AGENDA AND NOTICE OF A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY COMMISSION

Friday, May 24, 2019
9:00 a.m.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
811 Wilshire Boulevard, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

AGENDA NO. | ITEM AND DESCRIPTION | PRESENTER | PAGE
--- | --- | --- | ---

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

Agenda Items - The public will have an opportunity to speak to any agenda item when the item is called and before action is taken. A Request to Speak Form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the completion of the agenda item. The Chair will determine the order of speaking and unless the Chair grants more or less time, the speaker’s limit is two (2) minutes on each agenda item, subject to the total 20-minute period.

1.0 Review and approve the minutes from the Special Commission Meeting held Friday, April 26, 2019. 4

2.0 Consent Calendar
(Unless a Commissioner removes an item listed in this section or a Request to Speak form on the item is received by the Chair from a member of the public, this section will be voted upon without debate or presentations.)

2.1 Review and approve the Recommendations for the 2017 Request for Statement Qualifications (RFSQ). 9

2.2 Review and approve the review results and recommendations for the Request for Training Provider Qualifications – Centralized Training Academy for certification as a qualified training provider. 12

2.3 Review and approve the Quality Review Results for the 2019 Transitional Housing Evaluation RFP and authorize Executive Director to enter into contract with the recommended provider. 15

2.4 Review and Approve California Emergency Solutions and Housing Program (CESH) Authorizing Resolution and Certification of Administrative Entity Letter. 25

2.5 Authorize Executive Director to enter into grant agreements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) pursuant to the 2018 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) award as announced to LAHSA on February 6, 2019. Terms for these grant agreements will be for
the period between February 1, 2019 and January 31, 2020 for funding allocated to LAHSA, the lead agency for the Los Angeles Continuum of Care, by HUD. In the event that funding period or amount allocated from HUD is reduced or not forthcoming, authorize the Executive Director to reduce terms of service, compensation, or not enter into sub-recipient agreements as deemed appropriate.

2.6 Authorize Executive Director to enter into agreements and amendments with sub-recipient for activities in Fiscal Years 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, funded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), City of Los Angeles' Housing & Community Investment Department (HCIDLA), City of Los Angeles Homeless Emergency Aid Program (City HEAP), County of Los Angeles’ (County) Chief Executive Office (CEO) and/or State Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) funds as shown on the attachment, subject to funding being allocated to LAHSA. In the event that funding period or amount allocated from HUD, HCIDLA, City, CEO and/or the State is reduced or not forthcoming, authorize the Executive Director to reduce terms of service, compensation, or not enter into agreements as deemed appropriate.

2.7 Authorize LAHSA's Executive Director to enter into Purchase Agreements and purchase real property located at 12860 Arroyo Street, Sylmar, CA 91342 (the Sylmar Armory) from the State of California, contingent upon receipt of clearance, pursuant to Government Code Section 65402, from the City of Los Angeles that the purchase conforms with the City's General Plan; and contingent upon availability of funding, as may be required to effect the purchase, and to execute a Lease Agreement with LAFH upon completion of the Purchase. In the event that clearance from the City or funding for the purchase is/are not forthcoming, authorize the Executive Director to not enter into Purchase and Lease Agreements as deemed appropriate.

2.8 Review and approve Delegated Authority Policy for Purchasing and Contracts.

2.9 Review and approve FY 2019-20 Proposed LAHSA Budget.

2.10 Review and approve Letters of Support:
2.10 (a) SB 369 – Lowering Barriers for Safe Parking Participants.
2.10 (b) SB 18 – Funding for Homeless Prevention.

2.11 Review and approve LAHSA Comment Letters:
2.11 (a) HUD Rule on Assistance to Mixed-Status Families.
2.11 (b) Federal Regulations in Opportunity Zones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Review and approve the threshold and quality review results of the 2019-2021 LAHSA A-133 Single Audit Request for Proposals (RFP) and authorize Executive Director to enter into contract with the recommended firm.</td>
<td>Peter Lynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Executive Director Report.</td>
<td>Peter Lynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Chief Program Officer Report.</td>
<td>Heidi Marston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Review and approve the Quality Review Results for the 2018 Interim Housing RFP, hear potential appeals, and authorize Executive Director to enter into contracts with the recommended providers.</td>
<td>Kelli Pezzelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Aamir Shaikh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Adults and Transition Age Youth</td>
<td>Andrew Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Presentation on LAHSA Automation and Technology.</td>
<td>Paul Duncan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Josh Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Presentation on report to Board of Supervisors regarding Family Coordinated Entry System (CES).</td>
<td>Commissioner Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Report on the Programs &amp; Evaluation Committee Meeting held on Thursday, May 16, 2019.</td>
<td>Commissioner Greuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Report on the Finance, Contracts and Grants Management Committee Meeting held Thursday, May 16, 2019.</td>
<td>Commissioner Kamin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Report on the Policy &amp; Planning Committee Meeting held on Friday, May 17, 2019.</td>
<td>Commissioner Pearson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Report on the Audit Committee Meeting held on Friday, May 17, 2019.</td>
<td>Commissioner Bernard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Commissioner updates and agenda requests for future meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 15, 2019

Chair, Programs and Evaluation Committee
Re: December 2018 Interim Housing RFP – Quality Review Results Appeals
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
811 Wilshire Blvd., 6th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Re: 2018 Interim Housing RFP – Process Appeal

We are writing to submit a Process Appeal to the Quality Review Results that Special Service for Groups, Inc., (SSG) received regarding application #13007 in response to the 2018 Interim Housing RFP. LAHSA materially failed to follow procedures specified in the RFP in a manner that negatively impacted our application results for our Enhanced Bridge Housing Project at 5514-5516 Ruthelen Street to fill a gap for an underserved subpopulation of Seniors 55 and older.

First, the review process demonstrated a serious lack of attention to detail, which begs into question the accuracy with which procedure was implemented overall. The initial review of at least one document led to erroneous analysis because LAHSA had reviewed only one of four pages of the submitted document. This error only came to light during a clarifying conversation about a proposed site on May 9, 2019. Additionally, communication by LAHSA during the clarifying and results process has been so incomplete and inaccurate as to jeopardize our eligibility and ability to submit an appeal. The results notification letter was addressed to an incorrect address and emailed to someone other than the primary contact for SSG, as well as lacked any detail regarding the basis for our disqualification.

Second, the process for confirming that our proposed site met all qualifications was inefficient, causing concern that staff conducting the analysis may not be properly informed or trained. In particular, LAHSA conducted at least one site visit to our proposed housing site, at which point no concerns were raised about the CoFO, depriving SSG of the opportunity to clarify our basis for considering the CoFO appropriate in a more thorough and timely fashion. Furthermore, the RFP Q&A indicated that, when it comes to what would be considered a responsive CoFO, “other uses will be determined on a case-by-case basis from the local Building and Safety Department,” our application results thus appear to be highly dependent on the knowledge and judgment of LAHSA staff, which makes a timely, thorough and effective review process essential to appropriate results.

Considering that there was an element of judgment involved in determining “appropriate use,” we also assert that applying the following stipulation from the RFP and providing an opportunity to clarify or correct our CoFO within the 60-day window from award, as stated in the RFP, would have been a more effective and correct implementation of procedures as stated in the RFP:
“Qualifying proposers that do not submit a CoO that lists an appropriate use as the building’s designated use at the time of application submission will be recommended for award conditioned upon LAHSA receiving the documentation within 60 days of award announcement.

Finally and most importantly, we contend that ultimately such a judgment call about “appropriate use” was based on incomplete or incorrect interpretation of applicable regulations. In the City of LA, another “appropriate use” for Interim Housing is Transitional Housing with Supportive Services. The definitions of transitional housing and interim housing are nearly identical (see Definition of Interim Housing in the attached document, which clearly includes Crisis and Bridge Housing). Transitional Housing is allowed as a by-right use in any residential zone per City of LA Memo dated 11/15/18 (also attached).

But for LAHSA’s errors in these areas, SSG is confident that we would have been a successful proposer because we would have established that our proposed site meets the program criteria and would not have been disqualified due to deficient documentation. Given the substantial local need for Enhanced Bridge Housing such as SSG proposed, it is incumbent on LAHSA to ensure that review of documentation is conducted at the highest standard.

You may contact Veronica Lewis, Division Director, at (323) 948-0414 or vlewis@hopics.org or Elizabeth Berger, Development Director, at (213) 553-1882 or eberger@ssg.org, should you have any questions or need any further information. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Herbert K. Hatanaka, DSW
Executive Director
Special Service for Groups, Inc. (SSG)

Veronica Lewis, MPA
Division Director
SSG/HOPICS

Attached:
Exhibit I - Overview re Cofo details
Exhibit II - LADBS Memo - Transitional & Supportive Housing
Exhibit III - 2019 Interim Housing Minimum Service and Operations Standards
Exhibit IV - Zimas Profile of the Property
RFP Requirements:

1. RFP seeks to “fund interim housing and services in the County of Los Angeles for adults, transitional age youth (TAY) and families who are experiencing homelessness
2. Certificate of Occupancy “must list ‘shelter’ or other appropriate use as the building’s designated use

Arguments:

1) RFP explicitly includes the option for “other appropriate use” besides shelter
2) In the City of LA, another “appropriate use” for Interim Housing is Transitional Housing with Supportive Services
3) The definitions of transitional housing and interim housing are nearly identical
   a. See Definition of Interim Housing below; clearly includes Crisis and Bridge Housing
4) Transitional Housing is allowed as a by-right use in any residential zone per City of LA Memo dated 11/15/18

Support:

1) **Definition of Interim Housing**
   2019 Los Angeles City and County Interim Housing Minimum Service and Operations Practice Standards

   “Interim Housing is an intervention that provides people experiencing homelessness with temporary housing intended to resolve their immediate experience of unsheltered homelessness, to connect participants to permanent housing opportunities in their communities, and to provide various other services. Interim Housing, as defined by Los Angeles County, includes Crisis Housing, Winter/Seasonal Shelter, Bridge Housing, Recovery Bridge, Recuperative Care, Stabilization Housing, and Safe Haven programs.”

   *In the standards, the footnote to this paragraph indicates that Transitional Housing is technically categorized as Interim Housing

2) **Definition of Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing**
   City of Los Angeles Inter-Departmental Correspondence: Clarification Regarding Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing

   “As defined in LAMC Section 12.03, Transitional Housing is defined as ‘a building where housing linked to Supportive Services is offered, usually for a period of up to 24 months, to facilitate movement to permanent housing for persons with low incomes who may have one or more disabilities, and may include adults, emancipated minors, families...”
with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.’”

“Supportive Services are defined in LAMC 12.03 to include ‘Services that are provided on a voluntary basis to residents of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing, including, but not limited to, a combination of subsidized, permanent housing, intensive case management, medical and mental health care, substance abuse treatment, employment services, benefits advocacy, and other services or service referrals necessary to obtain and maintain housing’”

3) **Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing are residential uses**
   City of Los Angeles Inter-Departmental Correspondence: Clarification Regarding Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing

   “California Government Code Section 65583 states in relevant part:

   ‘Transitional housing and supportive housing shall be considered a residential use of property, and shall be subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone.’

   Projects that meet the definition of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing are residential uses and as such are permitted in any zones which allow a residential use.”

4) **Certificate of Occupancy for 5514-16 Ruthelen Street lists a residential use and property is in a zone that allows a residential use**
   LADBS

   Use per Certificate of Occupancy: Duplex (residential)
   Zoning: R2-1 (residential)

**Question for LAHSA:**

- What other “appropriate use” is there in the City of LA for Interim Housing other than Transitional Housing with Supportive Services?
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

DATE: November 15, 2018

TO: Public Counters
Department of City Planning Staff
Department of Building and Safety Staff

FROM: Kevin J. Keller, AICP
Executive Officer, Department of City Planning

SUBJECT: Clarification Regarding Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing

The purpose of this memo is to provide guidance on zoning code regulations as they apply to the development of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing, in a manner consistent with California Government Code Section 65583 and the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), as of the date of this memo. This memo provides guidance on five areas of clarification related to Supportive Housing, Transitional Housing and Supportive Services.

1. Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing are residential uses.

California Government Code Section 65583 states in relevant part:

"Transitional housing and supportive housing shall be considered a residential use of property, and shall be subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone."

Projects that meet the definition of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing are residential uses and as such are permitted in any zones which allow a residential use. Consistent with state law, Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing should be subject only to the standards that are applied to other residential uses in the same zone. For this purpose, Transitional Housing and Supportive Housing are defined in Sections 50675.2 and 50675.14 of the California Health and Safety Code, respectively.

2. Supportive Services are included in the definitions of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing, and are accessory to the residential use.

The following are definitions from the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) and California Health and Safety Code.
Supportive Housing: As defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 50675.14(b)(2), "Supportive Housing means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community."

This definition is consistent with the definition provided in LAMC 12.03, which further specifies that "any Floor Area used for the delivery of Supportive Services shall be considered accessory to the residential use."

