of HI-related efforts to place individuals and families in PH, the meso-level metric for returns to homelessness after a PH placement provides a measure of the extent to which HI/H-funded PH services are administered to ensure those placed do not return to homelessness. Like the same metric at the macro-level, we measured the proportion of exits to PH for homeless households in which they did not subsequently re-enter the homeless services system within six months of the placement, as recorded in HMIS.

- The overall return rates decreased significantly from Year Two, from 9.2 Percent to 5.9 Percent and the return rates decreased for all programs analyzed.

MICRO-LEVEL STRATEGY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Since micro-data were not available for us to analyze the outcomes of all strategies, our assessment of these strategies relies on information provided in HI quarterly reporting to the Board. The most significant outcomes are summarized below grouped by topic domains:

TOPIC A: PREVENT HOMELESSNESS

- The number of families served under Strategy A1 (Prevent Homelessness for at-risk Families) increased by 16.9 Percent between Year Two and Year Three.

^{iv} Although a portion of the magnitude of this increase reflects DHS’s improved data quality in Year Three, the growth in D7 placements between Year Two and Year Three is undoubtedly significant even allowing for data-related factors.

- The proportion of participant families that exited A1 and either retained their housing or moved into PH increased from 73 Percent to 89 Percent.
- A total of 1,223 individuals were served under Strategy A5 (Prevent Homelessness for at-risk Individuals) in Year Three.
- More than 90 Percent of those who exited A5 either retained their housing or moved into PH.

TOPIC B: SUBSIDIZE HOUSING

- Strategy B3 (Partner with Cities to Expand RRH) expanded with 20,950 active enrollees.
- The number of B3 participants who secured PH increased by 18 Percent.
- Strategy B7 (Interim/Bridge Housing for Those Exiting Institutions) expanded significantly with almost 60 Percent more new enrollees and active participants compared to Year Two.
- PH placements among enrollees in interim/bridge housing increased by 22 Percent compared to Year Two.

TOPIC C: INCREASE INCOME

- Under Strategies C2 and C7 (Increase Employment through Supporting Social Enterprise), the number of participants enrolled in transitional employment increased in Year Three by 58.1 Percent, from 800 to 1,265.
- The number of C2/C7 participants placed in unsubsidized employment more than doubled, from 283 to 582.
- Participants enrolled in Strategy C4 (Countywide SSI Advocacy Program) exceeded 10,000, 1,266 of whom submitted applications for SSI benefits, a three-fold increase from Year Two.

TOPIC D: PROVIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

- Inmates receiving jail in-reach services under Strategy D2 (Expansion of Jail In-reach) declined by 61 Percent to 1,349 and placements in bridge housing among discharged inmates decreased by 40.7 Percent in Year Three, but these decreases reflect DHS' deliberate decision to provide more focused case management geared towards improved outcomes. PH placements among those discharged, however, increased, by 34.5 Percent from 119 to 160.
- The number of homeless persons seeking to clear criminal histories under Strategy D6 (Criminal Record Clearing Project) increased by 3.7 times in Year Three, from 577 to 2,108.
- PH placements associated with Strategy D7 (Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for PSH) grew from 984 in Year Two to 2,353 in Year Three an increase of 139.1 Percent.
- The number of participants who are receiving rental subsidies under the strategy increased over the same period by 53.9 Percent from 2,421 to 3,725.

TOPIC E: PROVIDE CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES


- The number of individuals receiving services and/or referrals through Strategy E6 (Countywide Outreach System) almost tripled in Year Three by comparison with Year Two from 6,833 to 17,673.
- The number of PH placements associated with Strategy E6 increased by roughly 2.8 times from 275 to 757.
- The number of IH placements made in connection with Strategy E6 increased by 26.1 Percent from 1,164 to 1,468.

- Households assessed through the Coordinated Entry System (CES) under Strategy E6 declined by roughly 6 Percent.
- The average length of time between an E6-related assessment to housing match remained high, exceeding eight months.
- Strategy E8 (Enhance the Emergency Shelter System) continued to expand the availability of crisis housing, with entries increasing by almost one-third from 13,524 in Year Two to 17,759 in Year Three.
- The number of active E8 IH participants increased by 40 Percent, exceeding 22,000.
- The number of households making exits from E8 IH placements to PH grew by 44 Percent, reaching almost 4,000.

MITIGATING THE IMPACT OF A STATEWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS

The increase reflected in the 2019 PIT count for Los Angeles was sobering for the HI and its partners, but the evidence indicates that the growth reflected in the count is part of a broader California affordable housing crisis, one that has substantially increased the homeless population Statewide. By comparison with recent PIT homeless counts conducted in other California counties, the magnitude of the 2019 increase in LA County was significantly smaller than what most other counties experienced. (Figure 6). This suggests that, while the HI strategies could not completely shield the County from the effects of the broader affordable housing crisis, the expanded services and capacities made available through the HI and Measure H likely mitigated the effects of this crisis. Estimates prepared by the United Way Home for Good Initiative support this view, projecting that in the absence of the HI, the PIT count for LA County would have increased 28 Percent. Mitigation of the effects of a deep and complex Statewide crisis does not figure directly into the outcome measurements examined in this report. However, this aspect of the HI is a by-product of results explicitly examined in this report and is worth highlighting as one of the HI’s most critical accomplishments in Year Three.

Figure 6. The Most Recent PIT Homeless Counts in Select California Counties*



*According to the San Diego Regional Task Force on the Homeless, the 6 Percent decline reported in San Diego County’s 2019 PIT count reflects a methodology change relative to the previous count, which has the effect of significantly reducing the number of vehicle dwellers included in the overall count.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Preparing this report would not be possible without the generosity and collegiality of personnel at agencies playing lead roles in administering HI strategies, who assisted us in no small measure by making data available to us and spending time with us to ensure we interpret them correctly, as well as by sharing details on the operation of specific HI strategies with us and providing feedback on previous drafts of our analysis. We would like to extend our gratitude, in particular, to Heidi Marston, Mazharul Islam, Steven Rocha, and Meredith Berkson at the LAHSA; Cheri Todoroff, Whitney Lawrence, Kevin Flaherty, Richard Wood Libby Boyce, Leepi Shimkhada, and Sarah Mahin at the DHS; Luther Evans, LaShonda Diggs, Kelvin Driscoll, Deon Arline, Maria Rivera, Henry Bermudez, Jennifer Zogg and Milli Tran at the DPSS; Bill Kehoe, Patricia Almaguer and Max Stevens in the Office of the Chief Information Officer; and Phil Ansell and Elizabeth Ben-Ishai in the Office of the HI.

**LA COUNTY'S HOMELESS INITIATIVE:
YEAR THREE OUTCOMES**

**HALIL TOROS, PHD
DENNIS CULHANE, PHD**

PUBLIC SECTOR ANALYTICS

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. OVERVIEW

In February 2016, the LA County Board formally approved a comprehensive set of strategies to combat the County's homeless crisis. Development of the strategies occurred through a collaborative process, which was coordinated by the CEO's HI and involved not only County but also non-County stakeholders, including cities, municipal leaders, community organizations, advocates, and concerned citizens. Together these strategies establish and/or expand a range of client-centered services for persons who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and are structured to produce measurable outcomes. The strategies seek to (a) prevent homelessness, (b) expand subsidized housing, (c) increase income among those who are homeless or are at risk of becoming homeless, (d) enhance homeless case management and supportive services, (e) create a coordinated homeless services system, and (f) expand affordable and homeless housing.

1.1.1. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

This report presents outcomes for the period from July 2018 through June 2019, which was LA County's FY 2018-19 and Year Three of the HI. The outcomes are reported within a framework consisting of three macro-level systemwide measures, four meso-level program measures, and twenty-eight micro-level measures corresponding to individual HI strategies. Where the data permit us to do so, Year Three outcomes are compared with outcomes from Year One and Year Two.

1.2. FIRST THREE YEARS OF THE HOMELESS INITIATIVE

In the first three years of the initiative, HI strategies account for cumulative and unduplicated totals of 20,839 PH placements and 39,628 IH placements.¹

1.2.1. HI AND MEASURE H PERMANENT AND INTERIM HOUSING PLACEMENTS OVER THREE YEARS

Figure 1-1 shows in-year PH and IH placements.² After increasing by 68 Percent between Year One and Year Two, 9,630 new HI PH placements between Year Two and Year Three represented an additional 25.1 Percent year-over-year increase. HI-funded IH placements almost doubled between Year One and Year Two and increased by an additional 26.7 Percent between Year Two and Year Three.

1.2.2. SYSTEMWIDE PLACEMENTS MORE GENERALLY


HI resources, however, do not reflect the entirety of LA County's overall homeless services system. The macro performance metrics discussed in this report reflect a *systemwide* perspective, encompassing and combining HI-funded outcomes, including PH placements, as well as outcomes associated with the County's homeless services system more broadly, inclusive of activity outside the immediate purview of

¹ Please note that IH placement totals include all placements funded entirely or partially with HI resources.

