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Public Participation
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MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BLACK PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS MEETING
Held April 16, 2018

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Ad Hoc Committee on Women & Homelessness Meeting, held in the LAHSA Administrative Office located at 811 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, California, was called to order at 1:16 pm by Commissioner Waggoner.

Attendance
LAHSA Commissioners Present:
Jacqueline Waggoner, Chair
Kelli Bernard, Vice Chair

Committee Members Present:
Va Lecia Adams
Rachel Brashier
Robin Hughes
Juana Mark
Molly Rysman
Sean Spear
Dhakshike Wickrema
Edward Anderson
Oliver Buie
Janet Kelly
Anita Nelson
Suzette Shaw
Reba Stevens
Jack Barbour
Brian Ford
Veronica Lewis
Alisa Orduna
Brenda Shockley
Pete White

Committee Members Absent:
Chancela Al-Mansour
Wendell Blassingame
Chela Demuir-Cartier
Monique King-Viehland
Lola Smallwood-Cuevas

LAHSA Staff:
Peter Lynn, Executive Director
Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems
Eileen Bryson, Commission Liaison

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum
Roll was called and quorum was established at 1:16 p.m.

1.0 Introductions.

Commissioner Waggoner thanked the members for participating and outlined the issues that will be examined by the Committee. Peter Lynn, Executive Director, welcomed and thanked the members. Commissioner Bernard thanked the members and staff and shared information about the formation of the committee. Patricia Lally, Facilitator, welcomed the group.

The committee members introduced themselves and shared what brought them to the table.

Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems, thanked the committee and introduced staff.

2.0 Session on Implicit Bias and Institutional Racism.
Patricia Lally and Earl Edwards, Committee Facilitators, gave the report:

- Ms. Lally and Mr. Edwards shared information on implicit bias and institutional racism as shown in the provided presentation.
- Ms. Lally gave information about what the group will be covering and the goals of the committee.
Mr. Edwards and Ms. Lally reviewed demographic information, factors contributing to homelessness, racism, and explicit vs. implicit bias.

The Committee recessed at 2:53 p.m. and reconvened at 3:05 p.m.

The Committee viewed two videos regarding implicit bias and one about equity.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

3.0 Introduction to Racial Equity Toolkit.
Patricia Lally, Committee Facilitator, gave the report:

Ms. Lally shared information on racial equity toolkit as shown in the provided presentation.

Molly Rysman departed at 3:58 p.m.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

4.0 Work Session and Discussion on Call to Action and Racial Equity Outcome.
Patricia Lally and Earl Edwards, Committee Facilitators, gave the report:

Ms. Lally and Mr. Edwards facilitated a discussion on a draft call to action and racial equity outcome.

There was discussion about the potential outcome vision. “The number of Black people experiencing homelessness is proportional to that of the general population.”

Suggestions were made about various topics including considering incremental work, possibly focusing on housing outcomes rather than homelessness, thinking about the process of resolving homelessness, considering the factors involved in people becoming homeless and preventing them from exiting homelessness, the challenges with working with the concept of proportionality, the listening session information be considered as expert data, community reinvestment, and reducing barriers. Commissioner Waggoner reminded the committee to remain focused on the urgency of the issue.

The Committee will be providing feedback to the facilitators.

Supervisor Mark Ridley Thomas expressed support for the work being done by the Committee.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

5.0 Work Session and Discussion on Questions for Listening Sessions.
Patricia Lally and Earl Edwards, Committee Facilitators, gave the report:

Ms. Lally and Mr. Edwards led a discussion about community listening sessions, locations, and encouraged a range of participants.

Speaker(s): Public comment was deferred to the end of the meeting.

6.0 Committee Work Plan Review and Discussion.
Patricia Lally and Earl Edwards, Committee Facilitators, gave the report:

This item was not heard.

7.0 Update Regarding Future Listening Sessions and Committee Meetings.
Patricia Lally, Committee Facilitator, gave the report:

This item was not heard.
8.0 Public Participation

Public Speaker: Genevieve Clavreul expressed displeasure at the lack of public participation throughout the meeting.

Public Speaker: General Jeff was disappointed that he didn’t hear about the meeting earlier and is disappointed that the facilitator is not black.

Public Speaker: Carl Popules wonders how the committee membership was vetted and how cultural sensitivity is included.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.
An Introduction to LAHSA and the Coordinated Entry System

May 21, 2018

Josh Hall
Associate Director, Coordinated Entry System
The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) was created in 1993 as an independent, Joint Powers Authority between Los Angeles City and County.