Transitional Housing: As defined in LAMC Section 12.03, Transitional Housing is defined as "a building where housing linked to Supportive Services is offered, usually for a period of up to 24 months, to facilitate movement to permanent housing for persons with low incomes who may have one or more disabilities, and may include adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people."

Supportive Services: Supportive Services are defined in LAMC 12.03 to include, "Services that are provided on a voluntary basis to residents of Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing, including, but not limited to, a combination of subsidized, permanent housing, intensive case management, medical and mental health care, substance abuse treatment, employment services, benefits advocacy, and other services or service referrals necessary to obtain and maintain housing."

3. Supportive Services, when provided in conjunction with Supportive Housing or Transitional Housing, do not subject the project to any additional requirements.

Supportive Services, whether provided directly onsite or linked to outside providers, normally will require some physical space within the residential building dedicated to providing those services, including but not limited to: case management offices, community rooms, demonstration kitchens, recreational facilities, medical or health clinics, and counseling and referral facilities. Those services are intended for residents of the building only. Supportive Services that are provided onsite for use of residents are to be considered accessory to the residential use, and should not subject the project to any additional requirements, including maximum square footage limits when otherwise complying with total floor area regulations of the underlying zone. As such, the inclusion of qualified Supportive Services in conjunction with Supportive Housing or Transitional Housing does not require the provision of additional automobile parking.

4. Supportive Housing projects shall not be required to utilize LAMC Section 14.00 A.13 ("Density Bonus for Qualified Permanent Supportive Housing.").

LAMC Section 14.00 A.13 provides a voluntary incentive program to qualifying Supportive Housing Projects. Supportive Housing projects are not required to utilize the incentives and
procedures in that Zoning code section. The adoption of that Subdivision by Ordinance No. 185,492 does not in any way invalidate the applicability of Government Code Section 65583, and Supportive Housing Projects may continue to use that Government Code Section in conjunction with other affordable housing incentive programs.

5. Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing shall not be required to utilize LAMC Section 14.00 A.12 ("Interim Use of Motels for Supportive Housing or Transitional Housing").

LAMC Section 14.00 A.12 provides a voluntary, streamlined pathway to facilitate the interim use of an existing motel, Hotel, Apartment Hotel, Transient Occupancy Residential Structure, or Hostel as Supportive Housing or Transitional Housing. The adoption of that Subdivision by Ordinance No. 185,489 does not in any way invalidate the applicability of Government Code Section 65583, and Supportive Housing and Transitional Housing Projects may continue to use that Government Code Section in conjunction with other affordable housing incentive programs.

For questions, please contact Cally Hardy in the Department of City Planning at (213) 978-1643, or cally.hardy@lacity.org.
INTERIM HOUSING OVERVIEW
Interim Housing is an intervention that provides people experiencing homelessness with temporary housing intended to resolve their immediate experience of unsheltered homelessness, to connect participants to permanent housing opportunities in their communities, and to provide various other services. Interim Housing, as defined by Los Angeles County, includes Crisis Housing, Winter/Seasonal Shelter, Bridge Housing, Recovery Bridge, Recuperative Care, Stabilization Housing, and Safe Haven programs (see Glossary for definitions).\(^1\)\(^2\)

INTERIM HOUSING PRACTICE STANDARDS
These Interim Housing Practice Standards establish minimum requirements for the operation of Interim Housing programs in Los Angeles City & County, to which such programs (formerly known as “emergency shelters” within Los Angeles County) shall adhere. This document is not intended to stand on its own and shall be read in conjunction with other funders’ contractual requirements. Standards will be reviewed on an annual basis, and may be amended to best reflect current best practice, priorities and stakeholder feedback.

Table of Contents
1. Philosophy & Design
2. System Collaboration
3. Admission, Intake & Assessment
4. Case Management
5. Housing & Services Plan
6. Staff Training
7. Program Operations & Additional Service Standards
   a. Program Operations
   b. Program Administration
   c. Data Collection & Documentation
   d. Security, Health, & Safety
   e. Medication Management & Storage
   f. Food Preparation & Meals
   g. Restrooms, Showers, & Laundry
   h. Environment

Appendix A – Glossary
Appendix B – Grievance Policies & Procedures and Termination Policies & Procedures
Appendix C – ADA Compliance

\(^1\) Transitional Housing, while technically categorized as Interim Housing, will have separate Practice Standards developed.
\(^2\) Augmented Winter Shelters are exempt from these standards.
1. PHILOSOPHY & DESIGN
Programs shall be required to serve all participants with a Housing First approach. The Housing First philosophy is based on the premise that stable housing is a critical determinant of health, education, employment, and other positive outcomes related to well-being. Housing First programs do not require any preconditions for admittance. Instead, the focus is on quickly moving people experiencing homelessness into permanent housing with needed services. In practice, this means that participants shall not be rejected or exited from Interim Housing due to lack of sobriety or income, or based on the presence of mental health issues, disabilities, or other psychosocial challenges.

Programs shall also ensure that a Harm Reduction approach is used in serving participants. Programs using Harm Reduction strategies work with participants to reduce the negative consequences of continued use of alcohol, drugs, or non-compliance with medications rather than establishing no-tolerance policies, or termination assistance based on a participants' inability to achieve sobriety or due to medication non-compliance. Program service strategies shall include all possible approaches to assisting participants in their efforts to reduce or minimize risky behaviors, while at the same time helping participants move into, and stabilize in, permanent housing. This approach has its limits, of course: Harm Reduction approaches are not intended to prevent the termination of a participant whose actions or behavior constitute a threat to the safety of other participants or staff.

In addition to implementing a Housing First model which incorporates Harm Reduction techniques, all programs shall incorporate Trauma Informed Care into their delivery of services. Trauma Informed Care is an organizational structure and service framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma. Trauma Informed Care emphasizes physical, psychological, and emotional safety for participants, families, and service providers alike, and helps participants rebuild a sense of control, personal empowerment and reduce re-traumatization. In practice, Trauma Informed Care services account for trauma in all aspects of service delivery and prioritize the trauma survivor's safety, choice, and control. Trauma Informed Care services create and promote a culture of nonviolence, learning, and collaboration.

Programs shall develop and maintain a set of policies for educating and training program staff on Housing First, Harm Reduction strategies, and Trauma Informed Care.

2. SYSTEM COLLABORATION
1. Programs shall participate fully in the greater Los Angeles County homelessness assistance system, including the Los Angeles Coordinated Entry System (CES).
2. To ensure coordination with the CES, program staff shall participate in all relevant CES and SPA-level activities, including system and service coordination meetings.
3. Programs shall leverage resources through active collaboration with other programs that provide services to participants within their respective communities.
4. Programs funded by LAHSA shall accept referrals according to LAHSA Interim Housing Scope of Required Services.
5. Programs funded by the Los Angeles County Health Agency shall accept referrals at the direction of applicable Health Agency department.
6. Interim Housing programs in which the funder does NOT yet and refer the participants shall prioritize referrals for those who are the least likely to resolve their homelessness without assistance. This includes those with the most acute need of Interim Housing, specifically people who are unsheltered and/or identified for the program by an Outreach Coordinator or an Outreach Team.

3. ADMISSION, INTAKE, & ASSESSMENT
   1. Programs shall not establish supplementary admission requirements or criteria in addition to those established by program funders.
   2. Whenever possible, programs shall work to divert participants seeking program entry by encouraging them to re-connect with family or friends who could temporarily or permanently house them. If resources are needed to successfully divert a person from entry into the homeless system, a referral shall be made to a CES Diversion/Prevention program (when available).
   3. For participants the program is unable to divert,
      a. programs shall confirm within HMIS that CES assessment tool has been completed.
      b. If no tool has been completed, program staff shall complete or update the appropriate CES assessment tool (e.g. VI-SPDAT, Family-SPDAT, or Next Step Tool for Youth) as part of the intake and assessment process.³
   4. Completion of CES assessment shall not be a barrier to program entry.⁴ If participant is unable to complete the CES assessment at time of entry, the participant shall be given an opportunity to complete the assessment as soon as possible if no other viable housing options are identified through diversion strategies.
   5. Programs shall make an attempt to serve families intact regardless of family composition.
   6. Programs shall pursue reasonable accommodations to better-serve all participants, including, but not limited to, ADA.
   7. Programs shall ensure that participants are provided safe and adequate Interim Housing accommodations and services based on each participant’s self-identified gender identity.
   8. During Intake, programs shall orient participants to all program guidelines and expectations.

4. CASE MANAGEMENT ⁵
   1. All programs shall provide Case Management services.
   2. Case Management services shall include at least the following: An assessment of housing and service needs within seven days of admittance, the establishment of a Housing and Services Plan, and connections to community resources and opportunities.
       a. Interim Housing programs operating temporary/seasonal programs (i.e. Winter Shelter or other cold/wet weather programs) shall offer Case Management services and Housing Stability Plans for all participants who have stayed seven or more consecutive days or by participant request.
   3. Case Management shall coordinate all permanent housing activities with any additional Case Managers and/or other staff assisting participants with obtaining permanent housing opportunities.
       a. Interim Housing staff shall serve as point of contact for program participants, to maintain contact and facilitate communications with housing search and placement programs,

---

³ Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System assessment policies.
⁴ Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System assessment policies.
⁵ Department of Public Health SAP-C Recovery Bridge beds are excluded from Case Management standard.
property owners, property managers, landlords, etc., to assist participants with activities related to securing permanent housing placement.

4. Case Management shall make rapid connections to a broad continuum of resources and shall promote the participant’s active involvement in their Housing and Services Plan while emphasizing the temporary nature of their stay in the Interim Housing program.

5. Case Management services shall always be voluntary and participant-centered. It is the responsibility of the Interim Housing program to offer these services as frequently as needed to support participants. Case Management services shall be offered no less than once a week or as required by the funder.

6. Programs shall provide space for the provision of Case Management. Such spaces shall ensure privacy and confidentiality, as well as safety and security, for both participant and program staff.

5. HOUSING & SERVICE PLANNING

1. Following Intake and Assessment, Case Managers shall develop Housing and Services Plans that focuses on finding permanent housing for each individual or family, and also provide supportive services in coordination with the participant and any Case Managers and/or other staff assisting participants with obtaining permanent housing opportunities.

2. The Housing and Services Plan shall identify the participant’s needs, goals, actions to be taken, and progress towards goals. The Housing and Services Plan shall ensure that participants’ Interim Housing stay is as short as possible. Housing and Services Plans shall be updated as the participants’ needs and/or goals change, and as steps are completed or updated.

3. Program staff shall continuously engage participants who do not progress on their plans or who are not willing to address Housing and Services Plan action steps. Continuous engagement shall be offered no less than once a week or as required by the funder.

4. Programs shall assist participants with a range of funded and leveraged activities that address the participants’ goals (as stated in their Housing and Service Plans), including but not limited to:
   a. Assistance obtaining identification and other documents that are required for securing permanent housing;
   b. Enrollment in eligible mainstream resources (TANF, SSI/SSDI; health insurance, public benefits);
   c. Connections to substance abuse, mental health, physical health, employment/vocational, educational services, legal assistance, money management, subsidized childcare, food resources as well as life skills coaching. Programs shall also make efforts to provide participants reasonable access to phone and transportation resources.
   d. When a referral is made to any community service, case managers shall provide a warm handoff and a follow up to ensure the linkage has been made.

6. STAFF TRAINING

1. Programs shall establish and document a regular process for onboarding new staff and regularly update the training procedures for current staff.

2. Program trainings shall include a review of all Interim Housing program policies and procedures, including those discussed in these practice standards.

3. All Interim Housing staff shall receive training upon hire or upon request by funder and/or program management to ensure competency within the following core areas:
a. Program Operations;  
b. Effective interactions with participants;  
c. Housing First & Low Barrier Practices;  
d. Harm Reduction;  
   i. Overdose Prevention and Intervention  
e. Trauma Informed Care, including Secondary Trauma;  
f. Mental Health First Aid;  
g. Non-Violent Crisis Intervention;  
h. Stages of Change/Motivational Interviewing;  
i. Equal Access Gender Identity Policy;  
j. Emergency evacuation procedures (for single structure housing);  
k. Domestic Violence & Safety Planning;  
l. CPR, First Aid, & Communicable Disease procedures; and  
m. Cultural Responsiveness (which shall be reflective of population and community served).

4. Certificates and other documentation that verify training attendance shall be maintained for each employee and documented in the employee's file.

5. Program staff considered Mandated Reporters of suspected child and senior abuse and must report suspicions of child or senior abuse as required by California Law.
   a. Programs must be prepared to provide proof that their staff have been trained in the legal requirements of being a mandated reporter.

7. PROGRAM OPERATIONS & ADDITIONAL SERVICE STANDARDS

7a. Program Operations

1. Hours of operations shall be made known to participants. Interim Housing programs shall accommodate participants who require supportive services during evening and weekend hours.

2. Programs shall develop and implement a language access policy and procedure to ensure that all participants receive necessary program information according to their needs. The following components shall be included in the policy and procedure:
   a. Strategies for meeting the needs of those with visual and/or hearing impairments; and
   b. Written materials and program forms in languages that reflect the population being served.