² HI-funded PH and IH placements shown in this evaluation are higher than those reflected in Year Three quarterly reporting for two reasons: The 9,630 Year Three PH placements shown in this report include 253 placements not previously reported in Year Three quarterly reporting because the appropriate service records were not yet available. Similarly, the 19,688 Year Three IH placements shown here include 1,503 placements administered by the Department of Public Health's Substance Abuse Prevention and Control program, the data for which were not available at the time the quarterly public reports were prepared.


the HI. Figure 1-2 shows systemwide PH and IH placements i.e., inclusive but not limited to those funded with HI resources, in each of the first three years of the HI.³

Figure 1-1. Annual HI PH and IH Placements and Year-over-Year Increases in the First Two Years of Measure H*



*Measure H funds became available in Year 2

Figure 1-2. Systemwide PH and IH Placements and Year-over-Year Increases in Year Two and Year Three of the HI



The rationale for reporting both levels of measurement i.e., strictly- HI-related outcomes *and* overall systemic outcomes, is to demonstrate the difference the HI makes to the quantity of services available and, therefore, to those who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. As of the end of Year Three, HI resources funded over 39 Percent of the 53,357 systemwide cumulative total PH placements and roughly 64 Percent of the 61,560 systemwide cumulative total IH placements.

Between Year One and Year Three, HI-funded PH placements increased by 4.5 times. Over the same period, IH placements increased by more than five times (from 7,791 to 39,628). Most importantly, the

³ Systemwide PH and IH placements shown in this evaluation are higher than those reflected in Year Three quarterly reporting because the data recording the placements were not available at the time the quarterly reports were prepared. The Year Three PH placement total reflected in this report is higher by 253 and IH placement total is higher by 1,503.

counts suggest that placements funded by the HI have boosted the County’s PH capacities by 64.5 Percent and have almost tripled the County’s IH capacities.⁴

1.3. MEASURE H

In this Year Three report on HI outcomes, as well as in the Year Two performance evaluation, the distinction referenced above between HI-funded outcomes and systemwide outcomes is also, at some key levels of measurement, a distinction between outcomes funded by Measure H revenues and outcomes inclusive but not limited to those funded by Measure H.

In approving the HI’s strategies to combat the County’s homeless crisis in February 2016, the Board allocated \$100 million to this countywide effort. These funds were deployed to implement the strategies and to initiate new or enhanced services to homeless and at-risk subpopulations at what was then a partial scale. Measure H is projected to yield \$355 million *per annum* to fund the HI strategies and it first became fully available in Year Two.

1.3.1. GAUGING THE IMPACT OF MEASURE H THROUGH PERMANENT AND INTERIM HOUSING PLACEMENTS

Using Year One (Pre-Measure H) HI placements as a baseline, a cumulative total of 16,256 Measure H-funded PH placements in Years Two and Three represent an increase of 3.5 times over the Year One total (4,583 placements) and an annual average that is 1.8 times higher than the Year One total. Cumulative HI-funded IH placements over two years of Measure H total to 31,837, an increase of roughly 4 times relative to the baseline Year One total (7,791 placements) and an annual average that is roughly two times higher than the Year One total.

Figure 1-3. Measure H and non-Measure H Shares of Year Two and Year Three Cumulative Total Systemwide PH Placements
Systemwide *n*=37,980





Figure 1-4. Measure H and non-Measure H Shares of Year Two and Year Three Cumulative Total Systemwide IH placements
Systemwide *n*=44,802



⁴ This is based on subtracting the HI portions from the systemwide portions and the counterfactual assumption of no alternative to the HI were the initiative not to have been implemented. With respect to PH placements, the non-HI portion of the overall cumulative placements over three years (31,874 placements as shown in Figure 1-3) imply that the HI has added 64.5 Percent to County capacities (20,551/31,874 placements = 0.6447). In terms of interim housing placements, the non-H portion of the three-year cumulative total (21,122 as shown in Figure 1-3) imply that the HI has increased overall County capacities by 191% (40,331/21,122 = 1.909).

Measure H funds, as shown in Figures 1-3 and 1-4, have accounted for 42.8 Percent of cumulative PH placements and 71.1 Percent of cumulative IH placements over the two years during which these revenues have been available.

1.4. CHALLENGES PRESENTED BY HOMELESS INFLOW

The significant capacity increases made possible by the infusion of Measure H resources are undeniable and underscore the impact of the quarter-cent sales tax. In 2019, however, a 12 Percent increase in the annual PIT homeless count conducted by the LAHSA had the effect of obscuring the impact of Measure H and the HI's accomplishments and performance to date. The increase also drew attention to factors largely beyond the purview and control of the HI which directly affect the scale and scope of the County's homeless crisis.

1.4.1. 2019 HOMELESS COUNTS: LA COUNTY AND BEYOND

LAHSA is a critical HI partner in administering the Countywide approach to the homeless crisis. The agency presides over homeless services funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and provided within the Greater Los Angeles Continuum of Care (GLA CoC), the HUD jurisdiction inclusive of most of LA County. As the administrative body over HUD's GLA CoC, LAHSA is responsible for producing an annual PIT homeless count, which tallies the number of sheltered and unsheltered persons who are homeless on a typical night in LA County.⁵

LAHSA's count is the most widely observed and referenced measure of the County's homeless population, and year-over-year changes in the count inform the public's impressions, not only as to whether homelessness is increasing or decreasing in the County, but also about the effectiveness of government policy and services made available to the homeless population. The 12 Percent increase in LAHSA's 2019 PIT tally for LA County, 58,936 persons, up from 52,765 in 2018, created the challenge of reconciling the significant expansion in the scale of the County's homeless services system attributable to Measure H with this increase in the homeless population. It is useful then to frame discussions of the 2019 homeless count by comparing the year-over-year change in LA County against the change in other key California counties (Figure 1-5)


1.4.2. MITIGATING THE IMPACTS OF A STATEWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS

The information presented in Figure 1-6 helps place increasing homelessness in LA County between 2018 and 2019 within the context of a broader statewide problem. It simultaneously reveals that the magnitude of the increase in LA County was significantly smaller than what most other counties experienced, suggesting that while the HI strategies could not completely shield LA County from the effects of the broader crisis, the expanded services and capacities enabled by Measure H likely mitigated the effects of this crisis. Estimates prepared by the United Way Home for Good Initiative support this view, projecting that in the absence of Measure H resources, the PIT count for LA County would have increased 28 Percent.⁶

⁵LAHSA produces separate PIT counts for LA County overall and the GLA CoC, which does not include the cities of Long Beach, Glendale, and Pasadena.

⁶According to the San Diego Regional Task Force on the Homeless, the 6 Percent decline reported in San Diego County's 2019 PIT count reflects a methodology change relative to the previous count, which has the effect of significantly reducing the number of vehicle dwellers included in the overall count.

Figure 1-5. PIT Homeless Counts in Select California Counties.



1.4.3. MARKETS, RENTS, AND INCOMES: WHEN INFLOW OFFSETS HOMELESS SERVICES SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

Situating Los Angeles County’s homeless crisis as part of a more general statewide problem is important in framing the significance of Measure H. That the growth of LAHSA’s 2019 homeless count would have been higher in the absence of Measure H is, by extension, a key to the substance of communication with the public about the performance of the HI strategies. These concepts may be limited in their ability to immediately satisfy expectations of tangible and observable results, but for the concepts to have even limited resonance, the factors and dynamics upon which they are based must be clearly understood and identified.

Three factors are at the basis of the mechanism responsible for expanding the homeless population: broader housing market trends, rents, and incomes. A continuation of the upward trend in the real estate market has driven rents to levels recognized as beyond affordability for increasingly large sections of working families and individuals. People who rely on safety net incomes, such as the aging, disabled, and unemployed populations are particularly affected by these housing cost and supply pressures. As these market forces push rents out of alignment with renter incomes, they also exacerbate difficulties that public agencies experience in acquiring properties and land that can be used to develop affordable and homeless housing. The net effect is an acceleration in *homeless inflow*, the number of individuals and families becoming newly homeless from one year to the next. The annual PIT homeless count increases when the pace of homeless inflow exceeds the homeless services system’s capacity to absorb and house those who become homeless.

Homeless inflow and its underlying dynamics are not within the primary scope of this Year Three HI performance evaluation. As noted above, the factors responsible for fueling much of the inflow problem – markets, rents, and incomes – are largely beyond the homeless policymaking domain. Since inflow is a key challenge that will continue to affect the County’s efforts to combat homelessness and the outcomes produced through these efforts, we will return to this topic in the conclusion, with the intention of identifying how and where the HI and the County’s homeless services system can potentially contribute to a solution.

1.5. DATA SOURCES

Our analysis of HI performance and outcomes in Year Three is informed by administrative records collected by three of the largest agencies serving the County's homeless population.

- The LAHSA is the coordinating agency over the GLA CoC, which is a HUD jurisdiction that encompasses most of LA County. Services administered through LAHSA are recorded in the HMIS for the GLA CoC.⁷
- The LA County DPSS administers income and food assistance benefits through the CalWORKs, GR, and CalFRESH programs, as well as Medi-Cal eligibility and a range of other related services, most of which are recorded in the department's LEADER Replacement System (LRS).
- The LA County DHS administers the County's publicly run network of hospitals and other medical facilities and services. In addition to health and medical services, DHS provides homeless care and support through several programs. The DHS homeless services included in this report's measures are recorded in the department's Comprehensive Health Accompaniment and Management Platform (CHAMP) system.

