CoC Steering Committee

Thursday, February 13, 2020 at 3:30pm

Getting Started

☐ Call to Order
☐ Roll Call
☐ January Minutes Approval

Action Items

☐ 1. Sign November, December, & January Minutes
☐ 2. CoC Steering Committee Representative Discussion
   □ • Discussion & Nominations on officer positions – Election to occur in March
   □ • Motion for Don Titcombe to continue as the Local Non-Government Funder Representative – to begin his second term February 2020
   □ • At Large Position Vacant – with approval from new charter
   □ • Two Consumer Representative Positions Vacant – with approval of new charter

January Resolutions

☐ 1. Motion to elect Tom McCasland as Vice Chair – Resolution to be signed
☐ 2. Motion to re-elect Preston Witt for his second term – Resolution to be signed
☐ 3. Motion to re-elect Don Titcombe for his second term – Resolution to be signed
☐ 4. TDHCA ESG place holder – Resolution to be presented

Housing Innovations Presentation

☐ 1. Preliminary System Analysis Results
2. Workshop Update
3. Discussion & Recommendation for plan’s moving forward

Gaps

1. Services
2. Rental
3. Development

CoC Funding

1. Tier 1 FY19 Competition
2. Return Fund Analysis

Rapid Re-Housing Update & Discussion

1. RRH Data Presentation
2. Lead Agency Recommendation
   • Vote to occur in March

Dashboards

1. Update
2. Dashboard Recommendations

H-3

Update

Public Comments

Open
Wrap-Up Meeting

☐ Meeting Adjourn

Attendance

☐ Mike Temple, Chair, Houston Galveston Area Council
✓ Tom McCasland, Vice Chair, Houston Housing & Community Development
✓ Marilynn Kindell, Secretary, Fort Bend Community Development
✓ Daphne Lemelle, Harris County Community Services Development
☐ Horace Allison, Harris County Housing Authority
✓ Pending, Houston Housing Authority
☐ Dr. Joanne Ducharme, Montgomery County Community Development
✓ Melissa Quijano, Pasadena Community Development
☐ Barbie Brashear, Harris County Domestic Violence Coordinating Council
☐ Jennifer Herring, Harris County Sheriff’s Office
✓ Karen Tseng, Harris Health System
☐ Dr. Sara McArthur, Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center
☐ Scott Rule, The Harris Center
✓ Don Titcombe, Rockwell Fund Inc.
✓ Sharon Zachary, Alliance of Community Assistance Ministries
✓ Preston Witt, Harmony House Inc.

Next CoC Steering Committee Meeting

Thursday, March 12, 2020 at 3:30pm

United Way of Greater Houston

50 Waugh Drive, Houston, TX 77002
Strategic Planning Consultation Update – The Way Home CoC
February 2020 Update

Process Timeline

**Analyze Data: January-February**
- People, resources, utilization, performance

**Collect Feedback: February**
- Community Engagement Workshops, key stakeholder interviews

**Model System Refinements: March**
- Service strategies, costs, operations

**Produce Recommendations: April -May**
- Test feasibility, impact, priority

**Final Strategic Plan 2020-2024: June**
- Revise approach, present new Strategic Plan

Community Engagement Workshops
Each engagement workshop will include a brief review of system analysis findings to help ground the discussion. We’ll look at current conditions, utilization trends over the past five years, and system performance. Workshop participants will focus discussions around four core planning areas:

- **Reduce system inflow** through enhanced homeless prevention and diversion strategies
- **Enhance crisis housing** for persons requiring emergency shelter
- **Promote housing stabilization** options to quickly move and sustain persons in permanent housing
- **Address unsheltered homelessness and public space use** to ensure street homelessness is addressed within a broader community context

Workshop participants will have an opportunity to provide feedback in each of the four core areas. Housing Innovations will analyze impact and feasibility for all options identified by participants. System Modeling results presented in March will explore the execution of most feasible and impactful options.
**Strategic Plan System Goals**

1. Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless
2. Reduction in the number of persons who become homeless for the first time
3. Reductions in the length of time persons remain homeless
4. Increase in percentage of people who exit to or retain permanent housing
5. Reduction in the percentage of persons who return to homelessness after exiting to permanent housing
6. Reduction in percentage of persons assisted with prevention assistance who subsequently experience homelessness
7. Increase in percentage of adults who gain or increase income

**System Performance Review**

[Diagram showing system performance review with data points and percentages for various stages of housing support, including Emergency Shelter/Safe Haven (ES/SH), Transitional Housing (TH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Exit to Permanent Destinations, and Returns.]
System Comparisons Among Peer Jurisdictions

Rate of PIT Homelessness Among Poverty Population

Average Length of Time Homeless (Days)
RRH PROGRAM RESTRUCTURE
PROGRAM DATA INFORMATION

As we’ve considered the future of rapid re-housing, we looked back at the program’s structure and history to detect trends and issue. Of course, a large part of that information came from looking at the data generated from the operation of Rapid Rehousing in the past 3 years. As previously mentioned in the historical context of the program, the population being served by Rapid Rehousing has evolved from only serving families with minor children to also include adult households with no minors—referred to as “singles”. In order to see the differences created by serving different populations the data was broken down into two different time frames. The first timeframe contains data generated when the majority of those served by Rapid Rehousing were families with minor children. The second timeframe contains data when there was more of an influx of singles.

Outcomes

- In both timeframes, family outcomes showed that 75% or more of families that participated in Rapid Rehousing exited the program to a permanent housing solution—i.e. rental with continued assistance (such as from a housing voucher), rental without assistance, reunification with family or friends, etc. In timeframe 2 only 15% of singles exited the program to a permanent housing destination.
- In both timeframes, 13% or less of families were exited to a shelter or place not meant for human habitation (streets, car, etc.). For singles this jumped to 72% in timeframe 2.
- Returns to homelessness data is generated by looking at those who access homeless services within a year of their exit from Rapid Rehousing. Due to this timeframe, this information could only be obtained for timeframe 1. The data showed that only 8% of Rapid Rehousing family participants showed a return to homelessness. Since Rapid Rehousing only began serving singles in 2018 and the program typically runs for 12 months or more, enough time had not passed for this data to be accurately generated.
- Another data point that we looked at was average length of stay (time in program from enrollment to exit) for participates. For families, the average length of stay in timeframe 1 was 394 days and for timeframe 2 it was 306 days. For singles in timeframe 2, this greatly decreased to an average length of stay of only 59 days. One possible explanation for this is the noted issue of it being more difficult keeping singles engaged in the program.
Disabling Condition at Enrollment

- This slide shows the percentage of heads of households that reported having a disability condition and/or a permanent disability at the time of enrollment into the Rapid Rehousing program.
- In Timeframe 1, 25% of heads of households reported having a disabling condition and 21% reported they had a permanent disability. For timeframe 2 when singles were also included, these numbers doubled with 51% reporting a disabling condition and 47% stating they had a permanent disability.

Snapshot of Waitlist

- In order to get a better idea of most of the population that Rapid Rehousing would be serving moving forward, we looked at a snapshot of those currently on the waitlist at the beginning of November
  - This snapshot showed that the average household size on the waitlist was 1.45 (mostly singles)
  - The average age of those on the waitlist was 43.4
  - 81% of those on the waitlist reported having a disabling condition
  - 58% reported having a mental health condition
  - 23% reported having a substance abuse issue
- Of those currently on the waitlist, 80% are currently on the waitlist for Rapid Rehousing with 20% falling in the score range for the non-chronic category of Rapid Rehousing

After comparing data for the two different timeframes and populations we wanted to concentrate more on the data that would give us a better idea of those we would be serving moving forward, those more represented by timeframe 2. We also wanted to more specifically look at factors that appeared to have an affect on client outcomes.