3. Program shall accept all eligible participants with Service Animals per ADA and must provide reasonable accommodations for Emotional Support Animals.

4. Programs shall develop a process for distributing and communicating program rules to participants that is approved by the funder and includes the following components: Program expectations, participant responsibilities, and guidelines that outline behaviors that will lead to termination from the program. Program rules shall be Trauma Informed and not punitive. Program shall explore all options to continue providing temporary housing and services to program participants who have violated program rules, short of program termination.

5. Programs shall develop and provide participants with a written policy that outlines participants' rights upon admission. A statement of these rights, and how they are to be operationalized in

---

6 Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System assessment policies.
7 Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System access policies.
8 Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System access policies.
that specific program, shall also be posted in the facility, and shall include instructions for grievances. The rights to be specified shall include, but are not limited to:
   a. The right to be treated with dignity and respect;
   b. The right to religious liberty;
   c. The right to privacy;
   d. The right to be treated with cultural sensitivity;
   e. The right to self-determination in identifying and setting goals;
   f. The right to present complaints and grievances;
   g. The right to have an advocate present during appeals and grievance processes;
   h. The right to have all records and disclosures maintained according to the written standards and rules regarding confidentiality and privacy;
   i. The right to review their records and external disclosures of any personal participant information, as governed by the written program standards and rules regarding confidentiality and privacy;
   j. The right to be clearly informed, in understandable and applicable language, about the purpose of the services being delivered;
   k. The right to leave and return to the facility at reasonable hours in accordance with the program rules and standards, unless coordinated by site management; and
   l. The right to stay in facility 24 hours per day, except during required facility maintenance or non-operational hours per funder contract.
      i. Temporary/seasonal Interim Housing programs (i.e. Winter Shelter) that are funded for 14-hour operations shall allow participants access to program facility 24 hours per day during periods of inclement weather, as directed by the funder.

6. Safe Surrender posters shall be posted in a common area within the facility.
7. Suspected child or elder abuse and/or neglect from dependent adults shall be reported to the proper authorities according to State of California Mandated Reporting laws.
8. Programs shall maintain a daily census of participants.
9. Programs shall not require participants to perform chores or work duties.
10. Programs shall permit participants, during their period of stay, to report the program address as their legal residence for purposes such as receipt of mail and school and voter registration. If program safety policies prohibit listing address, program may provide an alternate address.
11. Programs shall establish policies and procedures with respect to participant satisfaction and grievances (see Appendix B: Grievance Policies & Procedures for more details).
12. Programs shall establish policies and procedures with respect to ADA Compliance in accordance with all applicable laws (see Appendix C: ADA Compliance for more details).

7b. Program Administration
   1. Programs shall not require participants to take part in religious activity.
   2. Programs shall not deny participation on the basis of race, religion, ancestry, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, or disability. However, facilities may serve a particular target population as directed by the funder.9

9 Refer to Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System nondiscrimination policies.
3. Publicly funded programs shall not charge participants for housing or other services (including surrendering cash and non-cash benefits).

4. Program staff shall be made identifiable through uniform attire or identification badges.
   a. Programs operating Interim Housing in confidential locations shall be exempted from this requirement to ensure the safety and security of participants and staff.

5. Programs shall maintain an organizational chart which lists all staff funded under the Interim Housing program.

6. Programs shall maintain clear and comprehensive job descriptions for all staff positions.

7. Programs shall maintain a quality assurance plan that outlines a process for the integration of participant feedback into revisions to program policies and procedures.

8. Programs serving youth/minors, and/or families with children, shall identify/designate staff that are responsible for coordinating with the McKinney-Vento Liaison(s) within the local school districts and/or charter schools so that the Interim Housing programs shall assist families, youth, and minors to:
   a. Reconnect homeless youth back into school;
   b. Ensure homeless K-12 students have access to the resources, materials and support(s) to stay in school and fulfill their academic goals;
   c. Connect the student(s) to educational services which may not be available on the local school campus.
   d. Connect homeless children under the age of 5 to Head Start, public schools, etc.
   e. Connect homeless children back to high school, college, job training, etc.

7c. Data Collection & Documentation

1. Programs shall maintain participant records that include documentation of all participant assessments, Housing and Services Plans, referrals, placements, interventions, or follow-up activities.

2. Programs shall enter data into the funders' data systems as required by funders. Data reported shall align with all policies and procedures outlined by funders.

3. Files containing participant information shall be stored in a secure and locked location (to maintain confidentiality). Documents shall only be accessible by authorized personnel.

7d. Security, Health, & Safety

1. Programs shall develop written policies and procedures that address universal precautions, tuberculosis control, and disease prevention, and are in compliance with Department of Public Health guidelines.

2. Programs shall ensure that at least one staff per shift has been trained in and has an up-to-date certification for CPR and emergency first aid procedures. For adult only facilities, at least one staff per shift shall have an Adult CPR/AED certification. For family sites, at least one staff per shift shall have an Adult and Pediatric CPR/AED certification.

3. Programs shall establish a policy and procedure for all entry and exits that includes sign in/out procedure for all participants.

4. Programs shall develop a policy and procedure for emergencies, disasters, and security, including the stockpiling of appropriate quantities of water and food rations. The plan shall include policies and procedures for:
   a. Reporting a fire or other emergency;
b. Emergency evacuations, including the differences in evacuation procedures depending on the type of evacuation and exit route assignments;
c. Assisting participants in their evacuation;
d. Accounting for all participants and staff after evacuation;
e. Staff performing rescue or medical duties;
f. Deterring theft and protect participant and staff from harm; and
g. Crisis interventions when staff are required or permitted to call 911, make a police report, or perform other non-violent interventions.

7e. Medication Management & Storage
   1. Interim Housing programs shall develop and implement a policy, subject to review and approval by program funder, regarding participant medication and its storage. The policy shall address medication storage, documentation, and medication support, refrigeration, and shall include a secured and locked location for medicine storage such as a medication cabinet, locker, or drawer.

7f. Food Preparation & Meals
   1. The program shall provide three meals per day to each participant: a breakfast, a lunch, and a hot dinner, or meals on another schedule as defined by funder contract.
      a. Meal plans and schedules shall be made weekly and posted in common areas. Any changes to the menu or schedule shall also be posted in common areas.
      b. Meals shall be served in an area specifically designated for meal consumption where adequate space for comfortable, seated dining is available to each participant.
      c. Programs shall accommodate participants who have special dietary needs due to medical necessity or religious beliefs.
      d. Meals shall be nutritionally adequate in accordance with U.S. Department of Agriculture guidelines.
      e. Participants shall have access to drinking water throughout the day.
   2. If meals are not prepared on site, programs shall provide catered meals, or otherwise make arrangements that ensure each participant is provided with adequate meals.

7g. Restrooms, Showers, & Laundry
   1. Interim Housing programs shall provide participants access to showers, sinks, and toilets.
      a. Access to showers, sinks, and toilets shall be made available according to participant gender identity, in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and/or local mandates.
   2. Programs shall ensure that all sheets, towels, and blankets are laundered weekly or more frequently as needed.
   3. If applicable, laundry equipment (washers/dryers) shall be provided free of charge to participants and include access to free detergent. If washers and dryers are not onsite, programs shall provide assistance with accessing laundromat services (i.e. funds for detergent, tokens, etc.).

7h. Environment
   1. Programs shall ensure that the facility is clean and complies with Department of Public Health Interim Housing Facilities Standards and all other applicable building, safety, and health codes.
   2. Programs shall maintain a heating and ventilation system that maintains a comfortable temperature.
3. Programs shall establish a housekeeping and maintenance plan that ensures a safe, sanitary, clean, and comfortable environment, and work diligently to prevent and eliminate insect and rodent infestations.

4. Programs shall provide trash receptacles throughout the facility. Trash shall be taken out of the facility into a localized dumpster and/or wheeled trash can multiple times within a shift or whenever full.

5. Programs shall provide each participant with a bed (or crib/bassinet for infants) and clean bedding that includes towels, sheets, a blanket, and a pillow.\textsuperscript{10}

6. Programs shall provide access to storage for participants' personal belongings during their stay.

7. Family Sites Only:
   a. Programs shall ensure that all furniture is child-safe and install childproof safety latches for drawers and cabinets with dangerous items.
   b. Programs shall provide baby changing stations and/or a safe place to change diapers.

\textsuperscript{10}Winter shelters may provide cots for beds.
Appendix A. Glossary

Assessment
An evaluation of a participant's strengths and barriers in achieving housing stability and other outcomes related to stability. The information provided through the assessment informs program referrals and Housing and Services Planning.

Bridge Housing
Temporary/interim housing that serves to "bridge" persons directly from homelessness to housing, via a reserved bed that facilitates placement into permanent housing. Beds are prioritized for high-acuity persons, persons matched to housing resources, and persons exiting institutions.

Coordinated Entry System (CES)
The Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System (LA County CES) facilitates the coordination and management of resources that comprise the homeless crisis response system in the county. CES allows users to efficiently and effectively connect people to interventions that aim to rapidly resolve their housing crisis. CES works to connect the highest need, most vulnerable persons in the community to available housing and supportive services equitably.

Coordinated Entry System (CES) Assessment
The Los Angeles County Coordinated Entry System utilizes a triage and prioritization assessment tool called the Vulnerability Index-Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (VI-SPDAT). This tool is implemented as part of CES to assist in prioritization of housing program resources based on participant vulnerability.

Crisis Housing
Short term, Low-barrier emergency shelter for participants experiencing a housing crisis, targeting those who are homeless or at imminent risk of becoming homeless. Crisis Housing provides clients with stability as they are quickly assessed for diversion, family reunification, self-resolution of homelessness, and/or connection to appropriate and eligible longer-term housing resources.

Diversion
A strength-based, creative problem-solving conversation with people experiencing immediate housing crisis and who are currently seeking assistance through the homeless response system. Examples of diversion can include conflict resolution, family reunification, and one-time financial assistance that will assist with an alternative housing solution (short or long term) outside of the homeless response system.

Equal Access Gender Identity Policy
On August 25, 2017, the LAHSA Board of Commissioners adopted its policy on equal access in accordance with an individual's gender identity in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care. This policy, titled Equal Access and Gender Identity (EAGI), requires that contractor, programs, shelters, other buildings and facilities, benefits, services and accommodations, regardless of funding source, ensure equal access to an individual in accordance with their gender identity.

Family
Family includes, but is not limited to, regardless of marital status, actual or perceived sexual orientation, or gender identity, any group of persons presenting for assistance together with or without children and irrespective of age, relationship, or whether or not a member of the household has a disability. A child
who is temporarily away from the home because of placement in foster care is considered a member of
the family.

Funder
Funder refers to any public or private agency or organization that provides direct financial contribution,
as well as fiscal and programmatic administration and oversight, to non-profit organizations, community-
based organizations, etc., for the operation and services of Interim Housing facilities and programs.

For the purposes of these Standards, funders may include, but not be limited to: Los Angeles Homeless
Services Authority (LAHSA); Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS); Los
 Angeles County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS); Los Angeles County Department of Health
Services (DHS); Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (DMH); Los Angeles County Department
of Public Health (DPH); Housing and Community Investment Department of the City of Los Angeles
(HCIDLA)

Harm Reduction
Harm reduction is a set of practical strategies that reduces the negative consequences associated with
drug use, including safer use, managed use, and non-punitive abstinence.

Housing First
Housing First is an approach to quickly and successfully connect individuals and families experiencing
homelessness to safe, stable housing without preconditions and barriers to entry, such as sobriety,
treatment or service participation requirements. Supportive services are offered to maximize housing
stability and prevent returns to homelessness as opposed to addressing predetermined treatment goals
prior to safe, stable housing.

Intake
Capturing basic client data into a database upon entry into a program (e.g., capturing and loading
required data to HMIS upon entry to emergency shelter). This process shall also begin to identify a
participants’ service needs and lay the foundation for a housing plan to return the participant to stable
housing.

Low Barrier
Policies and practices designed to “screen in” rather than screen out applicants with the greatest barriers
to housing, such as having very low-income, poor rental history, or criminal history. Low Barrier is an
active approach to the Housing First model that ensures homeless participants and families may quickly
exit homelessness.

Motivational Interview Principles
A clinical approach that emphasizes a collaborative therapeutic relationship in which the clinician “draws
out” the client’s own motivations and skills for change, thereby empowering the client.

Practice Standards
Practice Standards are minimum baseline requirements for each system component which all funders
and funding administrators agree to adopt and incorporate into their program guidance and funding
contracts with contractors.
Reasonable Accommodation
Under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), a Reasonable Accommodation (RA)/Reasonable Modification (RM) is a modification in rules, policies, practices, or services, that is provided when such accommodations would be necessary to afford an individual with a disability equal opportunity to participate in programs and/or services of a covered agency. Provision of RA/RM could mean:
- Modification of rules, policies or practices;
- Removal of architectural or communication barriers; or
- Provision of auxiliary aids and services needed for an individual with a disability to utilize a public service.