Our Mission Statement is: “To support, create and sustain solutions to homelessness in Los Angeles County by providing leadership, advocacy, planning and management of program funding.”
• Funding Distribution
• Program Design
• Monitoring & Compliance of Programs and Funding
• Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
• Education and Coordination

LAHSA

100+ Providers Serving our Homeless Neighbors
City of LA & County of LA

City of Los Angeles
- Prop HHH/Measure H
- Land Use
- Law Enforcement
- Economic & Workforce Development

County of Los Angeles
- Land Use (Unincorporated)
- Social Services
- Health Services
- Law Enforcement
- Economic & Workforce Development
- Education
The Coordinated Entry System (CES)
The Coordinated Entry System (CES) is a countywide system that brings together new and existing programs and resources in order to connect people experiencing homelessness to the most appropriate housing and services to end their homelessness.
What is CES?

• CES lays the groundwork for a more efficient and effective use of resources and creates a system that is easier for people experiencing homelessness to access and navigate.

• The goal is to create a system that is more **Effective, Efficient, and Fair** for everyone experiencing homelessness.
Why CES?
Los Angeles County
CES for All Populations

Coordinated Entry System

Families

Single Adults

Transition Age Youth

CES Essentials
- Coordination
- Common Approach
- Information Sharing
- Accessible Entry Point
- Common Triage Tools
- Prioritization
- Housing Navigation
- Linkage to services
- Housing Stabilization & Retention
Where does someone access CES?

Main ways to access CES:

• “No Wrong Door” approach
• Outreach
• CES Access Sites or Drop in Centers
• Partner locations i.e. community colleges, county departments, faith based community, etc.
• 211
CES Triage Tools

- CES utilizes a common needs assessment tool to connect people the right interventions AND prioritize limited resources.
- All tools based on the Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool, or SPDAT.
CES Triage Tools

CES Triage Tools provide a score which helps to “triage” a person’s or household’s need

- Is the person connected to benefits?
- Is the person a Veteran?
- Do they have unaddressed health or mental health issues?
- Should they be referred to shelter or rapid rehousing?
- Do they need to be matched to permanent supportive housing?
Resources through CES
Resources

- Outreach
- Access Centers
- Housing Navigation
- Interim Housing
- Transitional Housing
- Rapid Re-housing
- Supportive Housing
How CES matches to Resources

• A Housing Provider enters a housing resource(s) in CES
  ▫ Could be a project based unit, a tenant based voucher, a rapid re-housing slot, or a transitional housing slot

• The housing provider includes the eligibility criteria that is required for the available resource

• A CES Matcher is notified of the housing resource

• The CES Matcher finds an individual that is prioritized and eligible for the resource

• The CES Matcher “matches” the person to the resource
Questions?
Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness

May 21, 2018
I’m here because . . .

The change starts with each of us in our respective positions.

Suddenly, I was on 6th and San Pedro, and saw what felt like a lost family.

There is a real difference between who is experiencing homelessness and who is speaking on behalf of that community.

You can’t just talk about it; you’ve got to be about it.

I’m so excited that we are starting this dialogue . . . tackling homelessness requires all of our attention.
I’m here because . . .

I want to see the difference not just on paper but on the streets.

You are not 9% of the population and 40% of the homelessness population by accident. We must mobilize.

We come from that moment of knowing that they look like us and they are us.

Sentenced to live on the streets is immoral. The faith community owns a lot of property in South Los Angeles. To do nothing about it is also immoral.
I’m here because . . .

I’m here to come together to “hash out” some solutions.

I want to come up with concrete ways to make a difference. Who knows better how to help than those who have experienced homelessness themselves.

I’m thankful that this day has come. I come with a sense of grief.

I’m here because I’m heartbroken. I see a sea of black homeless faces everyday.
A Racial Equity Toolkit Case Study
The Racial Equity Toolkit

The Racial Equity Toolkit is comprised of a set of questions to guide us as we assess how our policies, projects, initiatives, and budget decisions benefit or burden communities.

This process is intended to disrupt institutional racism and lead us towards more equitable outcomes.
Step 1: Racial Equity Outcome - Case Study

All people—particularly people of color—have access to safe and secure housing.
Step 2: Engage Stakeholders and Analyze Data

In Seattle, staff conducted a listening session at a women’s shelter. The group shared the burden of criminal history records when seeking housing.