Age

- We first looked at how age affected client outcomes and noted that exits to permanent housing occurred more often for those between the ages of 25-40. Please remember that the current average age of those on the waitlist is 43.
Employment at time of assessment

- Clients that were currently employed at the time they completed a coordinated access assessment had the best outcomes in Rapid Rehousing.
- Clients who reported that it had been more than a year since they had been employed exhibited only a 50/50 chance for a positive exit from Rapid Rehousing.

Income

- When looking at income we utilized the HUD definition of income, which includes not only income from employment but also payments in lieu of earnings (unemployment and disability compensation, worker's compensation and severance pay; welfare assistance payments; alimony and child support payments; and regular contributions or gifts received from organizations or from persons not residing in the dwelling).
- Data showed income reported during the coordinated access assessment did not have as big of an impact as recent employment.
- Those who reported only social security or disability income were less likely to exit to permanent housing than those that reported zero income at the time of assessment.

Special Needs- Disability and Mental Health

- Clients that reported they had a disability or mental health diagnosis at the time of assessment showed only a 50/50 chance of having a positive outcome from Rapid Rehousing. Please remember that 81% of those on the waitlist in November reported having a disabling condition and 58% reported having a mental health condition.

Utilizing all the information from both the historical content and the data gathered we have developed a set of recommendations that not only address how rapid rehousing should be operating but also who would be best served by the program.

Recommendations

- Structure
  - Dissolve the CMI role in the adult RRH program and continue with the FAI structure; subcontracting out for 1-2 agencies to provide Case Management services. This would release City, County, and State funding back to the system and keep CoC funds to operate the program and pay for rent.
- Reallocate extra funds from the CoC RRH grant to Dedicated Plus. This would allow for the opportunity to utilize City, County, and State dollars to fund outreach, diversion, or homeless prevention.
- The young adult RRH program should remain as is and will continue to be evaluated.
  o Program Delivery
  - Provide financial assistance with a one-year lease term targeting those who reported that they have been employed within the last 90 days at the time of their coordinated access assessment. This recommendation was determined using data showing that maintaining employment indicates a certain level of ability to operate in the mainstream and potentially self-resolve within a year. Additionally, financial assistance for more than one year has not shown to help resolve barriers to independent living.
  - Continue to implement a gradually increasing pay scale to better assimilate participates to paying rent and budgeting their income and would offer incentives for completing tasks orientated to self-sufficiency.
The following data slides are looking at 2 specific timeframes

Timeframe 1
- Oct 2017 - Sept 2018
- Only families with a minor were enrolled

Timeframe 2
- Oct 2018 - Sept 2019
- RRH opened up to single adults
Family PH Outcomes

Timeframe 1:
- Avg. LOS- 394
- 75% exited to permanent housing
- 13% exit to shelters or place not meant for human habitation
- 8% of clients returned to homelessness after 1 year

Timeframe 2:
- Avg. LOS- 306
- 80% exit to permanent housing
- 11% exit to shelters or place not meant for human habitation
- Too soon to look at returns
When looking deeper at family positive outcomes

- **Timeframe One:**
  - 57% left without an ongoing rental subsidy
  - 30% left with an ongoing rental subsidy
  - 13% reunited with family and friends

- **Timeframe Two:**
  - 53% left without an ongoing rental subsidy
  - 38% left with an ongoing rental subsidy
  - 9% reunited with family and friends
Singles
Outcomes

No data for Timeframe One

Timeframe Two-

- Avg. LOS - 59
- 15% exit to some kind of PH
- 20% of clients with a PH exit, left with a subsidy
- 72% exit to shelters or place not meant for human habitation
- Too soon for returns
## Disabling Condition at Enrollment in RRH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe One</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HoHs Enrolled</td>
<td>Dis. Condition</td>
<td>Permanent Dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe Two</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HoHs Enrolled</td>
<td>Dis. Condition</td>
<td>Permanent Dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Snapshot of the Waitlist in November 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Condition Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Count</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Age</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. HH Size</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Family Size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis. Condition</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percentage of the Waitlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH (Score of 28+)</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CH (Score of 27-18)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRH (Score of 17-10)</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Clients Scored &lt;10 in 2019</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nov. 2019 Waitlist Contd.
More Data!!!