Recovery Bridge
Recovery Bridge Housing (RBH) is a type of abstinence-based, peer supported housing that combines a subsidy for recovery residences with concurrent treatment in outpatient (OP), intensive outpatient (IOP), Opioid Treatment Program (OTP), or outpatient withdrawal management (OP-WM) settings. RBH is often appropriate for participants with minimal risk with regard to acute intoxication/withdrawal potential, biomedical, and mental health conditions. If there is risk potential, these concerns are to be managed by the treating provider.

Recuperative Care
Temporary housing in which participants receive health and mental health oversight, usually for an acute illness or injury.

Stabilization Housing
Temporary housing with case management and other supportive services for vulnerable participants, with the goal of improving participants’ health and increasing their housing security.

Safe Haven
Safe havens are supportive housing that shall not require participation in services and referrals as a condition of occupancy. Instead, it is hoped that after a period of stabilization in a safe haven, residents will be more willing to participate in services or referrals and will eventually be ready to move to more traditional forms of housing.

Transitional Housing
Transitional Housing is conceptualized as an intermediate intervention between emergency shelter/crisis housing and permanent housing. It is intended to be more long-term, service-intensive and private than emergency shelters, yet remains time-limited to stays of three months to three years. It is meant to provide a safe, supportive environment where residents can overcome trauma, begin to address the issues that led to homelessness or kept them homeless, and begin to rebuild their support network.

Trauma Informed Care
Trauma Informed Care is defined as: an organizational structure and treatment framework that involves understanding, recognizing, and responding to the effects of all types of trauma. Trauma Informed Care also emphasizes physical, psychological and emotional safety for both participant and providers, and helps participants rebuild a sense of control and empowerment. Trauma Informed services take into account an understanding of trauma in all aspects of service delivery and place priority on the trauma survivor’s safety, choice, and control. Trauma Informed Services create a culture of nonviolence, learning, and collaboration. Contractors must also develop sets of policies and procedures for educating and
training staff on Trauma Informed Care practices and how trauma may adversely affect aspects of a person’s development.

**Winter/Seasonal Shelter**
A low-barrier to entry, hypothermia prevention program providing basic shelter operations (showers, two meals, a bed, open for a minimum of 14 hours).

**Warm Handoff (aka Linkages)**
A personalized participant referral or transfer of care from one service provider to another. A warm handoff typically includes a face-to-face introduction between participant and providers to promote successful connections with the new provider and minimize any service disconnection.
APPENDIX B. GRIEVANCE POLICIES & PROCEDURES AND TERMINATION POLICIES & PROCEDURES

Grievance Policies & Procedures

1. The following are the Grievance and Termination Policies and Procedures minimum standards.
   b. Programs shall submit a copy of the Grievance Policies and Procedures and the Termination Policies and Procedures to the program’s funder(s) for review and approval.
   c. The Grievance Policies and Procedures and the Termination Policies and Procedures shall be discussed with participants during intake and copies offered to the participant.
   d. Programs shall maintain documentation of the participant’s signature acknowledging that the Grievance Policies and Procedures and Termination Policies and Procedures were discussed and offered to them or documentation that the client was unable/unwilling to sign the acknowledgement.
   e. Grievance Policies and Procedures and Termination Policies and Procedures shall be prominently displayed in common area(s) in the facility.

2. Grievance Policies and Procedures shall include, but are not limited to, the following:
   a. The identification of at least one staff and an alternate (by staff title, not name) who are responsible for addressing all grievances. The designated alternate shall be responsible for addressing grievances in which the designated staff is the subject of the grievance;
   b. Information about how the participant can file a grievance, including information about how they can contact assigned staff(s) and alternate(s) to file a grievance;
   c. A timeline not to exceed 72 hours in length, during which the participant will acknowledge of the grievance being received and a timeline not to exceed 10 business days during which the participant will receive a written decision about the grievance that includes the factors that led to the final determination;
   d. Information about how the grievance will be reviewed, including a discussion of what facts will be used in the review;
   e. Information about the appeal process to be entered into if the participant is not in agreement with the grievance decision including the identification of at least one staff and an alternate (by staff title, not name) who are responsible for a second level review of the grievance and a timeline not to exceed 72 hours in length, during which the participant will receive acknowledgement of the request for a second level review of the grievance being received and a timeline not to exceed 10 business days during which the participant will receive a second level written grievance decision that includes a statement of the factors that led to the final determination;
   f. Information about the appeal process to be entered into if the participant is not in agreement with the second level grievance decision that includes discussion of the client’s right to contact the Department of Public Health, the funder or Dispute Resolution Services for review of the programs decision, and the contact information for these entities;
   g. Request for Dispute Resolution Services may be referred to the:

   Office of the Los Angeles City Attorney Dispute Resolution Program
   City Hall
   200 N Spring Street, 14th Floor
   Los Angeles, CA 90012
   Office: (213) 978-1880
Fax: (213) 978-1312  
Email: Mediate@lacity.org;

h. Discussion of how the confidentiality of the participant who filed a grievance and the written grievance will be ensured; and

i. Discussion of the receipt and outcome of all grievances will be documented and maintained including the date the grievance was submitted, the date the submission was acknowledged, the staff that addressed the grievance and the date the participant received the written grievance disposition.

Termination Policies and Procedures

1. Termination Policies and Procedures shall include, but are not limited to, the following:
   a. The reasons for terminations. These reasons might include possession of weapons, sexual misconduct, behaviors that are a danger to others, verbally/physically threatening behaviors, or direct observation of participant engaging in illegal activity on site;
   b. Contacting the funder, if required, prior to terminating the participant. Exceptions to this include behaviors necessitating calling 911 and situations requiring immediate termination that occur on the weekends and evenings. In these instances, and if required, the funder shall be contacted the following business day;
   c. Discussion of how participants will receive written notification of terminations and informed that they may appeal the decision by filing a grievance; and
   d. Discussion of how terminations will be documented, and the maintenance of any police reports or other documents associated with the termination such as written confirmation of meetings with the participants regarding their possibly being terminated.
APPENDIX C. ADA COMPLIANCE

The following section outlines requirements related to ADA compliance. If a site is unable to comply with any of the following standards, programs shall document that reasonable accommodations to meet the accessibility needs of participants was provided, and program must ensure that documentation of reasonable accommodations is filed for future monitoring.

1. Facilities shall be accessible to participants with mobility devices.
2. Facilities shall not have areas, in or out of the property, with broken, raised, or unlevel sidewalks or walkways, or stairs or steps with no identified accessible pathway to the entrance and/or curb cuts.
3. Entry into the facility shall be accessible to participants with limited mobility, including participants who use wheelchairs or scooters, manually-powered mobility aids such as walkers, crutches, or canes.
4. The exterior of the facility shall be accessible for participants with disabilities when approaching, entering or inside the location.
5. Programs shall provide at least one restroom with at least one stall with a five-foot turning radius.
6. All restrooms established under this section shall have handles for an individual using a mobility device to move themselves without assistance.
7. If parking is available at the facility, programs shall provide at least one ADA accessible van parking space for every 25 non-accessible parking spaces. The accessible space shall provide enough room for a van with a hydraulic side lift to go up and down without any issue.
8. All fire alarm systems and fire extinguishers shall be no more than 48 inches from the ground for easy access in case of an emergency.
9. All programmatic areas shall be accessible for an individual with a mobility device.
10. Programs shall provide at least one shower accessible for those with a mobility device, regardless of gender.
11. Program sites with more than 50 beds shall provide at least one accessible roll-in shower or at least two transfer ADA shower seats.
12. Programs shall provide accessible beds for persons with mobility disabilities designed for easy transfer from a mobility device.
13. If there are common/communal areas located at the facility, they shall be accessible for all participants, including those with mobility devices.
14. If there is a dining area located in the facility, it shall be accessible for all participants, including those with mobility devices.
15. Doors within the facility shall be equipped with a handle which can be opened with a closed fist rather than a knob.
16. Accessibility postings shall be posted in plain sight in a common area of the facility.
Interim Housing Minimum Service and Operations Practice Standards
Public Comment Memo for December 2018 CES Policy Council

Background:
Efforts to seek input on the draft Interim Housing Practice Standards were conducted in an iterative fashion, starting with involved stakeholders/service providers to create a foundation for the Standards, followed by small group feedback sessions including people with lived experience of homelessness. Following an extensive revision process, the draft Practice Standards were published for a two-week public comment period from November 26 through December 7, 2018. The full list of consulted parties is as follows:

- Interim Housing Learning Community
- Lived Experience Advisory Board
- Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles
- Coordinated Entry System Leadership
- Coordinated Entry System Policy Council
- Public Comment (broader Los Angeles community)

In total LAHSA received 20 public responses as provided in the supplementary document. The following chart outlines the most common themes provided by written public comment and the Policy Council’s feedback at their November 28, 2018 meeting. A team of reviewers including LAHSA, DMH, DHS and HUD TA collectively reviewed the comments and integrated applicable changes directly to the revised version of the standards document. Other comments that did not impact change will be flagged for other policy or document input and consideration as relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME #1</th>
<th>CONCERN</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicability to Winter Shelter: Applicability of the IH Practice Standards for Winter Shelter programs given the augmented scope of services provided</td>
<td>The Standards have been amended to allow flexibility of requirements that would not be appropriate for running Winter Shelters, while ensuring those seeking shelter during inclement weather are able to do so. A footnote has been added to page 1 of the document to reflect this comment. Case management services will be offered to participants who consistently seek Winter Shelter, or those who request it, to increase access to stabilization plans and necessary services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td><strong>Applicability to Domestic Violence Programs:</strong> Comments were raised regarding the specific need for flexibility or requirement exemption for domestic violence service and housing providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The safety, security, and privacy of all participants will always be taken into account when considering program design and expectations, particularly when programs serve those fleeing or surviving domestic violence, sexual assault, or human trafficking. In addition to ensuring that adequate, in-person training is facilitated with the necessary providers, the CES Operations Guide (currently in development) enumerates specific practices to ensure the intake, assessment, and case management adequately preserve the safety of the participant. The Standards were also edited to allow additional flexibility for domestic violence providers to operate effectively and safely, for example utilizing alternate addresses and not requiring staff to wear identification badges. Trainings provided on domestic violence training topics will only be provided by domestic violence service providers and will always be delivered in person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#2</th>
<th><strong>System Design:</strong> Several comments expressed implementation concerns about the current assessment, prioritization, and referral processes. In particular, areas for improvements in CES administration were highlighted for consideration, such as timing of the assessment process, the connection between acuity score and priority order, and referral protocols. The public comments brought forth reservations about client referrals sometimes failing to consider the needs of disabled clients.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input noted for program guide development. This comment, along with other comments that were system-wide recommendations and broader than Interim Housing regarding assessment, prioritization, and referral processes will be shared with the Coordinated Entry System Policy Council. Current referral forms and procedures should assist staff in identifying client needs and referring them to facilities with the appropriate accommodations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #3 | **Service Strategy Recommendations:** Comments recommended the refinement or inclusion of service strategies, including:  
- Critical Time Intervention  
- Trauma-Informed Care |
|---|---|
| | *Critical Time Intervention:* The focus of the Interim Housing Practice Standards is to outline and reinforce the minimum standards to which all programs in L.A. County will be held. Potential new avenues of service, such as Critical Time Intervention, have been noted for future opportunities to strengthen training curriculum.  
*Trauma-Informed Care:* The definitions of Trauma-Informed Care were clarified throughout the document to be robust and oriented to prevent... |
### Training Frequency:
Comments expressed apprehension that additional staff trainings could become burdensome.

LAHSA and County partners agree that annual trainings for all staff could pose a barrier to programs. The Practice Standards have been amended to reflect that all staff need to be trained on the core curriculum outlined in the Standards upon hire and upon funder or program management request.

### Emotional Support and Service Animals:
Emotional Support and Service Animals language should be clarified with consideration of all possible scenarios facing IH facilities.

The definitions of Emotional Support and Service Animals are aligned with federal, state, and local laws. The Standards outline expectations to provide access and accommodation to participants and their service or support animals. Reasonable accommodations could encompass transferring participants to a different Interim Housing site which is better equipped to serve them and their service or support animal.

### Data Management Practices:
Public comment conveyed the desire for comprehensive data tracking placements, referrals, and diverted clients. For tracking client entry/exit, however, some facilities have more than one entrance and felt that this data would be difficult and unreliable.

Outcomes of diversion efforts are captured in County Strategies A1 and A5 for Homeless Prevention Programs for Individuals and Families. LAHSA is currently working on expanding diversion training and data capture across CES.

Interim Housing programs are expected to maintain policies and procedures which account for client safety and whereabouts. While this may not be an explicit entry/exit policy, the operations must provide a daily census and be in adherence with an emergency preparedness plan.

### Meal Plans:
The public elevated apprehensions that it is sometimes difficult to publish meal plans and schedules a week in advance. It is also difficult to accommodate preferences for all clients.