Since all source data systems include clients with multiple IDs over the three years of HI implementation, a robust entity-resolution process was completed to assign unique IDs to all persons studied. After de-duplicating all clients in these records across the three agencies, selected performance measures were assessed using descriptive statistical methods.

1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

In keeping with the approach taken in the Year One and Year Two HI performance evaluations, our analysis of Year Three moves from the homeless services system overall, to the HI at an aggregated program level, to individual HI strategies. Specifically:

- **Section 2** of this report focuses on the macro-level systemwide performance measures that aggregate outcomes associated with strategies and services funded through Measure H and the HI, as well as outcomes tied to activity not funded through Measure H/HI, but which are nevertheless provided through the County's homeless services system more generally.
- **Section 3** examines outcomes at the meso- or program-level, where HI strategies in common programmatic areas (inclusive of H- and non-H-funded activity) are aggregated in headline metrics.
- **Section 4** moves the analysis to the micro-level, evaluating the performance of all individual HI strategies for which client-level data are available.
- **Section 5** is the concluding chapter and offers some thoughts on outcomes examined in this report and returns to the homeless inflow problem discussed above.

⁷The cities of Long Beach, Pasadena, and Glendale are outside the GLA CoC. LAHSA made outcomes data on HUD-funded services for these cities available to us for this evaluation.

SECTION 2

MACRO-LEVEL SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The macro-level metrics within the evaluation framework of this analysis measure the performance of LA County's overall homeless services system, inclusive of HI's strategic activity i.e., Measure H-funded services, as well as services and benefits not directly associated with the HI, but which are nevertheless important components in the overall range of support and care available to the County's homeless population.

This is the third year for which results are available for these three macro-measures. The Year One (FY 2016-17) and Year Two (FY 2017-18) outcomes will act as a reference point for comparing the Year Three results with the first two years of the HI.

Three macro-level performance measures serve as key indicators of the overall effectiveness of the countywide homeless service delivery system:

- The duration of periods of homelessness;
- The number of homeless households (both families and individuals) who were placed into PH;
- Returns to homelessness following placement into PH.

2.2. MACRO-MEASURE 1

LENGTH OF TIME HOMELESS FROM INITIAL CONTACT WITH THE HOMELESS SERVICES SYSTEM

2.2.1. OVERVIEW

This measure is operationalized as the time from assessment to a placement in PH. Three types of placements are assessed: placements in PSH; residential move-ins with RRH assistance (people who moved into PH with or without an RRH subsidy); and other exits to PH through self-resolution and other means (private market rental, stable arrangements with family or friends, etc.) The data for this measure came from homeless services provided through LAHSA and recorded in the HMIS). Services provided through DPSS and DHS were not included because assessment dates for the services were not available.

2.2.2. FINDINGS

Table 2-1 and Figure 2-1 show the median times between assessments and placements measured at the household level. Assessment data were not available for all placement episodes; approximately two-thirds of placements could be aligned with an assessment date and median times to placement were measured for these placements. Only data from these placements were included in the results presented here. The remaining one-third of households either did not have an assessment date or their assessment date could not be aligned with the placement.

Table 2-1. Median Days between Household Assessments and PH Placements


Year	PSH	RRH	Self-Resolved Exits to PH	All Placements
FY 2018-19	105	75	90	86
Percent Change	-20.5	-7.4	5.9	-7.5
FY 2017-18	132	81	85	93
Percent Change	-1.5	5.2	3.7	4.5
FY 2016-17	134	77	82	89

Like Year Two, approximately 7,500 assessments followed by placements were used for this measure. The length of time from assessment to housing placements declined by 7.5 Percent for all placements and the sharpest decline was observed for PSH placements at 20.5 Percent. The following results are also noteworthy:

- The combined median duration to placement was 86 days in Year Three, 7 days shorter than the 93-day median in Year Two.
- The longest time between assessment and placement was for PSH placements, at 105 days, which declined by 27 days between Years Two and Three.

The results shown in Table 2-1 are presented graphically in Figure 2-1.

Figure 2-1. Median Days Between Assessments and PH Placements



2.3. MACRO-MEASURE 2 PLACEMENTS IN PERMANENT HOUSING

2.3.1. OVERVIEW

One of the most basic measures of progress in the provision of homeless services is the number of exits to PH made from the homeless services system over a given year. The “placements” macro-measure tallies the number of PH placements in Year Three compared to the same macro-metric for Years One and Two.

The data to produce this measure came from three administrative sources:

- HMIS, which tracks PH placements that occur in conjunction with individuals and families using homeless services.
 - These LAHSA-associated service episodes include placements in PSH, residential move-ins following RRH assistance, and other self-resolved PH placements (private market rental, stable arrangements with family or friends, etc.)
- DPSS records for PH subsidies provided to homeless individuals pursuing Supplemental Security Income (SSI) through DPSS’s GR Housing Subsidy and Case Management Program.⁸
- DHS records of PSH and RRH placements.

2.3.2. FINDINGS

Table 2-2 shows unduplicated counts of placements in PH. In Year Three there were 20,262 unduplicated family members and individuals who left homelessness for PH situations. This was almost the same number of households that left homelessness for PH in Year Two. After a big increase between Years One and Two, PH placements did not change in Year Three. However, if the exhausted DPSS B1 housing subsidies for GR participants are excluded from the comparison, we observe almost a 4 Percent increase in Year Three.

The table also shows the breakdown of exits by individuals and family members.⁹ Specific elements of the changes from Year Two to Year Three among the categories of PH exits include:

- The largest increases were observed for residential move-ins with LAHSA’s RRH program, which exceeded 7,400 and DHS PSH placements, which reached almost 3,000 in Year Three (an increase of approximately 23 Percent).
- To create better system alignment and to support the need for increased RRH resources targeting families, DHS began sunseting its Measure H funded RRH program in FY 2018-19. Overall RRH placements increased by almost 19 Percent.

⁸The housing obtained through the GR Housing Subsidy is permanent while the subsidy is contingent on the person in question being in receipt of GR.


⁹If an exit from DHS was also recorded in HMIS, that placement is only shown under a DHS placement type.

Table 2-2. Unduplicated Counts of Individuals and Family Members Placed in PH

Year	LAHSA PSH	LAHSA RRH	LAHSA – Self-Resolved Exits	DHS PSH	DHS RRH	DPSS GR	Other Veterans	TOTAL
	Individuals and Family Members							
Year Three (FY 2018-19)	1,545	7,430	7,050	2,914	470	253	600	20,262
Percent Change	-31.2	22.6	-2.4	23.2	-22.1	-296.8%	-7.0	0.5
Year Two (FY 2017-18)	2,247	6,061	7,227	2,366	603	1,004	645	20,153
Percent Change	-16.3	87.2	20.9	29.0	58.7	-20.3	NA	31.1
Year One (FY 2016-17)	2,686	3,238	5,979	1,834	380	1,260	0	15,377
Year	Individuals							
Year Three (FY 2018-19)	1,261	2,209	4,561	2,914	470	253	600	11,926
Percent Change	5.3	18.4	-13.6	23.2	-22.1	-296.8%	-7.0	-8.0
Year Two (FY 2017-18)	1,197	1,866	5,277	2,366	603	1,004	645	12,958
Percent Change	-26.3	-9.2	74.2	29.0	58.7	-20.3	NA	27.3
Year One (FY 2016-17)	1,624	2,055	3,029	1,834	380	1,260	0	10,182
Year	Family Members							
Year Three (FY 2018-19)	338	5,314	2,684	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,336
Percent Change	-67.8	26.7	37.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.9
Year Two (FY 2017-18)	1,050	4,195	1,950	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,195
Percent Change	-1.1	254.6	-33.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	38.5
Year One (FY 2016-17)	1,062	1,183	2,950	NA	NA	NA	NA	5,195

- LAHSA PSH placements continued to decrease by another 31.2 Percent, mostly attributable to the decrease in family placements. However, DHS PSH placements increased by 23.2 Percent, almost compensating for the decrease in LAHSA placements. Over 4,400 PSH placements were recorded by LAHSA and DHS combined.
- Overall, permanent placements of family members increased by 15.9 Percent but permanently placed individuals decreased by 8.0 Percent. The share of family members in new permanent placements increased from 35.7 to 41.1 Percent.
- In HMIS, approximately 2,500 individuals with PH exits in Year Three also had such exits in Year Two, indicating that 85 Percent of the placements in Year Three represented persons with new placements.
- During Year Three, almost one in five individuals in HMIS had more than one placement. They had, for example, multiple exits and re-entries to PSH projects. They are shown only once in the table.

Figure 2-2. Unduplicated PH Placements by Year, Agency, and Housing Type



2.4. MACRO-MEASURE 3

RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT HOUSING PLACEMENT

2.4.1. OVERVIEW

The third and final macro performance measure is the degree to which individuals and families tallied in the system-level metric as exiting to PH subsequently returned to homelessness. This is a measure of successful and sustained exits. More specifically, we measured the proportion of exits to PH for homeless households (persons and families) in which they did not subsequently re-enter the homeless services system. The data sources for this analysis were the same as those used to assess the numbers of PH in section 2.3.

