Contra Costa System Map

Determining Resource Capacity, Need & Maximization Opportunities to End Homelessness
Presentation Agenda

• System Map Purpose
• Key Highlights from the System Map
• **Use of the System Map:** Right-Sizing the System
• **Use of the System Map:** Maximizing Existing Resources
• Next Steps
Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC)

- Nonprofit technical assistance firm; specializes in housing & human services
- California HCD technical assistance (TA) contractor: Capacity Building
- Fulfilling Contra Costa TA related to system planning efforts

Ashley Mann-McLellan, Housing Team
What Does this System Map Represent?

- Positioning of Housing Resources in Contra Costa
- Agencies Administering Housing Resources
- General Participant Flow through Contra Costa System of Care
- Capacity of Housing Resources
- Key Data Points Related to Need
How to Use This System Map

• Resource Allocation (how do we fill capacity gaps)

• Setting Strategic Plans or Priorities (what do we address first)

• Resource Maximization (how do we use what we have efficiently)
  • Prioritization of Participants For Limited Resources
  • Exploring Process Causes of Bottle Necks
  • Improving Performance of All System Components
North Star in System Resource Planning

Inflow - Prevention & Rapid Resolution - "Rare"

Link to Permanent Housing Pathways - "Brief"

Stabilization - "One-Time"
End homelessness by making it rare, brief & one-time

Federal framework

2 Part Approach to Reach the Goal

1. Ensure the system has the resources it needs
2. Ensure the system is performing well with the resources it has
Quick Note: The Community’s Working Document

• System map will be distributed at a later date

• Based on questions/thoughts you have today, it may be updated prior to use in planning efforts
# Contra Costa Continuum of Care Provider Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homelessness Prevention</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
<th>Rapid Re-Housing</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHELTER, Inc.</td>
<td>East County Shelter</td>
<td>Appian House - Youth (18-24 y/o)</td>
<td>Berkeley Food &amp; Housing Project - Veterans</td>
<td>Contra Costa Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Food &amp; Housing Roads Home</td>
<td>Men's Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>Pomona Apts. - Youth (18-24 y/o)</td>
<td>CCIH-Housing Works - Families on CalWorks</td>
<td>Contra Costa Interfaith Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAND (DV)</td>
<td>Women and Families Shelter</td>
<td>Bay Area Rescue Mission</td>
<td>SHELTER, Inc. - Re-entry, Veterans families, individuals &amp; DV</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development/Lifelong Medical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUME</td>
<td>Brookside Adult Interim Housing</td>
<td>Casa Verde - Veterans</td>
<td>STAND - Domestic Violence</td>
<td>SHELTER, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookside Adult Interim Housing HCHV</td>
<td>STAND - Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Ulkema House - Substance Use Recovery</td>
<td>Veterans' Affairs (HUD-VASH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calli House Youth Shelter</td>
<td>Ulkema House - Substance Use Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concord Adult Interim Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Dorn Respite Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Dorn Respite Center HCHV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Nights Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity Winter Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Crunch
Data Highlights from the System Map

- **5,800 HH** experience literal homelessness annually.
- **26%** leave to permanent housing (1450 HH).
- **There are PH resources to meet about 50% of the need/year*.**
- **The average LOT homeless increased from 15 to 17 months (2017-2018).**
- **28% are chronically homeless.**
- **At least 2,900 more PH interventions are needed to meet the need in a year.**

*Assumes nationally used number of 25% may self-resolve just for estimation purposes*
Coordinated Entry Wait Times for a Housing Resource

- 1,400 Participants assessed & in the queue
- 10 months for those who were referred to a resource
- 11+ months for those waiting
Sheltering Participants

• About half of the homeless population experiences unsheltered homelessness (approx. 3,000/5,800)

• Emergency shelter meets a little over half of the unsheltered need (57%)
  • 70 cots/night through the Warming Center

• 1 bed is used by 3 participants/year
Housing Resources Dedicated to Homeless Population

- Estimate: there are about 700 housing openings/year
  - Permanent Supportive Housing (36 openings/year)
  - Rapid Re-housing (656 openings/year)
  - Add VASH (88 openings last year, total = about 788)
Providers & Participants Are Leveraging Resources Outside of CoC

• Shared housing, private market, hotels, relocations, other affordable hsg

• About 1,000 literally homeless participants accessed permanent housing outside of CoC resources last year
Using the System Map to Right-Size
Right-Sizing Requires a Community to Have Clear Vision

Throughout this section, you will see visions TAC uses from the federal framework to end homelessness as an example to create right-sized scenarios.
System Map contains placeholders for:

- Rates of movement to permanent housing
- Capacity (CE wait times; housing openings/year)
- Affordable housing vacancy rate

These placeholders can be adjusted based on changes in performance & resource allocation to envision right-sized scenarios

Ex. new RRH & PSH that comes on-line will change need
Emergency Shelter Capacity Right Now

- ES Serves about 1700 HH/year
  - Meets about 57% of unsheltered need (3,000 HH)
- LOS about 4 months
- 1 bed is used by 3 HH/year

Vision: If we right-sized so every unsheltered person could have the option to come inside

  Approximately 400 more shelter options (low barrier) would be needed
Transitional Housing Capacity

- Serves about 136 Participants/Year
- Stays vary between 3 months- 1+ year

Vision: If we right-sized so that TH was used as an intervention for those that choose it over an immediate permanent housing option...