What we learned:
➢ 1 in 5 people become homeless shortly after leaving prison

➢ 14% of surveyed people experiencing homelessness said they were on probation or parole at the time they became homeless

➢ About 28% reported they were involved in the justice system prior to experiencing homelessness.
Step 3: Identifying Benefits and Burdens

From data and our listening sessions, we learned that criminal background checks are a barrier to housing that disproportionately impacts people of color.
Step 4: Strategies to Maximize Benefits & Eliminate Harm

(Seattle, WA) August 14, 2017 - City Council passes law preventing rental restrictions based on criminal records

*The ordinance seeks to combat homelessness and inequality.*

According to officials, the ordinance would prevent landlords from screening applicants based on criminal convictions which addresses barriers people with criminal backgrounds may face when attempting to secure rental housing.
Step 5: Evaluate and Raise Racial Awareness

Evaluating City of Seattle’s legislation:
- Is the Ordinance working as intended?
- Are aggrieved, potential renters filing claims?
- Are landowners and leasing agents aware of the Ordinance?
- What does our Fair Housing Testing tell us?
- Gather feedback from stakeholders.
- Are the trainings on the new Ordinance effective?
- Use this opportunity to raise awareness about racial inequity related to this issue.
Step 6: Report Out – Case Study

Develop a plan to share analysis and report responses back to leadership and stakeholders.
THANK YOU
Racial Equity Outcome

Eliminate racial disparities impacting Black people experiencing homelessness by ensuring racial equity within the homeless crisis response system.
Examining Equity in the Homeless Service System Through Data
For the LAHSA Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness
• Section 1: Demographics of the homeless population in LA County

• Section 2: Service receipt by race/ethnicity

• Section 3: Outcomes by race/ethnicity
Data sources used

• Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count
  • Gives a snapshot of homelessness in LA County
  • Mandated by US Department of Housing and Urban Development
  • Conducted annually in January
  • Includes unsheltered (metro lines, county parks, riverbeds) and sheltered (emergency shelters, transitional housing, and Safe Havens).

• Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
  • Records information about clients who access housing and homeless services in LA County
  • Mandated by US Department of Housing and Urban Development
  • Data collected at intake into Coordinated Entry System
  • Includes homeless and those at-risk of homelessness
LA County vs. Homeless Population

**LA COUNTY POPULATION**
- Black: 9%
- White: 26%
- Latinx: 48%
- Asian: 15%
- Other: 2%

**HOMELESS POINT-IN-TIME POPULATION (2017)**
- Black: 40%
- Latinx: 35%
- White: 20%
- Asian: 1%
- Other: 4%

Source: Census Bureau Quick Facts, 2016

Source: Greater LA Homeless Count
Does not include Long Beach, Pasadena, or Glendale
Are the Demographics of Black People Experiencing Homelessness Different from other Race/Ethnic Groups?
## Family Structure in LA County’s Homeless Response System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single adults</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with children</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition age youth</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>184,216</td>
<td>105,244</td>
<td>69,597</td>
<td>22,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, excluding street outreach and coordinated assessment projects.
### Age and gender of single adult homeless population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124,342</td>
<td>56,428</td>
<td>58,398</td>
<td>14,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Chronic homelessness and disabilities among homeless - single adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Disabling Condition</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124,342</td>
<td>56,428</td>
<td>58,398</td>
<td>14,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Adults defined as 25 and older.
Justice system is any of the following: juvenile or probation camp; juvenile or adult probation; jail or prison; parole
Source: Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count, 2017.
Do people of different race/ethnic groups receive similar homeless services?
Percentage of homeless in each race/ethnic group enrolled into different housing programs - single adults

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Speed of housing navigation, by race/ethnicity and acuity

Priority score is based on CES triage tools: VI-SPDAT (adults), VI-FSPDAT (families), and Next Step Tool (TAY)
Source: HMIS, all exits (adult, family, TAY) to permanent housing with or without subsidy, 2016-2017
Do people of different race/ethnic groups have similar outcomes after placement into housing?
Defining outcomes

Housing placement outcomes on the following slides defined as follows:

1. **Permanent housing, differentiated by subsidy receipt:**
   1. **Permanent housing with subsidy:** Permanent Supportive Housing; rent or own with some housing subsidy
   2. **Permanent housing without subsidy:** Living with family or friends; moving into an apartment or a motel without subsidy, own without subsidy

2. **Transitional Housing**

3. **Interim housing:** Emergency shelter; Safe Haven; bridge housing

4. **Institutions:** Psychiatric hospital or facility; substance abuse treatment facility; nursing home or other long-term residence

5. **No Placement:** Place not meant for human habitation; jail, prison, or hospital

6. **Unknown Housing Placement**
Outcomes for those placed in interim housing - single adults

unknown placements excluded

All other placements for each race/ethnic group are unknown

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Outcomes for those placed in transitional housing - single adults

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Outcomes for those placed in rapid rehousing - single adults

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Recidivism rates by placement type - single adults

Recidivism rate is defined as the share of intakes for whom there is a return to an HMIS Interim Housing program within a year after exit date.