Return to homelessness is operationalized as individuals and families leaving homelessness for a PH placement only to use homeless services again within six months of the placement, as recorded in HMIS. Household records included here are for those who exited in the first two quarters of the respective fiscal years, providing an opportunity to follow them for six months.

2.4.2. FINDINGS

Table 2-3 shows the rates of return to homelessness by data source. For each of the HI years, the PH placements examined were from those who exited in the first half of each year. In Year Three (FY 2018-19), the overall return rates decreased significantly from Year Two (FY 2017-18), from 8.9 Percent to 3.7 Percent.

Table 2-3. Rates of Return to Homelessness

Year (FY)	Total Placements	Total Returns	% Returned
Year Three: FY 2018-19 (Q1-Q2)	11,571	426	3.7
Year Two: FY 2017-18 (Q1-Q2)	10,339	921	8.9
Year One: FY 2016-17 (Q1-Q2)	9,168	773	8.4

SECTION 3

MESO-LEVEL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Meso-level measures serve as the “headlines” of the HI. They bridge the overarching macro-measures presented in Section 2 and the strategy-specific micro-measures that are the basis of LA County’s HI. While the macro-measures include outcomes associated with homeless-related services provided outside of the HI, the meso-level headline metrics are aggregations of strategy-specific outcomes (discussed in the next section) and are focused on HI activities and services.

This section presents outcomes for four of eight meso-level measures for which outcomes were available in Year Three. As with the macro-level measures, having outcomes from Years One and Two provides a benchmark and comparison point for Year Three outcomes presented here.

The four meso-level measures covered in this section are:

- Number of persons/households prevented from becoming homeless or being discharged into homelessness.
- Number of persons/households placed in IH (e.g., shelter and bridge housing, transitional arrangements, housing for those in recuperative care, and residential services provided to persons receiving treatment for substance use disorders).
- Number of persons/households placed in PH, inclusive of subsidized and unsubsidized PH, RRH, and PSH.
- Number of people/households who retained PH from date of placement.

The four remaining meso-level outcomes were not assessed in this report because adequate data were not available from Year Two. These meso-level measures are: *number of people who gain employment or enroll in vocational training/education; number of people who receive newly approved or reinstated cash aid, including disability benefits; enhanced service delivery and coordination for homeless clients; and expansion of the supply of affordable and homeless housing.*

3.2. MESO-MEASURE 1

NUMBER PREVENTED FROM BECOMING HOMELESS OR BEING DISCHARGED INTO HOMELESSNESS

3.2.1. OVERVIEW

This headline measure counts households receiving prevention assistance in the wake of experiencing a housing emergency that met stated criteria for imminent risk of homelessness.

Two of the five individual strategies, A1 (which directly addresses prevention of family homelessness) and A5 (which directly addresses prevention of individual homelessness) are combined and summarized below. The remaining three strategies – A2 (discharge planning guidelines); A3 (housing authority family reunification program); and A4 (discharges from foster care and juvenile probation) – are not part of this report. Since exit information was not available for DPSS-sponsored homelessness prevention assistance, the findings are primarily based on LAHSA data.

3.2.2. FINDINGS

Table 3-1 shows the number of households prevented from becoming homeless for all three years. A1 numbers are families and A5 numbers are individuals. The A5 results were only available for Years Two and Three because A5 was not implemented until February 2018.

Table 3-1. Households Prevented from Becoming Homeless

Year (FY)	LAHSA A1 (Families) Served	LAHSA A1 (Families) Exits	LAHSA A1 (Families) Exits to PH	% PH Exits
Three: 2018-19	1,003	800	709	88.6
Two: 2017-18	858	470	341	72.6
One: 2016-17	547	349	287	82.2
Year (FY)	LAHSA A5 Served	LAHSA A5 Exits	Exits to PH	% PH Exits
Three: 2018-19	1,221	848	788	92.9
Two: 2017-18	257	91	82	90.1

Key results presented in Table 3-1 include:

- In Year Three (FY 2018-19), 1,003 families were assisted by the LAHSA A1 strategy. This reflects an expansion of almost 17 Percent in the number of families served relative to Year Two (FY 2017-18).
- The proportion of all A1 families that exited into PH increased significantly from approximately 73 Percent to 89 Percent.
- The number of families who exited to PH in conjunction with A1 program participation expanded from 341 in Year Two to 709 in Year Three, an increase of almost 108 Percent.
- In FY 2018-19, 1,221 individuals were assisted by the LAHSA A5 strategy, reflecting an expansion of almost 5 times the number of individuals served relative to Year Two. Since the A5 strategy was implemented in February 2018, this large increase is mostly due to the late implementation date in Year Two.
- Almost ninety-three Percent of the individuals who exited the A5 program retained (or made the transition into other) PH.

3.3. MESO-MEASURE 2 NUMBER WHO ARE PLACED IN INTERIM HOUSING

3.3.1. OVERVIEW

HI strategies providing in IH services address the need for increasing the supply of safe accommodations for those who otherwise have nowhere to spend the night. The temporary orientation of these facilities, however, also necessitates short stays that lead to long-term housing arrangements.

Three HI strategies focus directly on IH. Two of the strategies, B7 (Interim/Bridge Housing for those Exiting Institutions) and E8 (Enhance the Emergency Shelter System), are reviewed individually in Section 4 and their measures are consolidated in this meso-level measure. Analysis of strategies B7 and E8 draws on data from LAHSA/HMIS and DHS/CHAMP. The placement number for Department of Public Health (DPH) was provided by DPH and may include some of the persons served by LAHSA or DHS programs.

We present below the use of IH both systemwide and for only those households (single adults and families) that received IH through HI strategies.

3.3.2. SYSTEMWIDE INTERIM HOUSING PLACEMENTS

Table 3-2 shows all IH placement numbers in LA County. The table shows counts of unique individuals. If a person was served by both LAHSA and DHS only the placement for DHS was included in the tallies.

Table 3-2. IH Placements*


Year	LAHSA	DHS	DPH	Total
FY 2018-19	24,381	2,887	1,503	28,771
Percent Change	22.2	50.7	NA	31.6
FY 2017-18	19,951	1,916	0	21,867
Percent Change	23.6	212.6	NA	30.5
FY 2016-17	16,145	613	0	16,758

*DHS and LAHSA placements are de-duplicated within the table rows. DPH placements are assumed to be de-duplicated as well; but the data provided by the department may duplicate placements recorded in the LAHSA and DHS columns to a small degree.

For Table 3-2, key findings include:

- The total number of unduplicated IH placements was just shy of 29,000 in FY 2018-19, a 31.6 Percent increase from FY 2017-18.
- While LAHSA-tracked placements increased by 22.2 Percent (over 4,400 placements), DHS placements increased by 50.7 Percent.
- Approximately one out of five persons served in IH experienced multiple stays within the reporting year.

Figure 3-1. IH Placements, by Agency and FY



3.3.3. PERSONS PLACED IN HI/MEASURE H-FUNDED INTERIM HOUSING

Table 3-3 shows the number of persons who were served in IH facilities funded in whole or in part by Measure H over two years. These persons were a subset of the unduplicated persons using IH as reported in subsection 3.3.2. A total of 19,688 unduplicated individuals were placed in IH facilities funded in whole


or part by Measure H in Year Three, an increase of 26.7 Percent over Year Two. Among the 19,688 persons placed in IH during Year Three, 292 had multiple placement records across the LAHSA and DHS IH programs. In Table 3-3 placements are counted once in each relevant row, summed in the multiple placements row, and unduplicated in the bottom line total. Figure 3-2 shows graphically the results presented in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Persons Using HI-Affiliated IH Services, by program

Program	Year One	Year Two	% Change	Year Three	% Change
DHS B7	690	1,273	84.5	775	-39.1*
LAHSA B7	112	338	201.8	535	58.3
DPH B7	0	0	NA	1,503	NA
LAHSA E8	7,229	13,975	93.3	16,337	16.9
DHS E8	NA	643	NA	830	29
Multiple Placements in Year	-240	-631	NA	-292	NA
Total	7,791	15,538	99.4	19,688	26.7

*DHS maintained 450 B7 IH beds in Year Three. However, the number of total clients served by B7 funding was significantly affected by increased lengths of stay in IH due to a lack of PH resources.

Figure 3-2. Persons Using HI-Affiliated IH Services, by Program



3.4. MESO-MEASURE 3 NUMBER PLACED IN PERMANENT HOUSING

3.4.1. OVERVIEW

This headline measure aggregates individuals and family members placed in PH across the PH HI strategies. The measure enables assessment of the effectiveness of HI-related efforts to end homelessness for individuals and families through placements in RRH, PSH, and other subsidized and unsubsidized PH.

Two HI strategies focused directly on PH – B3 (Partner with Cities to Expand RRH) and D7 (Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for PSH) – are reviewed individually in Section 4 and their measures are consolidated below. Two additional strategies, B4 (Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies) and B6 (Family Reunification Housing Subsidy), also focused on PH but did not have individual household data available and thus were not summarized under this meso-measure. Strategy B1 (Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing SSI), was not included since new enrollments into the program were suspended temporarily after Year Two. Analysis of Strategy B3 draws on data from LAHSA/HMIS and DHS/CHAMP and D7 on data in CHAMP. Systemwide permanent placement numbers are presented in Section 2.