In recognition of these constraints, the Interim Housing draft was revised to provide more flexibility around posting timelines and clarity on accommodating dietary restrictions. LAHSA and County partners maintain that food provisions should accommodate medical necessities or religious beliefs. Clients should also be provided access to weekly meal plans and schedules and should be notified if either the meal plan or schedule changes during the week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#8</th>
<th><strong>Privacy and Gender Identity:</strong> Build out rules and facility requirements to responsibly handle showers/bathrooms for youth, families, transgender, or gender non-conforming individuals.</th>
<th>The Interim Housing Practice Standards draft aligns with federal, state, and local mandates requiring access to showers, sinks, and toilets according to participant gender identity. Family programs will be expected to maintain additional policies to preserve the safety and privacy of children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td><strong>Operating Hours:</strong> While the public appreciated a desire for increased intake hours and accessibility to serve clients, there was large concern over a lack of additional funding for increased hours and services.</td>
<td>Programs will not be expected to furnish additional hours if their project is not designed for such operations. These additional intake hours will be approved at the funder level to ensure effectiveness and proper fit. LAHSA and its County partners will, however, continue to seek additional funding to support the work to support and serve persons experiencing homelessness and those at risk of becoming homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td><strong>Limited English Proficiency:</strong> Commenters requested extensive additional standards to improve access to translators and translated materials for Limited English Proficiency, as well as training, hiring, and retaining bilingual staff.</td>
<td>The comments have been noted and will be utilized in developing Limited English Proficiency policies in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td><strong>Procedural Recommendations:</strong> Public comments raised an array of ideas for specific procedures to include in programmatic implementation. These included: assessment best practices, regular evaluation of staff knowledge, and recommended storage provision. In addition, commenters suggested that termination or suspension could be effective tools to occasionally modify participant’s behavior, while not permanently taking away their shelter bed.</td>
<td>Each funder may establish additional program operational requirements that go beyond the Practice Standards. Recommendations on assessment best practices, regular evaluation of staff knowledge, and storage provision will be noted for Program Guide development across all participating funders. The Interim Housing Practice Standards encourage the programs to develop a process and clearly communicate expectations of behavior and participation. However, termination as a means to influence client behavior is never appropriate or in alignment with Housing First. Funders may explore options outside of termination to improve client outcomes; additional procedures will be included in the Program Guides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Address/Legal Information

| PIN Number | 108B193 815 |
| Lot/Parcel Area (Calculated) | 6,330.8 (sq ft) |
| Thomas Brothers Grid | PAGE 673 - GRID H5 |
| Assessor Parcel No. (APN) | 5005022007 |
| Tract | CHESTERFIELD SQUARE |
| Map Reference | M B 21-90/91 |
| Block | None |
| Lot | 709 |
| Arb (Lot Cut Reference) | None |
| Map Sheet | 108B193 |

### Jurisdictional Information

- **Community Plan Area**: South Los Angeles
- **Area Planning Commission**: South Los Angeles
- **Neighborhood Council**: Empowerment Congress Central Area
- **Council District**: CD 8 - Marqueece Harris-Dawson
- **Census Tract #**: 2325.00
- **LADBS District Office**: Los Angeles Metro

### Planning and Zoning Information

- **Special Notes**: ZI-2477 South Los Angeles Community Plan Adoption
- **Zoning**: R2-1
- **Zoning Information (ZI)**:
  - ZI-2374 LOS ANGELES STATE ENTERPRISE ZONE
  - ZI-1231 South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales
  - ZI-2477 South Los Angeles Community Plan Adoption
  - ZI-2452 Transit Priority Area in the City of Los Angeles

- **General Plan Land Use**: Low Medium I Residential
- **General Plan Note(s)**: Yes
- **Hillside Area (Zoning Code)**: No
- **Specific Plan Area**: South Los Angeles Alcohol Sales
- **Subarea**: None

- **Special Land Use / Zoning**: None
- **Design Review Board**: No
- **Historic Preservation Review**: No
- **Historic Preservation Overlay Zone**: None
- **Other Historic Designations**: None
- **Other Historic Survey Information**: None
- **Mills Act Contract**: None
- **CDO: Community Design Overlay**: None
- **CPIO: Community Plan Imp. Overlay**: None
- **Subarea**: None
- **CUGU: Clean Up-Green Up**: None
- **HCR: Hillside Construction Regulation**: No
- **NSO: Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay**: No
- **POD: Pedestrian Oriented Districts**: None
- **RFA: Residential Floor Area District**: None
- **RIO: River Implementation Overlay**: No
- **SN: Sign District**: No

This report is subject to the terms and conditions as set forth on the website. For more details, please refer to the terms and conditions at zimas.lacity.org

(*) - APN Area is provided "as is" from the Los Angeles County's Public Works, Flood Control, Benefit Assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Reuse Incentive Area</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Linkage Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Market Area</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Market Area</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Communities (TOC)</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA - Community Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Parking</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parking</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Line</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Ft School Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Ft Park Zone</td>
<td>Active: Chesterfield Square Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessor Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Parcel No. (APN)</td>
<td>5005022007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN Area (Co. Public Works)*</td>
<td>0.146 (ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Code</td>
<td>0200 - Residential - Double, Duplex, or Two Units - 4 Stories or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Land Val.</td>
<td>$424,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Improvement Val.</td>
<td>$391,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Owner Change</td>
<td>03/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Sale Amount</td>
<td>$800,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate Area</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Ref No. (City Clerk)</td>
<td>596328, 2834388, 1993536, 1453463, 1299018, 0271646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Built</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Class</td>
<td>D7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bedrooms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bathrooms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Square Footage</td>
<td>3,506.0 (sq ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data for building 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data for building 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data for building 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No data for building 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Hazard</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td>Area Not Mapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District No. 1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercourse</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste / Border Zone Properties</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane Hazard Site</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Wind Velocity Areas</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Grading Area (BOE Basic Grid Map A-13372)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Wells</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seismic Hazards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Fault Near-Source Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Fault (Distance in km)</td>
<td>2.93363904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Fault (Name)</td>
<td>Newport - Inglewood Fault Zone (Onshore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Transverse Ranges and Los Angeles Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault Type</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Rate (mm/year)</td>
<td>1.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Geometry</td>
<td>Right Lateral - Strike Slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip Type</td>
<td>Poorly Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Dip Width (km)</td>
<td>13.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupture Top</td>
<td>0.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupture Bottom</td>
<td>13.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip Angle (degrees)</td>
<td>90.00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Magnitude</td>
<td>7.10000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsunami Inundation Zone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Development Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Improvement District</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise Zone</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal Community</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalization Zone</td>
<td>Central City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Enterprise Zone</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES STATE ENTERPRISE ZONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Neighborhood Initiative</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct all Inquiries to</td>
<td>Housing+Community Investment Department (866) 557-7368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://hcidla.lacity.org">http://hcidla.lacity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Act Property</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division / Station</td>
<td>77th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting District</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District / Fire Station</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Flag Restricted Parking</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is subject to the terms and conditions as set forth on the website. For more details, please refer to the terms and conditions at zimas.lacity.org (*) - APN Area is provided "as is" from the Los Angeles County's Public Works, Flood Control, Benefit Assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Required Action(s)</th>
<th>Project Description(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPC-2008-1552-CPU</td>
<td>CPU-COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE</td>
<td>SOUTH LOS ANGELES NEW COMMUNITY PLAN PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC-1990-346-CA</td>
<td>CA-CODE AMENDMENT</td>
<td>AMENDMENT TO THE L.A.M.C. TO - DRAFT AN ORDINANCE TO PROHIBIT THE GRANTING OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE OFF-SITE SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (LOURDES GREEN/KAREN HOO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC-1983-506</td>
<td>Data Not Available</td>
<td>SPECIFIC PLN ORD FOR INTERIM CONDITIONAL USE APPRVL FOR ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE SALE OF ALCOHOL WHICH ARE GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE SOUTH CENTRAL AREA OF THE CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2008-1781-EIR</td>
<td>EIR-ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT</td>
<td>SOUTH LOS ANGELES NEW COMMUNITY PLAN PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA NOT AVAILABLE**

ORD-171682
ORD-171681
ORD-162128
Address: 5514 S RUTHELEN ST
APN: 5005022007
PIN #: 108B193 815
Tract: CHESTERFIELD SQUARE
Block: None
Lot: 709
Arb: None
Zoning: R2-1
General Plan: Low Medium I Residential
### GENERALIZED ZONING

#### RESIDENTIAL
- Minimum Residential
- Very Low / Very Low I Residential
- Very Low II Residential
- Low / Low I Residential
- Low II Residential
- Low Medium / Low Medium I Residential
- Low Medium II Residential
- Medium Residential
- High Medium Residential
- High Density Residential
- Very High Medium Residential

#### COMMERCIAL
- Limited Commercial
- Limited Commercial - Mixed Medium Residential
- Highway Oriented Commercial
- Highway Oriented and Limited Commercial
- Highway Oriented Commercial - Mixed Medium Residential
- Neighborhood Office Commercial
- Community Commercial
- Community Commercial - Mixed High Residential
- Regional Center Commercial

#### INDUSTRIAL
- Commercial Manufacturing
- Limited Manufacturing
- Light Manufacturing
- Heavy Manufacturing
- Hybrid Industrial

#### PARKING
- Parking Buffer

#### PORT OF LOS ANGELES
- General / Bulk Cargo - Non Hazardous (Industrial / Commercial)
- General / Bulk Cargo - Hazard
- Commercial Fishing
- Recreation and Commercial
- Intermodal Container Transfer Facility Site

#### LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
- Airport Landside / Airport Landside Support
- Airport Airside
- LAX Airport Northside

#### OPEN SPACE / PUBLIC FACILITIES
- Open Space
- Public / Open Space
- Public / Quasi-Public Open Space
- Other Public Open Space
- Public Facilities

#### FRAMEWORK

#### COMMERCIAL
- Neighborhood Commercial
- General Commercial
- Community Commercial
- Regional Mixed Commercial

#### INDUSTRIAL
- Limited Industrial
- Light Industrial
### CIRCULATION

#### STREET
- Arterial Mountain Road
- Collector Scenic Street
- Collector Street
- Collector Street (Hillside)
- Collector Street (Modified)
- Collector Street (Proposed)
- Country Road
- Divided Major Highway II
- Divided Secondary Scenic Highway
- Local Scenic Road
- Local Street
- Major Highway (Modified)
- Major Highway I
- Major Highway II
- Major Highway II (Modified)

#### FREEWAYS
- Freeway
- Interchange
- On-Ramp / Off-Ramp
- Railroad
- Scenic Freeway Highway

#### MISC. LINES
- Airport Boundary
- Bus Line
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Coastline Boundary
- Collector Scenic Street (Proposed)
- Commercial Areas
- Commercial Center
- Community Redevelopment Project Area
- Country Road
- DWP Power Lines
- Desirable Open Space
- Detached Single Family House
- Endangered Ridgeline
- Equestrian and/or Hiking Trail
- Hiking Trail
- Historical Preservation
- Horsekeeping Area
- Local Street
- MSA Desirable Open Space
- Major Scenic Controls
- Multi-Purpose Trail
- Natural Resource Reserve
- Park Road
- Park Road (Proposed)
- Quasi-Public
- Rapid Transit Line
- Residential Planned Development
- Scenic Highway (Obsolete)
- Secondary Scenic Controls
- Secondary Scenic Highway
- Secondary Scenic Highway (Proposed)
- Site Boundary
- Southern California Edison Power
- Special Study Area
- Specific Plan Area
- Stagecoach Line
- Wildlife Corridor
POINTS OF INTEREST

Alternative Youth Hostel (Proposed)
Animal Shelter
Area Library
Area Library (Proposed)
Bridge
Campground
Campground (Proposed)
Cemetery
HW Church
City Hall
Community Center
Community Library
Community Library (Proposed Expansion)
Community Library (Proposed)
Community Park
Community Park (Proposed Expansion)
Community Park (Proposed)
Community Transit Center
Convalescent Hospital
Correctional Facility
Cultural / Historic Site (Proposed)
Cultural / Historical Site
Cultural Arts Center
DMV DMV Office
DWP DWP
DWP Pumping Station
Equestrian Center
Fire Department Headquarters
Fire Station
Fire Station (Proposed Expansion)
Fire Station (Proposed)
Fire Supply & Maintenance
Fire Training Site
Fireboat Station
Health Center / Medical Facility
Helipad
Historic Monument
Historical / Cultural Monument
Horsekeeping Area
Horsekeeping Area (Proposed)
Horticultural Center
Hospital
Hospital (Proposed)
HW House of Worship
Important Ecological Area
Important Ecological Area (Proposed)
Interpretive Center (Proposed)
Junior College
MTA / Metrolink Station
MTA Station
MTA Stop
MWD Maintenance Yard
Municipal Office Building
Municipal Parking lot
Neighborhood Park
Neighborhood Park (Proposed Expansion)
Neighborhood Park (Proposed)
Oil Collection Center
Parking Enforcement
Police Headquarters
Police Station
Police Station (Proposed Expansion)
Police Station (Proposed)
Police Training site
PO Post Office
Power Distribution Station
Power Distribution Station (Proposed)
Power Receiving Station
Power Receiving Station (Proposed)
Private College
Private Elementary School
Private Golf Course
Private Golf Course (Proposed)
Private Junior High School
Private Senior High School
Private Special School
Public Elementary School
Public Elementary School (Proposed)
Public Golf Course
Public Golf Course (Proposed)
Public Housing
Public Housing (Proposed Expansion)
Public Junior High School
Public Junior High School (Proposed)
Public Middle School
Public Senior High School
Public Senior High School (Proposed)
Pumping Station
Pumping Station (Proposed)
Refuse Collection Center
Regional Library
Regional Library (Proposed Expansion)
Regional Library (Proposed)
Regional Park
Regional Park (Proposed)
Residential Plan Development
Scenic View Site
Scenic View Site (Proposed)
School District Headquarters
School Unspecified Loc/Type (Proposed)
Skill Center
Social Services
Special Feature
Special Recreation (a)
Special School Facility
Special School Facility (Proposed)
Steam Plant
Surface Mining
Trail & Assembly Area
Trail & Assembly Area (Proposed)
UTL Utility Yard
Water Tank Reservoir
Wildlife Migration Corridor
Wildlife Preserve Gate
SCHOOLS/PARKS WITH 500 FT. BUFFER