The following slides have data that are exit outcomes from Sept 2018 - Oct 2019.
What groups seem to do well at exit?

- The best outcomes were clients with an age of 25-40.
- Average age on the waitlist right now is 43.
Employment Matters

- Clients who were currently employed when they completed a CA assessment had the best outcomes in RRH.

- Clients who reported at CA assessment that they had employment over one year ago exhibit a 50/50 chance at success in RRH.
Does Income Matter?

Income at CA assessment does not make as big of a difference as recent employment.

Maintaining some kind of employment indicates a certain level of ability to operate in the mainstream and potentially return within a year.

Someone entering with SSI/SSDI is less likely to exit to PH than someone entering with zero income.
Clients stating they have a disability or mental health diagnosis at their CA assessment had nearly a 50/50 chance of a positive outcome.

People have a broad experience with both of these diagnoses. Alone they cannot determine if someone will be successful or not. However, the majority of our clients experience one or both of these.
CMI and FAI Recommendation

- Coalition recommends getting rid of the CMI and continuing with an FAI
  - Agencies want the FAI structure and more control of the program
  - Subcontract with no more than 2 agencies for CM services
- Community guidelines that all agencies follow
  - This system works well for PSH programs
- Limit the funding streams used for RRH
  - This will solve most of the data issues
- If the CMI role continues past Spring 2021, a new CMI needs to be secured once CFTH’s final contract ends
RRH Recommendation

- Target individuals who state they have been employed within the last 90 days on their CA Assessment
  - Refer clients with a CA Assessment score range of 17-10
- Continue with a payment scale and possible incentives
- 1 year lease term of financial assistance
- Reallocate one million dollars from the CoC grant to Dedicated Plus
  - Use 1.25 million dollars of CoC funding to provide rental assistance and services
Other Considerations to Keep in Mind

- Housing people who receive SSI/SSDI will have a difficult time taking over a lease with the current rental market.
- People over the age of 62.
- Individuals in RRH may connect to employment but, that doesn’t mean they can connect to affordable/safe housing.
- How we use homeless preference vouchers outside of PSH.
The Way Home CoC Monthly Report

Households assessed at one of the Coordinated Access Hubs

Individuals housed in permanent supportive housing

Individuals housed in rapid rehousing

Number of days until permanent housing move-in

Number of days households are waiting for a housing referral

Number of households waiting for permanent housing
Where individuals were living prior to project enrollment

Bed Utilization on January 31, 2020

Percentage of beds occupied during the month

Leavers with Increased Income, January 2020

Percentage of adults that exited during the month & increased their income from any source between entry & exit
Milestones:

- Milestone 1 – Within 10 business days after execution of Agreement
  - Met on 9/23/19
- Milestone 2 – Upon payment of “holding deposit” to secure the first housing unit
  - Met on 11/20/19
- Meet Milestone 3 – Upon placement of the first 60 individuals into permanent housing
  - Met on 12/18/19

Outreach:

- Outreach
  - Leasing event held the week of January 20th
  - 39 people housed in two days
  - Area to the right of the sidewalk of the Chartres encampment was fenced off on January 24th

Landlords:

- The Redford Apartments
  - 84 units
- Avalon at Gulfgate
  - 25 units
- Fat Property
  - 15 units
- Angel Ridge
  - 5 units
- The Barracks at Bamwood
  - 7 units
- La Casita
  - 15 units
- Buena Vista
  - 4 units
- Lodebar Ministry
  - 15 units
- Palms at Rolling Creek
  - 15 units
- Sunset Crossing
  - 5 units
- Total
  - 190 units
Progress:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>In Process</th>
<th>Turned Down</th>
<th>Left Area</th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>In Process</th>
<th>Turned Down</th>
<th>Left Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chartres</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflow</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total Housed = 78
- Total In Process = 59
- Total Turned Down = 4
- Total Left Area = 74

Future:

- February 29, 2020
  - House remaining 40 people