3.4.2. FINDINGS

Table 3-4 shows the number of persons placed in HI PH in all three years. Key findings include:

- A total of 9,630 unduplicated family members and individuals were placed in HI PH in FY 2018-19, which reflects a 25.1 Percent increase from Year Two.
- The largest increase was observed in placements by the DHS D7 program that went up by 141.1 Percent between Years Two and Three. LAHSA B3 placements also increased significantly by 23.6 Percent while DHS RRH placements by the B3 program had been phasing out in Year Three.¹⁰
- Of the 9,630 placed family members and individuals, 70 Percent received their placement under the LAHSA RRH B3 program, and the remaining 30 Percent were placed through the DHS B3 and D7 programs.
- Measure H-funded GR housing subsidies became fully subscribed in Year Two. The 253 subsidy issuances DPSS made in Year Three were restricted to slots that opened due to attrition. The department issued a cumulative total of 1,542 HI-affiliated GR Housing subsidies over the Initiative’s first three years.


Table 3-4. Persons Placed in HI-Affiliated PH, by program

Program	Year One	Year Two	Percent Change	Year Three	Percent Change
DHS B3 (RRH)	446	681	52.7	484	-31.0
DHS D7 (PSH)	0	970	NA	2,339	141.1
LAHSA B3 (RRH)	4,137	5,302	28.2	6,554	23.6
DHS/DPSS B1	543	746	37.4	253	-66.1
Total	5,126	7,699	50.0	9,630	25.1

¹⁰Although a portion of the magnitude of this increase reflects DHS’s improved data quality in Year Three, the growth in D7 placements between Year Two and Year Three is undoubtedly significant even allowing for data-related factors.

Figure 3-3 shows graphically the results presented in Table 3-3.

Figure 3-3. Persons Placed in HI-Affiliated PH, by Program



*Measure H funds became available in FY 2017-18

3.5. MESO-MEASURE 4 RETURNS TO HOMELESSNESS FOLLOWING A PERMANENT PLACEMENT

3.5.1. OVERVIEW

The fourth and final meso performance measure is the degree to which individuals and family members returned to homelessness following an HI-funded permanent placement. This is a measure of successful and sustained exits. More specifically, we measured the proportion of exits to PH for homeless households (persons and family members) in which they did not subsequently re-enter the homeless services system.

Return to homelessness is operationalized as individuals and family members leaving homelessness for a PH placement only to use homeless services again within six months of the placement, as recorded in HMIS. Household records included here are for those who exited in the first two quarters of the respective fiscal years, providing an opportunity to follow them for six months.

Strategies B3 (Partner with Cities to Expand RRH) and D7 (Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for PSH) are reviewed individually in Section 4 of this report and their measures are consolidated below. Analysis of Strategy B3 draws on data from LAHSA/HMIS and DHS/CHAMP, and D7 on data in CHAMP.

3.5.2. FINDINGS

Table 3-5 shows the number of persons who retained their HI-affiliated permanent placement housing for six months. Key findings include:

- The overall return rates decreased from 9.2 Percent in Year Two to 5.9 Percent in Year Three, which means that almost 19 out of 20 households retained their permanent placements six months following their placement date.
- The return rates decreased for all programs analyzed.

Table 3-5. HI-Affiliated PH Placements and Returns to Homelessness

Program	Year Two (Q1-Q2 Placed, Q3-Q4 Returned)			Year Three (Q1-Q2 Placed & Q3-Q4 Returned)		
	Placed	Returned	% Returned	Placed	Returned	% Returned
LAHSA B3	2,129	215	10.1	4,209	264	6.3
DHS B3	410	27	6.6	273	15	5.5
DHS D7	409	30	7.3	1,300	65	5.0
Total	2,948	272	9.2	5,782	344	5.9

SECTION 4

MICRO-LEVEL STRATEGY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The performance outcomes developed for each of the individual HI strategies are the foundation of the higher order (macro and meso) results presented in this document.

Micro-data were not available for us to analyze the outcomes of all strategies. These strategies are assessed based on the County's quarterly reports. Summaries of available Year Three outcomes for individual HI strategies are grouped here by six topic domains, presented with highlights of outcomes from specific strategies.

4.2. TOPIC A

PREVENT HOMELESSNESS

- A1: Homeless Prevention for Families
 - A5: Homeless Prevention for Individuals
- Outcomes were available for two of the five strategies under this topic.

4.2.1. STRATEGY A1:

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION FOR FAMILIES

For Strategy A1, over 1,000 families were served in the prevention program in Year Three, an increase of 17 Percent over Year Two, and the proportion of participant families that exited the program who managed either to retain their housing or move to PH increased from 73 Percent to 89 Percent. Almost all (93 Percent) A1 participants that exited the program did not enter any homeless services program within six months.

4.2.2. STRATEGY A5:

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION FOR INDIVIDUALS

For Strategy A5, almost 1,000 additional individuals enrolled in the prevention program in Year Three (compared to Year Two), and the proportion of participant individuals that exited the program who managed either to retain their housing or move to PH increased from 90 Percent to 93 Percent. Most (90 Percent) A5 participants that exited the program did not enter any homeless services program within six months.

The results for both A1 and A5 were presented in the context of meso-level measure 1, which aggregates the homeless prevention results in the HI.

4.3. TOPIC B

SUBSIDIZE HOUSING

Detailed outcomes were available for two of the eight strategies under this topic:

- B3: Rapid Re-Housing
- B7: Interim/Bridge Housing for Those Exiting Institutions
- Summary outcomes were available for another three strategies:
 - B1: Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing SSI
 - B4: Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies
 - B6: Family Reunification Housing Subsidy
- Outcome measures were available for five of the eight strategies under this topic.

4.3.1. STRATEGY B1:

PROVIDE SUBSIDIZED HOUSING TO HOMELESS DISABLED INDIVIDUALS PURSUING SSI;

Strategy B1 makes rental subsidies available to homeless GR recipients who are applying for federal disability benefits paid through SSI. The goal of the strategy is to provide housing subsidies, facilitate SSI approvals, and recoup the County’s housing costs following SSI approval. Measure H-funding allocated for GR housing subsidies was exhausted in Year Two. The 253 H-funded subsidy issuances DPSS made in Year Three were restricted to slots that opened due to attrition. Although the new subsidy issuances declined in Year Three, there were a total of 1,031 (carryover from previous months) participants in receipt of a subsidy.

4.3.2. STRATEGY B3:

PARTNER WITH CITIES TO EXPAND RAPID RE-HOUSING

Strategy B3 provides an expanded number of homeless households with RRH services and allows more cities to support this strategy. Key outcomes are shown in Table 4-1. Under this strategy, 20,950 people were served and 7,038 were placed in housing; in Year Two, 19,643 people were served, and 5,983 people were placed. The numbers of exits to PH continued to grow substantially by 18 Percent and the rate of exits to PH increased from 30 Percent (of those served) to 34 Percent. However, after a big jump from Year One to Year Two, the number of new enrollments dropped by 15 Percent in Year Three.

Table 4-1 Strategy B3: Key Outcomes Over Three Years

B3 Outcomes	Year One	Year Two	% Change	Year Three	% Change
Newly Enrolled	9,046	12,550	39%	10,703	-15%
Active in the Program	12,550	19,643	57%	20,950	7%
Secured PH	4,583	5,983	31%	7,038	18%

4.3.3. STRATEGY B4:

FACILITATE UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL HOUSING SUBSIDIES

Strategy B4 provides financial incentives to landlords to provide units to homeless households who need PSH and have Housing Choice vouchers to increase housing availability in a tight rental market. Specific forms of assistance include damage mitigation, structural modifications to conform to HUD housing standards, vacancy payments to hold units, and tenant move-in assistance (including security deposits). This strategy is the basis for the Homeless Incentive Program. Key outcomes are given in Table 4-2, showing a clear expansion of this program in Year Three. The total amount of security deposits and move-in assistance increased from \$900,000 to almost \$6 million. Outcomes of the earlier years are based on

data from LA County Development Authority (LACDA). However, outcomes for Year Three include data from all participating public housing authorities, which contributes to the significant increases in Year Three.

Table 4-2. Strategy B4: Key Outcomes Over Three Years

Program	Year One	Year Two	% Change	Year Three	% Change
Landlord Requests to Participate	490	691	41%	2,435	252%
Units Leased w/ B4 Incentives	419	498	19%	1,863	274%
Homeless Housed w/ B4 Incentives	440	629	43%	2,120	237%
Total Amount of Incentive Payments	\$662,000	\$1,285,000	94%	\$4,208,000	227%
Incentive Payments per Unit in Program	\$1,580	\$2,581	63%	\$2,258	-13%

4.3.4. STRATEGY B6:

FAMILY RE-UNIFICATION HOUSING SUBSIDY

Under Strategy B6, the Department of Children and Family Services and LACDA provide RRH and case management services to families in the child welfare system where the parents' homelessness is the sole barrier to the return of the child(ren). The only outcome measure available for this strategy was that housing was provided for 89 families in Year Three, compared to 71 families in Year Two.