- Existing School/Park Site
- Planned School/Park Site
- Inside 500 Ft. Buffer

Aquatic Facilities
- Beaches
- Child Care Centers
- Dog Parks
- Golf Course
- Historic Sites
- Horticulture/Gardens
- Skate Parks

Other Facilities
- Park / Recreation Centers
- Parks
- Performing / Visual Arts Centers
- Recreation Centers
- Senior Citizen Centers

COASTAL ZONE

- Coastal Zone Commission Authority
- Calvo Exclusion Area
- Not in Coastal Zone
- Dual Jurisdictional Coastal Zone

TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES (TOC)

- Tier 1
- Tier 2
- Tier 3
- Tier 4

Note: TOC Tier designation and map layers are for reference purposes only. Eligible projects shall demonstrate compliance with Tier eligibility standards prior to the issuance of any permits or approvals. As transit service changes, eligible TOC Incentive Areas will be updated.

WAIVER OF DEDICATION OR IMPROVEMENT

- Public Work Approval (PWA)
- Waiver of Dedication or Improvement (WDI)

LAMC SECTION 85.02 (VEHICLE DWELLING)

- No vehicle dwelling anytime
- No vehicle dwelling overnight between 9:00 PM - 6:00 AM. Must comply with all posted parking restrictions
- Vehicle dwelling allowed. Must comply with all posted parking restrictions

OTHER SYMBOLS

- Lot Line
- Tract Line
- Lot Cut
- Easement
- Zone Boundary
- Building Line
- Lot Split
- Community Driveway
- Building Outlines 2014
- Building Outlines 2008

- Airport Hazard Zone
- Census Tract
- Coastal Zone
- Council District
- LADBS District Office
- Downtown Parking
- Fault Zone
- Fire District No. 1
- Tract Map
- Parcel Map

- Flood Zone
- Hazardous Waste
- High Wind Zone
- Hillside Grading
- Historic Preservation Overlay Zone
- Specific Plan Area
- Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
- Oil Wells
Commission Action Requested:
None at this time

Background:
Special Service for Groups submitted an application for the Bridge Housing system component in the December 2018 Interim Housing RFP. In a letter dated, May 13, 2019, Special Service for Groups was notified that their documentation regarding their Certificate of Occupancy (CofO) submitted did not meet LAHSA’s criteria as specified in the RFP and would not be recommended for funding under this RFP. The CofO documentation that was submitted for this application listed two uses for the address 5514 – 5516 Ruthelen St, Los Angeles, CA 90062: Private Garage and Duplex.

On May 15, 2019, Special Service for Groups submitted an appeal letter that disagrees with the determination that was made regarding appropriate permit regulations for shelter sites receiving LAHSA funding.

LAHSA Response:
In the RFP, Section C - General Instructions, sub section 1: Proposal Submittal, LAHSA indicates that the CofO must indicate use of shelter or other appropriate use. LAHSA is waiting on information from the Los Angeles Building and Safety Department to make a determination.

Conclusion:
Based on our review of the proposer’s appeal and response letter, LAHSA is currently working with Special Service for Groups and awaiting new information regarding their permit status. It is LAHSA’s plan to bring new funding recommendations to the June 2019 P&E Meeting.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that no determination be made at this time and allow Special Service for Groups to provide new information to LAHSA staff regarding their permit status.
Technology @LAHSA

Empower Business Users Through Technology
Goal of LAHSA IT

• LAHSA strives to strategically deploy technology to best support key areas of LAHSA’s operations and empower end users

• LAHSA.org serves as the key public facing asset where LAHSA iteratively deploys web-enabled solutions aimed at promoting LAHSA’s overall technology vision

• Key examples of technology supported processes include:
  • LA HOP
  • Bed Availability
  • Procurement Operations
    • RFP Applications
    • RFSQ Assessment
• User friendly interface to help create and manage outreach request end to end
• Mobile friendly, leverages Google Maps API’s to encode geo-data
• Enables team management and ticket lifecycle management
Bed Availability

• Location focused web-app aimed at providing stakeholders the ability to search and find low barrier housing resources near them

• Location profile pages to support exchange of key information such as address, intake hours, and bed availability
Procurement Operations: RFSQ Assessment

- Replace manual intensive workbooks and adds greater transparency to the RFSQ assessment process
Procurement Operations: RFP Applications

- Web portal aimed at empowering procurement staff by enabling them to create, distribute, collect, and score RFP’s independently
Conclusion

• LAHSA aims to iteratively improve different aspects of the firm’s operations by leveraging technology to support existing processes or expedite process change when needed

• Additional projects not discussed include
  • Facility Assessment Tool
  • Groups and People apps
  • Housing Resources App
Background
The Chief Executive Office (CEO) and the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) worked closely with County Departments and the CES for Families (CESF) lead agencies to produce a report back as requested in the December 18, 2018 Board motion. The CEO provided an interim report on February 20, 2019 with preliminary recommendations for addressing urgent system gaps. The draft report (Attachment II) consists of three sections:

1) History and evolution of CESF and description of the current system (p. 3-8);
2) Current system functioning, including multi-year trends in growth and performance (p.9-20); and
3) Future of CESF (p. 21-38), including recommendations to improve system functioning and outcomes, and a proposed template and plan for consolidated recurring reporting to enable ongoing monitoring of CESF performance.

Key Report Findings
Overall system usage by component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Component</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
<th>FY 18-19, Q1 &amp; Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>10,131</td>
<td>9,156</td>
<td>10,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing (RRH)</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>3,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of CESF data identified these overarching themes:

1. **Funding for the “front door” of the system, the FSCs, has not kept pace with the large increases in referrals, screenings and enrollments** as indicated in Section 2 of the report.

2. **Continual over-enrollment in the CESF has adversely impacted systems operations** by causing caseloads to grow beyond acceptable ratios for effective case management (Graph 10, p. 16). In addition, over-enrollment has led to families not exiting the system as quickly as intended or needed (Graph 9, p. 15).

3. **The system is unable to efficiently move families from enrollment into permanent housing which has a compounding negative effect.** All system components (FSC, Prevention/Diversion, RRH, etc.) were on track to become oversubscribed in FY 2018-19 based on the report analysis (Gaps Analysis, p. 20).

System Improvement Recommendations
The report recommendations address a broad range of areas needed to optimize CESF functioning.

**System Access & Referrals (p.21-23)/Prevention & Diversion (p.23):**

- Developing consistent messaging for stakeholders regarding the capacity of the CESF and establishing a referral process from CESF to City, County or Community Resources to maximize mainstream resources, particularly when SPAs reach capacity
- Enhancing CESF infrastructure through expanded access points
- Integrate problem-solving/diversion across County agencies and other referral partners, including Skid Row sites.
- Establish a prevention focus within County departments

**System Capacity and Coordination (p.24-25):**

- Enhancing existing connections to DPSS, DCFS and other mainstream system benefits
• Evaluating housing/prevention resources within County systems that families can access
• Adequate funding of the CESF components (FSC, Interim Housing, RRH, etc.)
• Improve data sharing across system partners, particularly County departments

**Address Interim Housing Needs (p.27):**

- Expanding bed capacity through congregate housing
- Increase funding for case management staff for families in interim housing and better leverage other County interim housing services
- Controlling costs through master leasing

**Additional Recommendations (p.26, 28-30):**

- Supporting efforts to increase economic stability through strengthening collaboration with the homeless delivery system and evaluating existing training programs to support homeless families
- Advocacy to expand access to childcare and strengthening referrals to child care resources
- Increasing usage of housing vouchers and subsidies to support housing stability and retention
- Provide increased resources for Prevention and Diversion to address system capacity

An advocacy agenda of state and federal legislation to support the needs of homeless families is also included (p. 30-31).

**Funding Scenarios**

Three different funding options are included in Attachment III – Funding Scenarios (p. 1-5). We reviewed historical program data from FY 16-17 to Q2 of FY 18-19 and conducted a forecast analysis under each scenario. An assumption of need was developed based on both inflow and successful placements into housing.

**Scenario A:** This option maintains current system capacity, inclusive of increases already proposed for FY 2019-20; therefore, additional resources for diversion and prevention efforts, front door (FSC) operations, and RRH program costs to reduce caseloads are included. Total households to be enrolled in RRH would be 5,245 and total to be enrolled in Interim Housing would be 4,786.

**Scenario B:** This option would increase funding beyond what is already proposed for FY 19-20 for FSCs, problem solving/diversion and prevention, and RRH program costs, while establishing an annual system capacity of 3,500 each for RRH and Interim Housing. This scenario results in a higher percentage of households being placed successfully in housing than Scenario A, but also results in an estimated 1,496 families who are not successfully diverted being denied access to Interim Housing and RRH.

**Scenario C:** This option increases funding to be able to serve all households that need assistance through Interim Housing and RRH. This option also proposes more robust resources for FSCs, problem solving/diversion, prevention, and RRH program costs, which allows for more households being placed successfully in housing. Total households to be enrolled in RRH and Interim Housing would be 4,776 and 4,786 respectively.

**Next Steps**

The CEO and LAHSA will report back to the Board in August 2019 with a recommended action plan and timeline that will take into account several factors including guidance received during the May 9, 2019 Homeless Policy Deputies meeting; actual CESF expenditures and program outcomes through the end of FY 2018-19; status of Measure H and state funding potentially available to the CESF; as well as the impact of implementation of congregate housing and the SPA 2 cost-sharing interim housing pilot (CESF Report Memo, p. 3).
April 29, 2019

To: Supervisor Janice Hahn, Chair
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Chief Executive Officer

ENHANCING THE COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM (CES) FOR HOMELESS FAMILIES (ITEM NO. 12, AGENDA OF DECEMBER 18, 2018)

On December 18, 2018, the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to work with the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), the Community Development Commission (CDC), and the Departments of Public Social Services (DPSS), Health Services (DHS), Mental Health (DMH), Public Health (DPH), and Children and Family Services (DCFS), in consultation with the Executive Directors of the CES for Families (CESF) lead agencies, to report back in 60 days on the following:

- An evaluation of the functioning of CESF, with an outline of services and programs available to homeless families, along with policy and program recommendations;
- A template for a consolidated recurring report on the CESF that includes data from multiple departments and allows the Board to monitor CESF’s functioning;
- Analysis of promising practices and recommendations for transitioning families from interim housing into permanent housing, based on various CESF program components and each component’s contracted capacity, enrollment, spend down of funds, average time to housing placement, and an estimate of additional funding needs for the various services and programs; and
- Needed legislation at the Federal, State, or Local level to improve outcomes for homeless families.

On February 20, 2019, the CEO provided the Board with an interim report on the
implementation of the workgroup of County partners identified in the Board Motion (Workgroup), the expected outline of the report back, and some preliminary recommendations for addressing urgent system gaps. This serves as the final report in response to the motion.

**Workgroup Process and Outputs**

The CEO, in partnership with LAHSA, convened a Workgroup (Attachment I) to address the deliverables of this Board response. The full Workgroup met on several occasions from January 24, 2019 through March 6, 2019, to identify current challenges and opportunities in CESF, review and provide input on performance data, and develop and prioritize recommendations for improving system functioning and outcomes. Subgroups of the full Workgroup continued to meet throughout the month of March 2019 to consider feedback and the various inputs received to inform the development of the report. The CEO, LAHSA, and consultants from Shelter Partnership also included feedback and insights from partners such as the CESF lead agencies to inform the report’s data elements, analysis, and recommendations.

**Structure of the Report**

The report (Attachment II) consists of three main sections: 1) History and evolution of CESF and description of the current system; 2) Current system functioning, including multi-year trends in growth and performance, and projected resource gaps for the remainder of Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 and in subsequent years; and 3) Future of CESF, including recommendations to improve system functioning and outcomes, and a proposed template and plan for consolidated recurring reporting to enable ongoing monitoring of CESF performance.