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single adults, 25 and older
Permanent Supportive Housing: exit rates and placements for adults who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Exit Rate</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Path</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Placement</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total exits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total exits</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,947</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism rate is defined as the share of PSH exits for whom there is a return to an HMIS Interim Housing program within a year after exit date.

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, 25 and older
Key Takeaways

• Black residents are at much higher risk of becoming homeless.

• Black people experiencing homelessness are younger, more likely to be female, and more likely to be in families. They are also less likely to have disabilities.

• Black people experiencing homelessness are just as likely - and in some cases more likely - to be enrolled in homeless services.

• Once receiving services, they are more likely to exit their program and become homeless again.
Questions?
Appendix
### Intakes vs. Individual: How Frequently do Individuals Appear in the Homeless Response System in LA County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Individuals</td>
<td>80,754</td>
<td>56,501</td>
<td>36,224</td>
<td>12,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Intakes per Individual</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Intakes</td>
<td>184,216</td>
<td>105,244</td>
<td>69,597</td>
<td>22,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016
Transition Age Youth
## Age and gender of homeless population - TAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single Transition-Age-Youth (TAY)
### Chronic homelessness and disabilities among homeless - TAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Disabling Condition</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Percentage of homeless in each race group referred into different housing programs - TAY

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Defining outcomes

Housing placement outcomes on the following slides defined as follows:

1. Permanent housing, differentiated by subsidy receipt:
   1. Permanent housing with subsidy: Permanent Supportive Housing; rent or own with some housing subsidy
   2. Permanent housing without subsidy: Living with family or friends; moving into an apartment or a motel without subsidy, own without subsidy

2. Transitional Housing

3. Interim housing: Emergency shelter; Safe Haven; bridge housing

4. Institutions: Psychiatric hospital or facility; substance abuse treatment facility; nursing home or other long-term residence; foster care

5. No Placement: Place not meant for human habitation; jail, prison, or juvenile detention system; hospital

6. Unknown Housing Placement
Outcomes for those placed in interim housing - TAY

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Outcomes for those placed in transitional housing - TAY

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Outcomes for those placed in rapid rehousing - TAY

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Recidivism rates by placement type - TAY

Recidivism rate is defined as the share of intakes for whom there is a return to an HMIS Interim Housing program within a year after exit date.

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, single TAY
Families with Children
## Age and gender of homeless population - families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,276</td>
<td>15,278</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children (household heads)
Chronic homelessness and disabilities among homeless - families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Disabling Condition</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22,276</td>
<td>15,278</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
Percentage of homeless in each race group referred into different housing programs - families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Overall</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
Defining outcomes

Housing placement outcomes on the following slides defined as follows:

1. Permanent housing, differentiated by subsidy receipt:
   1. Permanent housing with subsidy: Permanent Supportive Housing; rent or own with some housing subsidy
   2. Permanent housing without subsidy: Living with family or friends; moving into an apartment or a motel without subsidy, own without subsidy

2. Transitional Housing

3. Interim housing: Emergency shelter; Safe Haven; bridge housing

4. Institutions: Psychiatric hospital or facility; substance abuse treatment facility; nursing home or other long-term residence;

5. No Placement: Place not meant for human habitation; jail or prison; hospital

6. Unknown Housing Placement
Outcomes for those placed in interim housing - families

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
Outcomes for those placed in transitional housing - families

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
Outcomes for those placed in rapid rehousing - families

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
Recidivism rates by placement type - families

Recidivism rate is defined as the share of intakes for whom there is a return to an HMIS Interim Housing program within a year after exit date.

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children
### Permanent Supportive Housing: exit rates and placements for families who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit to...</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Placement</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rate</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exits</strong></td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism rate is defined as the share of PSH exits for whom there is a return to an HMIS Interim Housing program within a year after exit date.

Source: HMIS intake data, 2010-2016, adult families with children.