4.3.5. STRATEGY B7:

INTERIM/BRIDGE HOUSING FOR THOSE EXITING INSTITUTIONS

Strategy B7 provides greater access to interim/bridge housing (e.g., shelters, stabilization beds, shared recovery housing, recuperative care beds, and Board and Care) to persons exiting institutions, such as jails, prisons, hospitals, foster care, urgent care centers, and other medical, behavioral health, and substance abuse treatment facilities. In Year Three, the distribution of the institutions through which individuals were served changed significantly relative to Year Two. In Year Two over half of the B7 participants were discharged from criminal justice institutions and 18 Percent from hospitals. In Year Three, only 26 Percent were discharged from criminal justice institutions, while 32 Percent were from hospitals and 28 Percent from substance abuse treatment.

Table 4-3 shows the number of persons with new enrollments and total number of people served by B7 programs, as well as the number of exits into PH. Including persons who were enrolled in prior years, almost 3,200 participants were served in the B7 programs at some point in FY 2018-19, a significant expansion over the previous years. Newly enrolled homeless persons increased by 60 Percent in Year Three. The increase in the population served by the B7 program is attributable to the new enrollments in recovery bridge housing through DPH Substance Abuse and Prevention Control, which were over 1,300

Table 4-3. Persons Enrolled in and Served by Strategy B7 Programs

Program	Year One	Year Two	% Change	Year Three	% Change
Newly Enrolled	802	1,606	100%	2,589	60%
Active in the Program	896	2,014	125%	3,199	59%
Exited to PH	N/A	445	N/A	544	22%

4.4. TOPIC C INCREASE INCOME

Summary outcomes were available for all seven strategies:

- C1: Enhance the CalWORKs Subsidized Employment Program for Homeless Families;
- C2/C7: Increase Employment for Homeless Adults by Supporting Social Enterprise;
- C3: Expand Targeted Recruitment and Hiring Process to Homeless/Recently Homeless People to Increase Access to County Jobs;
- C4: Establish a Countywide SSI Advocacy Program for People Experiencing Homelessness or at Risk of Homelessness;
- C5: Establish a Countywide Veterans Benefits Advocacy Program for People Experiencing Homelessness or at Risk of Homelessness; and
- C6: Targeted SSI Advocacy for Inmates.

4.4.1. STRATEGY C1:

ENHANCE CALWORKS SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS FAMILIES

Implemented in December 2016, Strategy C1 aims to increase participation in the CalWORKs Subsidized Employment Program for Homeless Families. In Year Two, 268 participants engaged in subsidized employment and 34 participants secured unsubsidized employment. These numbers dropped in Year Three to 236 and 10 showing that this measure failed to improve last year.

4.4.2. STRATEGY C2 AND STRATEGY C7:

INCREASE EMPLOYMENT FOR HOMELESS ADULTS

Strategies C2 and C7 focus on increasing employment among homeless adults, particularly using social enterprises, which are mission-driven businesses focused on hiring and assisting people who face the greatest barriers to work. The number of participants enrolled in transitional employment increased from 800 to 1,265 (up 58 Percent). The number of participants placed in unsubsidized employment doubled from 283 to 582, and the number of DPSS GR participants increased from 142 to 215. Since there is a significant difference between the number of participants enrolled in transitional employment and those placed in subsidized employment, placements may not be visible to Workforce Development, Aging and Community Services until much later.

4.4.3. STRATEGY C3:

TARGETED RECRUITMENT AND HIRING TO INCREASE HOMELESS ACCESS TO COUNTY JOBS

Under Strategy C3, hiring opportunities for LA County jobs are expanded, and outreach and recruitment are increased, for those experiencing homelessness. Aggregated outcomes show that efforts under this strategy were not effective since individuals getting hired into LA County positions through the C3 program dropped from 50 to 3 between Years Two and Three.

4.4.4. STRATEGIES C4, C5 AND C6:

COUNTYWIDE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY/SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INCOME AND VETERANS BENEFITS ADVOCACY

Strategies C4, C5, and C6 had similar objectives for different target populations and have been implemented together with the same providers responsible for all three strategies. Under Strategy C4, a

Countywide SSI Advocacy Program aids eligible homeless individual and those at risk of homelessness when applying for and pursuing SSI or other related benefits. Similarly, Strategy C5 established a Countywide Veterans Benefits Advocacy Program to aid eligible homeless veterans in applying for and obtaining income and/or health benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Finally, Strategy C6 developed a SSI Advocacy Program to assist disabled, incarcerated individuals to complete and submit their SSI application prior to discharge or to secure reinstatement of their SSI benefits, if the individual was receiving SSI prior to being incarcerated. Outcomes data to examine all three strategies came from DHS's CHAMP system.

While the number of individuals newly enrolled in Strategy C4 dropped 21 Percent to 5,393, the number active in the program exceeded 10,000. Approximately 12 Percent of enrollees (1,266 C4 participants) submitted applications for SSI benefits, which more than tripled between Years Two and Three. About a quarter, 327, of these applications were approved for SSI benefits and 44 were denied; the remaining 896 are pending disposition. The Percentage of C4 participants linked to mental health and health services remained the same in Year Three. Newly enrolled C4 participants linked to health services increased slightly in Year Three from 67 Percent to 68 Percent. Newly enrolled C4 participants linked to mental health services remained consistent at 37 Percent.

For Strategy C5 benefits, the number of individuals newly enrolled decreased from 405 to 320. Out of 607 currently enrolled participants, 31 submitted their applications for Veterans Benefits and 15 were approved. In addition, 77 submitted their applications for SSI and 17 were approved and 1 was denied; the remaining 56 are pending disposition. There were 117 C5 participants linked to mental health services and 228 to health services. The Percentage of C5 participants linked to mental health and health services increased in Year Three. Newly enrolled C5 participants linked to health services increased in Year Three from 64 Percent to 71 Percent. Newly enrolled C5 participants linked to mental health services increased slightly from 35 Percent to 37 Percent.

The number of individuals newly enrolled in Strategy C6 more than doubled from 225 to 513 and there were 633 participants active in C6 in Year Three. In all, 39 C6 participants submitted applications for SSI benefits and 5 of these applications were approved. The Percentage of C6 participants linked to mental health and health services increased in Year Three. Newly enrolled C6 participants linked to health services increased in Year Three from 53 Percent to 59 Percent. Newly enrolled C6 participants linked to mental health services increased from 32 Percent to 42 Percent.

4.5. TOPIC D

PROVIDE CASE MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES

Outcomes were available for three of seven strategies under this topic, with outcomes for one strategy (D7) based upon individual and service-level data. The other two outcomes were reported from summary data.

- D2: Expansion of Jail In-reach;
- D6: Criminal Record Clearing Project; and
- D7: Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for PSH.

4.5.1. STRATEGY D2:

EXPAND JAIL IN-REACH

Strategy D2 supports the expansion of jail in-reach services for all homeless people incarcerated in a LA County jail. The program started in January 2017. In partial Year One outcomes, 2,750 were engaged. In Year Two, this expanded to 3,489. In Year Three, the number of individuals served was reduced significantly to allow a focus on case management in addition to VI-SPDAT assessments and entering participants into the CES. The number of individuals who received jail in-reach services dropped by 61 Percent to 1,349 and the number of assessed D2 participants dropped by 63 Percent to below 1,000. Placements in bridge housing decreased from 723 to 429 (down 40 Percent) while placements in PH increased from 119 to 160.

4.5.2. STRATEGY D6:

CRIMINAL RECORD CLEARING PROJECT

Strategy D6 supports efforts to clear criminal histories for homeless persons with certain qualifications. In Year Three the program expanded, increasing the number of homeless persons engaged from 577 to 2,108. Petition filings for dismissal or reduction of criminal records increased from 264 to 2,780; 75 Percent of these petitions were granted. The Los Angeles City Attorney, in addition to the Public Defender's office, conducted outreach efforts and clinics, contributing to the expansion of this program.

4.5.3. STRATEGY D7:

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Finally, Strategy D7 provides individuals and families experiencing long-term homelessness with supportive housing by funding high-quality tenant services and when needed, rent subsidies. Outcome data came from DHS's CHAMP system. Programming under this strategy was launched in Year Two and expanded significantly in Year Three. The outcome measures showed:

- D7 participants placed in housing increased from 984 to 2,353, up 139 Percent.
- Number of participants who received local and federal rental subsidies increased from 2,421 to 3,725 up 54 Percent.

4.6. TOPIC E

CREATE A COORDINATED SYSTEM

This topic has the most strategies out of the six HI topics. Many of these strategies, however, cannot be directly associated with person- or service-level outcomes and thus are difficult to include in a report like this one. Outcomes were available for five of the seventeen strategies under this topic from summary data. The Topic E strategies covered here are:

- E4: First Responders Training;
- E6: Countywide Outreach System;
- E7: Strengthen the CES;
- E8: Enhance the Emergency Shelter System; and
- E14: Enhanced Services for Transition Aged Youth.

4.6.1. STRATEGY E4:
FIRST RESPONDERS TRAINING

Strategy E4 provides a framework for developing and implementing a training program that educates first responders (law enforcement, fire departments, and paramedics) about the complex and diverse needs of the unsheltered homeless population and how to connect homeless individuals to appropriate services. Summary outcomes are listed in Table 4-4. While the number of Los Angeles Sheriff’s Department (LASD) deputies trained declined from 1,315 to 729, the total number of first responders trained raised up to 2,044 since the inception of the program. The number of non-LASD law enforcement personnel trained was unchanged, and the number of non-law enforcement first responders trained increased by 18 Percent. A total of 854 non-law enforcement first responders have been trained since the inception of the program.