**Principal Themes Emerging from the Analysis**

The comprehensive analysis of CESF yielded a set of inter-dependent themes:

1) Investments in the “front door” of the system, the Family Solutions Centers (FSCs), have not kept pace with the increases in referrals, screening and enrollments. Overall, enrollments increased by 400% from the first quarter of FY 2015-16 to the second quarter of FY 2018-19.

2) The CESF’s main components (FSC, interim housing, rapid re-housing) are over-enrolled, leading to a system that is operating beyond capacity.

3) Continual over-enrollment has adversely impacted system operations, causing caseload sizes to balloon beyond acceptable standards and creating “gridlock” whereby families do not exit the system as quickly as intended or needed.

The percentage of families enrolled in rapid-rehousing who have moved into
permanent housing has fallen from 43% to 19% since FY 2016-17.

4) Over-enrollment and too few families being placed in permanent housing also produces negative consequences for vulnerable families, including in some Service Planning Areas (SPAs), delays in getting access to crisis housing, and longer lengths of stay in crisis housing following system enrollment. The systemic challenges raised in this analysis fosters unsustainable reliance on expensive motels as overflow shelter and the shifting of resources between different parts of the system, which short-changes one-part (i.e., rapid re-housing) to bolster others (i.e., FSCs and interim housing).

5) While negative impacts of strained resources are seen system-wide, they are felt most acutely in SPAs with the largest gaps between services demand and available resources.

6) Promising practices, including prevention and problem-solving/diversion, embedded within the FSCs but also within county agencies, as staffing and funding permits, can help mitigate system gridlock, but need to be piloted and/or brought to scale.

7) Exploring enhancements of existing DPSS, DCFS and other mainstream system benefits and housing/prevention resources for at-risk and homeless families is another important strategy.

8) Additional resource investments are needed to address projected gaps for FY 2019-20 and beyond, until the system can achieve a state of equilibrium.

**Summary**

The workgroup sessions, coupled with a comprehensive system analysis, produced a robust set of recommendations, included in Section 3 of Attachment II, covering policy, program and funding areas. Highlighted is that the most immediate need of the CESF is to address system capacity. For purposes of comparison, Attachment III provides a Funding Scenario Outline, projecting outcomes based on current funding, and with additional funding, using global assumptions and system projections. These assumptions and unknowns and additional scenarios are also included. Two of the scenarios included represent a shift in the current expectation that all families experiencing homelessness will be served through CESF.

**Next Steps**

The CEO and LAHSA intend to convene system stakeholders to guide implementation of the recommendations and development of the recurring CESF report. The CEO and LAHSA will work to implement any funding recommendations adopted by the Board.

If you have any questions, please contact Phil Ansell, Homeless Initiative Director, at
213-974-1752 or by email at pansell@ceo.lacounty.gov.
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   Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
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   Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
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## Enhancing the CESF Workgroup/Subgroup Participating Organizations

### County Departments/Agencies

- Los Angeles County Community Development Commission/Housing Authority (CDC/HACoLA)
- Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office (CEO)
- Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)
- Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, Housing for Health (DHS-HFH)
- Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (DMH)
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Substance Abuse Prevention and Control (DPH-SAPC)
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS)
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA)

### Coordinated Entry System Lead Agencies/Other Stakeholders

- Los Angeles Family Housing
- People Assisting the Homeless (PATH)
- Rainbow Services
- Special Services for Groups (SSG-HOPICS)
- Union Station Homeless Services
- Valley Oasis | Antelope Valley Domestic Violence Council
- The Whole Child
- Shelter Partnership
- St. Joseph’s Center
- Upward Bound House
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Section 1. History and Background of CESF

The Coordinated Entry System for Families (CESF) represents the evolution over the last decade of how Los Angeles County responds to family homelessness and housing instability. While required under the 2009 Federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act, the timing of, and impetus for, transforming what had largely been a program-by-program approach into a coordinated systems approach was driven by local leadership from the County of Los Angeles (County) in partnership with the City of Los Angeles (City) and Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), a joint powers authority. This leadership helped to pace the County ahead of other communities across the country.

From 2011-2012, LAHSA and the County convened a workgroup of family providers tasked with developing a regional approach to coordinated access and delivery of services, as required by the revamped Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program under the HEARTH Act. Concurrently, planning efforts were underway between LAHSA, the County, and the City to continue the Housing First approach funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)-funded Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP).

The efforts of the workgroup led to the procurement and establishment of Family Solutions Centers (FSCs) funded by both City and County ESG funding, as well as, County Homeless Prevention Initiative (HPI) funds. Initially launched in Summer 2013, in six of the eight Service Planning Areas (SPAs) due to funding limitations, the FSCs were intended to create centralized points for standardized screening, triage of needs, and referrals of families at risk of, or experiencing homelessness to the most appropriate housing and service interventions to meet their needs. Access to the FSCs was largely limited to referrals via 211, the County's Health and Human Services hotline. The vision of FSCs was to enable families to be served in their communities of origin by coordinating access to, and use of, existing programs based on individualized need. The initial vision of a coordinated entry system through the FSCs developed incrementally and while partnerships with shelters were required, initial funding focused on procuring FSC services. Most housing and service providers then were not formal partners of the FSCs, and the County housing resources were less aligned, and funding was less robust than it currently is. Partners continued to operate with varying eligibility requirements for services and did not or inconsistently referred families to the FSCs. The next phase sought to bring about a more seamless system.

In May 2013, the Board of Supervisors (Board) requested that the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) work with partners to develop a

---

1 ARRA was authorized in 2009 by Congress to respond to the “Great Recession”; ARRA established the HPRP program and provided funding to communities across the country to flexibly and proactively respond to recession-induced housing instability and homelessness. Through the HEARTH Act, Congress renamed the Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) program as the Emergency Solutions Grant and incorporated a broader range of eligible activities, including an enhanced commitment to homelessness prevention and Rapid Re-housing.

2 Programs included the DPSS-funded Homeless CalWORKs Family Project (HCFP), DPSS-funded Emergency Shelter Services (ESS), and federally-funded Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) projects, among others.
seamless system for homeless families, the Homeless Family Solutions System (HFSS), to be implemented by July 2014. The HFSS aimed to combine the multiple programs serving homeless families into one comprehensive, streamlined, and regionally-based program. Central to its design, DPSS shifted $7.3 million in Homeless CalWORKs Families Project (HCFP) and Emergency Shelter Services (ESS) funding to the HFSS. Importantly, the HFSS design enabled the County and LAHSA to collectively fund key system components, such as, coordinated assessment, interim housing, and rapid re-housing (RRH). The alignment of City and County funding, enabled LAHSA as system administrator, to establish FSC services in all eight SPAs, expand the number of formal, funded partners, and begin to streamline policies and protocols governing program referrals, enrollment and performance.

The HFSS launched in July 2014, with expanded system access. In addition to 211, families were now referred from City and County Departments, as well as, from the Los Angeles Unified School District’s (LAUSDs) McKinney-Vento Act liaisons. While direct access to the FSCs increased and funder expectations around numbers to be served increased, the capacity of each FSC to handle increased regional demand for its services remained constrained. The FSC design included funding increases for additional staffing for the FSCs; however, the increases were modest, owing to the need to allocate system resources across the various components and the County. Effectively, the FSC design asked individual FSCs to operate as the singular “front door” to the family system in their respective SPAs without fully providing the financial resources for this purpose.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, as part of larger efforts to standardize population-specific services, the HFSS was renamed the Coordinated Entry System for Families (CESF), in alignment with the nascent CES for Adults and CES for Youth. In early 2017, LAHSA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for three-year grants for CESF, which provided community-based awardees with augmented funds to operate various system components through June 2020. In February 2016, the Board approved the Homeless Initiative (HI) strategies. These strategies included scaling up of various CESF components (e.g., RRH and Interim Housing), expanding under-developed components (i.e., Homelessness Prevention and Diversion services), and “seeding” previously unfunded components (e.g., legal services). Voters approved Measure H in March 2017, which provided ongoing funding for the HI strategies.

Prior to FY 2017-18, only the CESF providers were able to conduct the Vulnerability Index-Family Service Prioritization Decision Awareness Tool (VI-FSPDAT) and enter it into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Additionally, Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) resources were not matched through CESF. To decrease the burden on the CESF system, the Department of Mental Health (DMH) worked with LAHSA and the CESF providers to develop a protocol that allowed DMH staff and contractors to conduct the CESF Screening Tool and the VI-FSPDAT and enter it into HMIS. LAHSA and DMH trained DMH’s providers on this new protocol, which was then implemented on March 1, 2018. That same month, DMH began using the CESF to match clients to DMH-managed PSH for families. Included in the protocol were instructions for DMH providers to first determine if the family was eligible for DMH interim housing resources prior to referring to the CESF. However, any

3 Funding came from, and/or was coordinated in conjunction with, LAHSA, DPSS, Los Angeles County CEO, County Community Development Commission (CDC) and the Los Angeles City Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA).
resources managed by the CESF, including Diversion, Prevention, RRH and PSH had to be accessed through the CESF and required a referral to CESF.

**Current CESF**

The CESF provides screening, triage, crisis intervention, diversion/problem solving, prevention, RRH, and housing-focused case management to prevent families, at risk of, or experiencing homelessness from entering the homeless service delivery system, and/or enable families experiencing homelessness to rapidly return to permanent housing. LAHSA most recently procured CESF in 2017. Providers are contracted with LAHSA through June 30, 2020.

A lead agency in each SPA manages the FSC and oversees a FSC/CESF collaborative. The FSC/CESF coordinate system resources in the region and collaborates with community service providers, who may, or may not be funded to provide homeless services, but collectively serve families who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness.

The Agencies serving each SPA and the services they are funded to provide are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>Contractor (bold = lead agency)</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Valley Oasis</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing, Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles (LA) Family Housing</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing, Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Union Station Homeless Services</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People Assisting the Homeless (PATH)</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing, Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LA Family Housing</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Salvation Army</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Joseph Center</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upward Bound House</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Salvation Army</td>
<td>Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Special Service for Groups/Homeless Outreach Program Integrated Care System (HOPICS)</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing, Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Upward Bound House</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Whole Child</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Salvation Army</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Harbor Interfaith Services</td>
<td>FSC, Prevention, Diversion, RRH, Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1736 Family Crisis Center</td>
<td>Bridge Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FSCs are the CESF’s primary point of entry. In most SPAs, the centralized access point is one physical site or center. Other SPAs, have established multiple FSC sites to provide broad geographic coverage and services access. Families are referred to FSCs via 211, DMH, Department of Public Social Services (DPSS), DCFS, McKinney Vento Education Liaisons, and other partner agencies or via self-referral (“walk-ins”). FSC staff conduct screenings to triage families, and then conduct standardized assessments using the VI-FSPDAT to determine families’ acuity and program eligibility. Case Management staff work with families to develop a Housing Stability Plan to stabilize families in their housing, with the level of assistance based on each family’s specific need. Families are also connected to available resources via the regional collaborative. Once a family is housed, the FSC lead agency (or a partner) continues providing case management to ensure that families retain their housing.

Under the current system, when families present to the FSCs for services, they have access to various agencies via co-located personnel, including:

- DPSS Homeless Case Managers (HCMs) to assess what DPSS benefits and services a family is potentially eligible to; and makes appropriate referrals and connections to available DPSS benefits and services.
- DMH Clinicians (either DMH-contracted or DMH staff) to conduct mental health screening and assessment and offer referral linkages.
- Department of Public Health (DPH) Substance Use Disorder Counselors also screen and refer families to clinical services, if desired.
- McKinney-Vento liaison staff are on site at FSCs to connect children to School District Education Services.
- DPSS Welfare-to-Work staff to refer families to child care resources, and employment services.
- Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies in most SPAs to educate and support families, at risk of, or experiencing homelessness to access child care services.

The CESF has also recently piloted a partnership with the LA County Office of Education (LACOE) Head Start at two FSCs to refer families to Head Start programs. Efforts are underway by LAHSA staff to help improve integration of County co-located staff and services with FSC operations in each SPA.

County Departments also provide a variety of housing resources and supportive services to homeless and at-risk families. Several resources, such as, DHS and DMH Interim Housing or Permanent Housing, and the DPSS Housing Program, are integrated into the CESF to better support linkages of families to those resources. DCFS’ Family Unification Program vouchers were also integrated into the CESF in FY 2018-19. DPSS resources have the strongest integration with the CESF based on DPSS’ funding investments and alignment dating to the early implementation of the CESF.

The CESF System Flow Map below illustrates how the system is currently designed to assist families. Based on the current system, families are matched to available crisis or bridge housing based on acuity score. Except for PSH, the system currently does not prioritize permanent housing resources based on a family’s vulnerability or need. PSH is prioritized for
the highest need families. Unless matched to PSH, all families are automatically enrolled in RRH.