Ex. Estimate 10% of total served would choose a TH option (570 HH/year)
Approximately 430 beds would be needed
Permanent Supportive Housing Capacity

- 36 openings (most upon turnover)/year
- Current chronic by name list (point in time): 800 participants
- Currently meets just 5% of current chronic by name list

Vision: If we right-sized so that we could offer every person on Chronic BNL a PSH unit...

Approximately 750 more PSH units would be added
Permanent Supportive Housing Capacity

- 36 openings (most upon turnover)/year
- Current chronic by name list (point in time): 800 participants
- Currently meets just 5% of current chronic by name list

Vision: If we right-sized so that we could offer every person on Chronic BNL AND those that enter into chronic homelessness a PSH Unit...

  Estimate: 1600-1800 experience chronic homelessness in a year
  1550-1750 PSH units would be needed

AND/OR: Engage PHA’s in a Move On strategy to create flow in PSH inventory
Rapid Re-housing Capacity

- 656 anticipated openings this year
- Will meet about 47% of the current Coordinated Entry queue

Vision: If we right-sized so that we could offer every person a pathway out of homelessness through rapid re-housing/other affordable housing...

   Estimate: 1100* RRH/other affordable housing would be needed
   Estimate varying degrees of intensity using assessment data (40% at highest score levels)

*Accounts for current RRH capacity, 25% self resolve rate, those that found housing outside of CoC resources, and those housed through PSH in an ideal system.
### Total Housing Resource Need (Estimate) Based on Sample Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing Resource</th>
<th># Needed to Add to Current System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Hsg/Move On</td>
<td>1550-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing/Other Affordable</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the System Map to Maximize Current Resources
HUD System Performance Measures (SPM) Mirror Rare, Brief & One-Time Vision

HUD does not establish benchmarks; asks communities to do this locally

Instead, HUD compares communities to previous performance

In communities’ interest to continually perform well
   Tied to CoC Renewal Funds NOFA more and more each year
   Ex. Performing well may increase chance of obtaining bonus funds for community

Using the System Map to Maximize Resources
North Star in System Resource Planning

Reduce Length of Time Homeless
Contra Costa: Increase (15 to 17 months)

Increase exits to Permanent Housing
Contra Costa: Increase (1,120 to 1,494)

Measure: Reduce Inflow
Contra Costa: Increase (1,707 to 1,854)

Measure: Reduce Returns to Homelessness
Contra Costa: 17% return rate

Change measured from 2017 to 2018 SPM reports
Many Caveats to Compared Data

• Local conditions, even in like, nearby communities will affect comparisons

• Data quality, migrations, mergers affect quality of numbers you see

• Key-look to see “like” communities’ progress over time rather than hard numbers
Using the System Map to Maximize Resources

Contra Costa’s Performance Compared to “Like” CoC’s (2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC</th>
<th>PIT</th>
<th>Average LOTH (ES/TH)</th>
<th>Placements to PH</th>
<th>Inflow-Newly Homeless</th>
<th>Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly/San Mateo</td>
<td>2154</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas/Monterey/San Benito</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevention & Rapid Resolution

• As this scales up, consider tying staff expertise related to common reasons people become homeless- income maximization, mediation/reunification & behavioral health specializations
  • Loss of income; job loss; asked to leave; substance use

• Build upon current strengths- 1/3 of all exits are to market rate or naturally occurring affordable housing
Flow Within & Out of Emergency Shelter and Transitional Hsg

Opportunities to Explore Include
- Increasing percentage of exits to PH - what is needed?
- Reducing LOS to turnover beds more frequently → sheltering more people

• Explore utilization rates on the program-level
  • Ranges from 50%-full utilization

• Explore barriers to maximizing all beds
  • Intake processes
  • Referral sources
  • Admissions criteria
  • Outreach/partnering
  • Discharge and termination policies

Using the System Map to Maximize Resources
Maximize Use of PSH for Most Vulnerable

- So few openings a year (36)

- Look at vulnerability and LOTH to ensure resources is serving most vulnerable with highest service needs
  - Ex. Lower scores were housed in some projects due to project set up with higher threshold criteria
  - As system planners are bringing in new PSH, ensure the design allows for your most vulnerable (top 40% of queue) to be housed.

- Consider Move On strategy to increase flow
Use RRH Efficiently Within the System

• Consider dynamic prioritization approach so that people who scored for PSH are offered other permanent housing options to exit homelessness quickly
  • Note - wait time for those not at the top of the list is 11+ months and counting
  • Pairing upcoming vacancies of any kind with a group of people who need the resource the most
  • Case conferencing: a tool to use to match people to upcoming vacancies

• Often using a score range to prioritize causes “buckets” of people who are lowest in that range to be stuck. For example:
  • If you prioritize everyone 10+ for PSH, since openings are limited, often 10-12 is overlooked
Dynamic Prioritization: A Visual
Dynamic Prioritization may pair people with higher vulnerability scores with rapid re-housing, a short-medium term rental assistance option.

- Communities are trying this approach because of the extremely limited PSH and deeply affordable housing stocks.

- So far research on RRH has not been able to give us predictors of who will do well.

- Contra Costa: Average VI Score housed in RRH: 7 (low-medium vulnerability).

- Contra Costa return rate from RRH so far: 6%
  - 122/2129 served and/or currently enrolled in RRH.

- National return rates- closer to 10-20%.
Use RRH Efficiently Within the System

Consider adopting a system wide progress engagement approach
• Adjust RRH $ assistance with the level of intensity a participant requires, rather than using a blanket financial package approach
• May save dollars on those who only needed a little assistance, and can use for those who need more
• May also save dollars within a program to serve more people
Questions
Thank You & Next Steps