Table 4-4. Strategy E4: Summary Outcomes

E4 Metric	Year One	Year Two	Year Three
Number of LASD deputies trained	558	1,315	729
Number of non-LASD law enforcement personnel trained	n/a	43	19
Number of non-law enforcement first responders trained	n/a	389	465

4.6.2. STRATEGY E6:
COUNTYWIDE OUTREACH SYSTEM

Strategy E6 creates a countywide network of teams to identify, engage with, and connect or re-connect homeless individuals to IH and/or PH and supportive services. As of June 30, 2019, all the Measure H-funded teams were fully implemented. Key outcomes are presented in Table 4-5, which shows that all metrics increased significantly in Year Three. Data cover activities of CES outreach teams, DHS multidisciplinary teams, and LAHSA homeless engagement teams. The number of persons who were connected to services or who attained referrals rose to 17,673 in Year Three, up nearly threefold from Year Two. Individuals placed in IH or PH increased 26 Percent and 102 Percent, respectively. However, the proportion of individuals placed in IH or PH among all homeless individuals who received outreach services or referrals decreased from 23 Percent to 13 Percent, due to limitations on available resources.

Table 4-5. Strategy E6: Summary Outcomes

E6 Metric	Year Two	Year Three	% Change
# individuals – initiated contact	17,929	22,410	25%
# individuals – newly engaged	8,658	10,905	26%
# individuals received services / successfully attained referrals	6,833	17,673	159%
# individuals – placed in crisis or bridge housing	1,164	1,468	26%
# individuals – placed in PH	375	757	102%

4.6.3. STRATEGY E7:
STRENGTHEN THE COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM

Strategy E7 strengthens the current adult CES and the Homeless Families Solutions System (now known as the CES for Families) to enhance the access of homeless individuals and families to IH and/or PH. The strategy was launched in Year Two and expanded in Year Three as shown in Table 4-6. The number of households assessed through CES decreased by 6 Percent. The number of persons/households with higher income increased by 19 Percent from Year Two to Year Three. The time from assessment to

housing match exceeded eight months in Year Three, an increase of 50 days over Year Two. On the other hand, the stays in crisis and bridge housing decreased from 63 days to 48 days, a reduction of 24 Percent.

Table 4-6. Summary Outcomes for CES under Strategy E7

E7 Metric	Year Two	Year Three	% Change
# households – assessed through CES	28,874	27,116	-6%
Average length of time – assessment to housing match	208	257	24%
Average length of time – stay in days in crisis/bridge housing	63	48	-24%
# persons/households – increased their income	5,937	7,093	19%

4.6.4. STRATEGY E8:

ENHANCE THE EMERGENCY SHELTER SYSTEM

Strategy E8 aims to expand the emergency shelter system by supplying “24/7 crisis housing” for individuals, families and youth ensuring a quick exit from homelessness. Outcomes data come from HMIS. Key outcomes reflect the numbers of persons using IH, which acts as a proxy for availability of IH. Outcomes are shown in Table 4-7 and indicate that there was an increase in the availability of crisis housing in Year Three relative to Year Two, with entries increasing 31 Percent and the number of active participants up 40 Percent. The number of households exiting from IH to PH also increased by 44 Percent from Year Two to Year Three, while the proportion of PH exits out of total exits to any destination stayed around 25 Percent.

Table 4-7. Strategy E8: Key Outcomes

E8 Metric	Year Two	Year Three	% Change
New enrollments	13,524	17,759	31%
Active in the program	15,970	22,362	40%
Exited IH to PH	2,752	3,971	44%

4.6.5. STRATEGY E14:

ENHANCED SERVICES FOR TRANSITION AGED YOUTH

Strategy E14 promotes enhanced services for Transition Age Youth (TAY). In total, 3,285 youth were assessed using the Next Step Tool. Among those, 150 TAY exited TAY transitional housing to PH, accounting for 39 Percent of total exits to any destination during Year Three.

4.7. TOPIC F

INCREASE AFFORDABLE/HOMELESS HOUSING

As was the case with the Topic E strategies, many of the strategies under this topic operate on a systems level and are difficult to quantify on a person and services level, which is the primary focus of this report. Nonetheless, all seven strategies in this topic are represented, though the outcomes reports are brief. Strategies F2 and F5 are paired and Strategy F7 has two components that are examined individually. The full list of F strategies is:

- F2: Linkage Fee Nexus Study;
- F3: Support for Inclusionary Zoning for Affordable Rental Units;
- F4: Development of Second Dwelling Unit Pilot Project;
- F5: Incentive Zoning/Value Capture Strategies;
- F6: Use of Public Land for Homeless Housing; and

- F7: Preserve and Promote the Development of Affordable Housing for Homeless households and Establish a one-time housing innovation fund.

4.7.1. STRATEGIES F2 AND F5:

[LINKAGE FEE NEXUS STUDY AND INCENTIVE ZONING/VALUE CAPTURE STRATEGIES](#)

For the combined Strategies F2/F5, the LA County Department of Regional Planning (DRP) will undertake analyses and propose policies to expand affordable housing in unincorporated areas, through linkage fees, inclusionary zoning, and other relevant actions. During FY 2017-18, the DRP commissioned a consultant team to develop three reports:

- An analysis of existing conditions and the real estate market;
- A linkage fee nexus study; and
- An inclusionary housing feasibility study.

Reports were completed as of January 31, 2019.

4.7.2. STRATEGY F3:

[SUPPORT INCLUSIONARY ZONING FOR AFFORDABLE RENTAL UNITS](#)

Strategy F3 directs the County to support inclusionary zoning legislation for affordable rental units. During FY 2017, the County supported AB 1505 to allow for inclusionary zoning of rental units. This was implemented in January 2018 and LA County then began working on an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance for the County’s unincorporated area (see Strategies F2/F5). During Year Three, staff continued to review the Inclusionary Housing Feasibility Study and are currently working to secure a consultant to analyze and update the study.

4.7.3. STRATEGY F4:

[DEVELOPMENT OF SECOND DWELLING UNIT PILOT PROJECT](#)

Strategy F4 has several components, one of which focuses on the development of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) pilot program for unincorporated areas. LACDA assumes responsibility for this pilot project, which selects sites and identifies nonconforming ADUs for review and consideration for future conformance. At the same time, a separate County ordinance facilitates ADU construction in unincorporated County areas. The strategy held a contest for ADU planning and design.

4.7.4. STRATEGY F6:

[USE OF PUBLIC LAND FOR HOMELESS HOUSING](#)

Strategy F6 has LA County identify vacant or underutilized properties for use as temporary or PH for people experiencing homelessness, as well as County properties that can offer safe overnight parking. As of the end of Year Three, activities are ongoing.

4.7.5. STRATEGY F7:

[AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS & ESTABLISH A ONE-TIME HOUSING INNOVATION FUND](#)

Strategy F7 has two components: preserve and promote the development of affordable housing; and establish a one-time housing innovation fund. For the affordable housing development component, five projects were awarded support to develop housing. For the fund component, the Housing Innovation Challenge was launched just before the end of Year Two. Project management is ongoing for the five projects that received Measure H funding in 2018.

SECTION 5 CONCLUSION

5.1. SUMMARIZING THE THREE LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN YEAR THREE

5.1.1. SYSTEMWIDE PERFORMANCE

Year Three of the HI saw significant expansions in the number of families and individuals served by the various programs, alongside improvements in housing placement retention rates. Among the three key macro-measures: overall time from assessment to housing placement improved by 7.5 Percent, decreasing to an average of 86 days; time from assessment to placement in PSH decreased 20.5 Percent, to 105 days; and the number of PH placements remained essentially unchanged just over 20,000 despite increases in LAHSA RRH and DHS PSH placements. This flatness in PH placements is in part due to the suspension of new enrollments into the DPSS GR SSI Outreach and Housing Subsidy program. LAHSA RRH and DHS PSH placements each grew by approximately 23 Percent, with PSH placements increasing to 4,459 in 2019. IH placements also grew substantially, by 31.6 Percent, to 28,771 persons and family members. Even with increases in RRH and PSH placements, rates of return to homelessness continued to decline among those placed. Most notably, rate of return to homelessness in six months declined by more than half, from 8.9 Percent to 3.7 Percent, even as placements increased by 1,232.

5.1.2. HI PROGRAMMATIC-LEVEL PERFORMANCE

Consistent with the macro-level measures, the priority meso-level outcomes, or headline measures, also showed increases in placements and improvements in outcomes:

- **Prevention programs saw a growth in families and individuals served.**
 - The number of families served increased from 858 in Year Two to 1,003 in Year Three, an increase of 16.9 Percent.
 - The rate of exits to PH out of all families that exited the program (or preventions that resulted in families remaining in PH) increased from 72.6 Percent to 88.6 Percent.
 - Among individuals, a fivefold increase in the number of persons served was observed in Year Three compared to Year Two, from 257 to 1,221.
 - Exits to PH (or preventions that resulted in individuals remaining in PH) were recorded among almost 93 Percent of the individuals who exited the prevention services in Year Three.
- **Measure H-funded IH placements grew from 15,538 in Year Two to 19,688 in Year Three, an increase of 26.7 Percent.**
 - LAHSA placements in IH grew 17.9 Percent but increased lengths of stay and a lack of PH resources caused DHS IH placements to decrease by 16.2 Percent in Year Three. The DPH B7 program added 1,503 placements.
- **Measure H-funded PH placements grew by 21.8 Percent between Year Two and Year Three.**
 - Approximately 70 Percent of Year Three PH placements were from RRH programs administered by LAHSA, and LAHSA's RRH placements grew by 23.6 Percent between Year Two and Year Three.
 - Year Three DHS PSH placements grew by 2.4 times between Year Two and Year Three, from 970 to 2,339.

- **The rate of returns to homelessness within 6 months following H-funded PH placements decreased from 9.2 Percent to 5.9 Percent.**
 - This decrease occurred despite a doubling in the number of PH placements at the basis of this measure in Year Three.

5.1.3. INDIVIDUAL STRATEGY PERFORMANCE

Micro-level measurement data were available for 28 of the HI strategies, including 7 based on client-level records and 21 from published County Quarterly Reports. The most significant outcomes are listed below:

- **Prevent Homelessness**
 - The number of families served under Strategy A1 increased by 16.9 Percent between Year Two and Year Three, from 858 to 1,003, and the proportion of participant families that exited the program and either retained their housing or moved into PH increased from 73 Percent to 89 Percent.
 - A total of 1,223 individuals were served under Strategy A5 in Year Three, and 93 Percent of those who exited the program either retained their housing or moved into PH.
- **Subsidize Housing**
 - Strategy B3 expanded with 20,950 active enrollees, and the number of participants who secured PH increased by 18 Percent.
 - The number of homeless persons housed with financial incentives under Strategy B4 more than tripled to 2,120. Incentive payments exceeded \$4.2 million.
 - Strategy B7 expanded significantly with almost 60 Percent more new enrollees and active participants compared to Year Two.
 - PH placements among enrollees in interim/bridge housing increased by 22 Percent compared to Year Two.
- **Increase Income**
 - Under Strategies C2 and C7, the number of participants enrolled in transitional employment increased in Year Three by 58.1 Percent, from 800 to 1,265, and the number of participants placed in unsubsidized employment more than doubled, from 283 to 582.
 - Participants enrolled in Strategy C4 exceeded 10,000, 1,266 of whom submitted applications for SSI benefits, a three-fold increase from Year Two.
- **Provide Case Management and Services**
 - Inmates receiving jail in-reach services under Strategy D2 declined by 61 Percent to 1,349, and placements in bridge housing among discharged inmates decreased 40.7 Percent, from 723 in Year Two to 429 in Year Three. These decreases reflect DHS' decision to provide more focused case management geared towards improved outcomes.
 - At the same time, however, PH placements among those discharged increased by 34.5 Percent, from 119 to 160.
 - The number of homeless persons seeking to clear criminal histories under Strategy D6 increased by 3.7 times in Year Three, from 577 to 2,108, and petition filings for dismissal or reduction of criminal records increased by more than 10 times, from 264 to 2,780. Roughly three-quarters of these petitions (2,108) were granted.

- PH placements associated with Strategy D7 grew from 984 in Year Two to 2,353 in Year Three, an increase of 139.1 Percent, and the number of participants who are receiving rental subsidies under the strategy increased over the same period by 53.9 Percent, from 2,421 to 3,725.
- **Create a Coordinated System**
 - All performance metrics measuring the development and implementation of a centralized homeless outreach network under Strategy E6 increased significantly in Year Three.
 - While the number of individuals receiving services and/or referrals almost tripled by comparison with Year Two, from 6,833 to 17,673, the number of PH placements associated with the strategy more than doubled from 275 to 757, and the number of IH placements increased by 26.1 Percent from 1,164 to 1,468.
 - Households assessed through the CES under Strategy E6 declined by roughly 6 Percent and the average length of time from assessment to housing match remained high, exceeding eight months, though average stays in crisis/bridge housing decreased from 63 to 48 days.
 - Strategy E8 continued to expand the availability of crisis housing, with entries increasing by almost one-third, from 13,524 in Year Two to 17,759 in Year Three. The number of active participants increased by 40 Percent exceeding 22,000, and the number of households making exits from IH to PH grew by 44 Percent reaching almost 4,000.

5.2. POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE HOMELESS INFLOW PROBLEM

LAHSA's January 2019 PIT count for LA County increased by 12 Percent despite a County homeless services system (Measure H and non-Measure H combined) that recorded over 20,000 PH placements in the previous fiscal year and was half-way through a year that would yield another 20,000 PH placements. Given the homeless inflow dynamic as the basis of the year-over-year growth in the homeless population, which is driven by factors largely outside the purview of the homeless services system, a key question is whether additional action can be taken from within the system to slow inflow. Even the broadened array of available services may not be able to stanch the flow of individuals and families into homelessness to a degree sufficient to yield year-over-year PIT count decreases if the homeless inflow exceeds the system's PH placement capacities.

5.2.1. LOOKING AT INFLOW FROM WITHIN THE HOMELESS SERVICES SYSTEM

An analysis of HMIS data encompassing enrollments, placements, exits, and homeless services use over FY 2017-18 and 2018-19, combined with housing placement records from other agencies and data systems, is suggestive of a recurrent pattern that may offer guidance for inflow interventions. The HMIS data show approximately 45,000 new homeless services entries in each of the two years, 16,000 homeless services re-entries from placements and exits in the previous year, and 25,000 ongoing homeless clients carried over into the new year from the previous year.

New homeless services entries, re-entries, and those carried over from one year to the next equate to approximately 86,000 homeless services users each year, of which 20,000 were subsequently placed in PH while another 25,000 made *Other* exits from the system. The 45,000 counted as PH or other exits are limited to those who do not return to the system. These patterns suggest an *Exit Gap* of roughly 41,000 persons after annual exits are counted against total enrollments. The Exit Gap is the balance of persons who need but do not receive PH assistance or placement each year. Utilization patterns observed in the

last two full years of homeless services system data show remarkable continuity of the inflow of homeless persons, as well as the exit of persons from the system. These counts and others discussed below are shown more precisely in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Homeless Services Enrollees and Exits Recorded in HMIS in Successive Fiscal Years

Fiscal Year	Homeless Services Enrollees			Homeless Services Exits*			Exit Gap	
	New	Returning	Previous Carryover	Total Enrollees	PH Placements	Other	Total Exits	Net Enrollees
2017-18	45,698	16,210	24,316	86,224	20,153	24,927	45,080	41,144
2018-19	44,129	16,416	24,728	85,273	20,262	24,030	44,292	40,981
2-yr Average	44,914	16,313	24,522	85,749	20,208	24,479	44,686	41,063

*Exits here are limited to PH placements and exit without a known return to the homeless services system.

5.2.2. RECONCILING A STABLE SERVICES GAP WITH AN EXPANDING HOMELESS POPULATION

The service deficit, or *Exit Gap*, reflected in the net 41,000 enrollees remaining after annual exits is relatively fixed over the two years observed, which is counterintuitive given the 12 Percent PIT count increase between January 2018 and January 2019. One would expect a significantly larger gap in FY 2018-19 over FY 2017-18.¹¹ What accounts for the continuity of the gap?

One likely contributor to the continuity is the segment of the homeless population that does not touch the homeless services system and is therefore not accounted for in the inflow and exit patterns discussed here. Secondly, the *Exits* category includes exits to so-called *Homeless Destinations* and to *Unknown Destinations*. To the extent that persons either do not touch the system at all or exit to homelessness without becoming re-engaged with the homeless services system, these persons would add to those who are recorded in the PIT count while remaining invisible to the system and thereby contribute to both the stability of the service deficit *and* the expansion of the population in the PIT count.

5.2.3. CREATING STABILITY AMIDST CRISIS

The stability of the persistent exit gap can potentially create a false impression, suggesting that the homeless crisis is contained or that its magnitude is in decline. Nevertheless, the implications of what the data show should not be understated or dismissed: new homeless services enrollees, returning homeless services enrollees, and enrollees carrying over from one year to the next have each remained flat over at least two years. While more analysis is needed to specify how the HI strategies and Measure H are related to this systemic continuity, there is little doubt that the coordinated expansion in the scope and scale of LA County’s homeless services system – a process approaching the half-way point of Year Four as of this writing – is at the core of the observed stability. The significance of this process in creating stability in an acute countywide homeless crisis and a statewide housing crisis is impossible to ignore.

In the near term, further analysis of the exit gap in more detail can help the HI and its partners maintain the systemic stability observed in the first two years of Measure H. In the intermediate and longer terms, examining the scope and scale of the unserved homeless population will be essential in determining how to advance beyond the exit gap. However, an appreciable increase in affordable housing and additional resources may be required before LA County’s homeless services system moves from a stable services deficit to a capacity to absorb inflow sufficiently to yield observable reductions in the overall homeless population.

¹¹The carryover into FY 2019-20 (25,409 ongoing service users) is up slightly compared with the previous two years, but new entries in the first quarter of FY 2019-20 are down relative to Q1 of FY 2018-19 by roughly 10,000 persons.