**CESF Current System Flow Map**

The design and success of the CESF are dependent upon:

1) **Effective management of inflow**, i.e., diverting families not in need of homelessness assistance, thereby reserving more expensive and time-consuming interventions for families with demonstrated need for those resources; and

2) **Efficient movement of families** through the system to facilitate swift permanent housing placements, and throughput, so newly homeless families can access the resources they need. Several macroeconomic forces and policy barriers impact the desired inflow and outflow of the system and are further described in Attachment II.

**Family Services Coordination in Skid Row**

The presence of homeless families on Skid Row has been an issue of substantial concern for many years and resulted in the Board’s 2006 “Zero Tolerance” Policy for Homeless Families on Skid Row. A critical component of services provided to families residing on Skid Row is the Skid Row Assessment Team (SRAT), a multi-departmental team that was formed in 2005 as a result of a mandate from then County Supervisor, Gloria Molina. Led by DCFS, the team
currently consists of staff from DPSS, DMH (on call), DPH, and LAHSA, who began working with the SRAT in 2018. The SRAT conducts assessments of homeless families residing in the Union Rescue Mission (URM) and works alongside various Skid Row community agencies to assess for eligible County supports and housing services, with the goal of protecting children and returning families to permanent housing. Through SRAT, five DCFS Children’s Social Workers assess for child safety, two DPSS HCMs determine eligibility and make referrals for DPSS services, a DPH Nurse conducts an initial health assessment and makes appropriate referrals, and a DMH Psychiatric Social Worker conducts mental health assessments and referrals, as needed.

In April 2018, the SRAT collaborative expanded to include LAHSA to provide a direct link to the FSCs. LAHSA is working with URM to reduce the number of families residing at the shelter, as well as, the length of stay. LAHSA maintains a by-name list of families at URM and tracks the number screened, assessed, and referred to an FSC. LAHSA also manages bi-weekly case conferencing with URM and the FSCs, and follows up on any access, assessment, and service-related issues with the FSCs. LAHSA continues to train URM staff to conduct screening, attempt to divert the family and use HMIS. LAHSA also provides CES Orientations for families at standing URM meetings to encourage their access to screening and CESF services, which are voluntary.

Families at URM are referred to FSCs for assessment based on the family’s SPA of origin, unless logistical or safety issues indicate that an FSC for a different SPA would be a better fit. Staff from PATH, the SPA 4 CESF lead agency, are co-located at URM, two days per week, to assist with coordination of families to other SPAs, as needed, and to assess families connected to SPA 4.

Appendix I provides data for families being served by the SRAT on Skid Row.
Section 2. Current Functioning of CESF

As directed by the Board, the CEO and LAHSA, in coordination with DPSS, DHS, DMH, DPH, CDC and DCFS, conducted a comprehensive trends analysis of the functioning of the CESF; convened a workgroup to develop a comprehensive set of recommendations to strengthen the CESF (Section 3: Future of the CESF), and identified parameters for the recurring progress report that was requested by the Board. Attachment IV includes a list of Workgroup participants who helped to inform this report. Also listed are the eight nonprofit CESF lead agencies operating FSCs, who provided input and support on data analysis, context setting, and participated in discussions regarding systemic and programmatic implications of the data.

The analysis covered inter-dependent system functions and components to illustrate changes in system demand and performance over time, ranging from Quarter One (Q1) of FY 2015-16 to Quarter Two (Q2) of FY 2018-19. In addition, the analysis explored the intersections between County mainstream systems and the CESF, for FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18. We also reviewed FY 2018-19 data related to services engagement in Skid Row (Appendix I). Of note, the lack of available data on survivors of domestic violence and their children, who received services from the CESF, was a limitation of the analysis.

System Access & Enrollments
Demand for CESF services has increased steadily since July 2015, as demonstrated by screening and enrollment data. Most recently (FY 2018-19, Q2), the CESF saw a 26 percent increase in the number of new families screened for services, compared to the same quarter in the previous fiscal year (FY 2017-18, Q2). This growth was on top of a 16 percent increase from the same quarter in FY 2016-17 to FY 2017-18. Housing Program enrollments, including interim housing and RRH enrollments, have increased 250 percent from FY 2016-17, Q2 to FY 2017-18, Q2.

While the system has seen an overall spike in enrollments, some SPAs appear to have been impacted more substantially than others. The number of active enrollments in SPAs 1, 3, 6, and 7 each increased over 300 percent between FY 2016-17, Q2 and FY 2018-19, Q2 (Graph 1, page 10).

---

4 The systems analysis relied upon HMIS data. Domestic violence providers are prohibited by Federal law from entering identifying information on survivor households in HMIS.
One of the contributions that increased crisis housing enrollments is the large number of carryover households from FY 2017-18. Because families were not exiting the system within the anticipated timeframe, FSC contracts for FY 2018-19 started at only 50 percent for new families served by the FSCs. As highlighted in the Interim Housing section, families are not exiting as quickly as they were in prior years. Housing affordability, as noted in Appendix II, Macro Environmental and Policy Forces, is a primary factor driving this trend.

**Interim Housing**

In December 2018, the system saw a 67 percent increase in active households enrolled in crisis housing. Since FY 2015-16 (Q1), there was a nearly 400 percent increase countywide in active households in crisis housing, inclusive of both site-based programs and motel vouchers, as indicated in Graph 2. Enrollments continued to grow with the launch of Measure H.

Graph 2: Active Crisis Housing (CH) Households by Quarter
The precipitous rise in families enrolled in crisis housing has stretched the system beyond its funded capacity. Collectively, the system was at 133 percent of its FY 2018-19 contracted capacity at the end of Q2 of FY 2018-19, and nearly 3,000 families are projected to be served through Q4 of FY 2018-19 (Graph 3).

The greatest number of families in crisis housing reside in SPAs 2 and 6. Combined, these two SPAs account for 55 percent of systemwide occupancy at the end of Q2, FY 2018-19. These SPAs have also experienced the steepest increases in the number of families enrolled in crisis housing.

Graph 3: Served within LAHSA Crisis Housing Programs, FY 2018-19
Expanding Shelter Capacity

To accommodate increasing demand for shelter, LAHSA and its partners have focused on expanding shelter capacity through new sites and/or additional beds at existing sites. Between FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19, there was a 41 percent increase in site-based interim housing units, consisting of both crisis and bridge housing programs, across the system (Table 1, page 10).

Six SPAs increased their unit capacity, while two SPAs maintained their unit capacity during this time. The largest percentage increase occurred in SPA 1; however, that region still has the fewest number of interim housing units with just 13 total units. SPA 6 continues to have by far the greatest unit capacity with 287 units. Overall, despite a 41 percent increase in new interim housing units across the system, bringing the current total to 582 units, there remains an inadequate supply to meet the demand, forcing the system to continue to rely on motels to shelter families experiencing homelessness, which exacerbates already increasing costs.

Table 1: Change in Site-Based Interim Housing Units (Crisis and Bridge) By SPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPA</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>FY 2018-19</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+225%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>+59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>+49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motels, which cost approximately $105 per night, are increasingly being used to ensure that families are not turned away, leading to higher system costs when compared to costs for other family interim housing units ($65 per night\(^5\)) as shown below.

---

\(^5\) Not inclusive of bridge housing.
Crisis Housing Turnover

The lack of shelter capacity and the expensive use of motels as alternative shelter are compounded by inadequate turnover of the crisis housing inventory. Lack of case management for crisis housing could also be a contributor. In practice, this means that families are remaining in shelter for longer periods of time, leaving families who need shelter without sufficient options. In fact, the gap between new and exited enrollees in crisis housing is worsening (Graph 5).

---

6 Based on FY 2018-19 (Q1-2) costs
The number of families exiting crisis housing has declined since FY 2017-18 Q2, while the number of new enrollees has increased rapidly. These trends underscore the lack of “flow-through” in the system – discussed in Section 1, as vital for effective CESF system functioning. Not surprisingly, the CESF is experiencing an increase in the lengths of stay by 36 percent from FY 2016-17, Q2 to FY 2018-19, Q2, with the current average stay close to five months. Taken together, these phenomena create “gridlock” and undermine the efficacy of the whole system.

With regards to exits from interim housing, the analysis shows that while more families are exiting crisis housing to permanent housing than ever before, the system is seeing less relative success in this regard. Specifically, the percentage of families with a successful exit from crisis housing (i.e., to permanent housing) is decreasing, as a share of total exits (Graph 6, page 12).
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)

Due to the high demand and the current protocol to enroll all families into RRH unless linked to PSH, the CESF is enrolling families beyond the funded capacity. CESF experienced a consistent increase in families enrolled in RRH from FY 2015-16, Q1 through FY 2018-19, Q2 with total RRH enrollments exceeding 4,400 (Graph 7). The largest increase from FY 2017-18, Q2 to FY 2018-19, Q2 has been in SPA 1 (225%). Other large increases occurred in SPA 2 (31%), SPA 3 (33%), SPA 6 (43%), and SPA 7 (52%).

While the number of active families enrolled in RRH has increased, the number who have secured housing has not. After steadily increasing (move-ins) from FY 2015-16, Q1 to FY 2017-18, Q2 because of increased funding to support RRH, the number of enrolled
families who moved into permanent housing steadily declined from FY 2017-18, Q3 to FY 2018-19, Q2 (Graph 8). This decline could be due to large caseloads (Graph 10) and the challenges finding permanent housing in the current rental market.

Graph 8: Families Served by RRH - Trends FY 2015-16 through FY 2018-19

![Graph 8](image)

As noted below in Graph 9 (page 14), the percentage of families currently being served by the program (active\(^7\)) families with move-in (i.e., living in permanent housing but still receiving RRH services) has dropped sharply relative to total families overall being served, from 48 percent in FY 2016-17, Q2 to 21 percent in FY 2018-19, Q2. This decrease in families moving into housing helps to explain why lengths of stay in interim housing are growing. It also contributes to the ballooning caseload sizes above system standards.

Graph 9 (at left): RRH Active Families Being Served Who moved into Permanent Housing, FY 2015-16 through FY 2018-19, Q2

![Graph 9](image)

The large number of families being served in RRH has resulted in extremely high caseloads. Across all FSCs, the average caseload is 1:100 families, while the system goal is 1:25 families (Graph 10). These large caseloads negatively impact the ability of case managers to effectively work with families to secure housing and exit the program.

\(^7\) Active is defined as enrolled in a program and not exited.
Prevention and Problem Solving/Diversion

Prevention services represent one of the most recent components of the system to be established. FSCs began providing prevention services in FY 2015-16. Enrollments in prevention have increased each year, as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Newly Enrolled</th>
<th>Exited</th>
<th>Exited to PH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018-19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of FY 2018-19, Q2, CESF providers had exceeded their contracted capacity for the full fiscal year, suggesting the need for increased resources to meet community demand. Along with diversion, prevention services are critical to reducing system entries and more effectively managing system resources.

Problem-Solving/Diversion, implemented in FY 2017-18 for the CESF, supports families to locate safe, appropriate alternatives to the homeless response system, such as staying with
family or friends. In FY 2017-18, more than 950 families were assessed for diversion and a total of 803, or 84 percent of families were successfully diverted.

**Intersections: County Systems and CESF**

The County Enterprise Linkages Project (ELP) data identifies homeless family members who had contact with County Departments either before, or after, the provision of services by CESF, as recorded in HMIS. Analysis of this data indicates that families in CESF programs (prevention, interim housing, RRH, and PSH) are connected to DPSS at higher rates than other County services (Table 3). The data also indicates for households enrolled in prevention and interim housing programs, there was an increased connection to DMH and DHS services in FY 2017-18 compared to FY 2016-17.

One limitation of the data depicted in Table 3 is that it only identifies families served by both systems at some point during the fiscal year and does not show when the overlap occurred. Having data in real time through ELP that shows when families are being served across systems would be beneficial to supporting better service coordination. AB 210, newly passed legislation that allows county and provider agencies to share confidential data to coordinate housing and supportive services, will enable near real-time sharing.

**Table 3: Comparison of FY2016-17 and FY2017-18 County Service Use Among Family Members in HMIS by Homeless Service Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>FY 2016-17</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Family Members</td>
<td>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</td>
<td># of Family Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCFS</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSS CalWORKs*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Prevention Individuals in HMIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,997</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,579</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Comparing FY2016-17 # of Family Members to FY2017-18 # of Family Members*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Housing</th>
<th>FY 2016-17</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Family Members</td>
<td>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</td>
<td># of Family Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCFS</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSS CalWORKs*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total Interim Housing

| Family Members in HMIS | 3,139 | 7,101 |

*Note: Comparing FY2016-17 # of Family Members to FY2017-18 # of Family Members

### Rapid Re-housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016-17</th>
<th>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</th>
<th>FY 2017-18</th>
<th>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCFS</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSS CalWORKs*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7,837</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rapid Re-Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,586</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Comparing FY2016-17 # of Family Members to FY2017-18 # of Family Members

### Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
<th>% of Family Members matched in HMIS</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCFS</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSS CalWORKs*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Permanent Supportive Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Comparing FY2016-17 # of Family Members to FY2017-18 # of Family Members

* DPSS data not available for FY 2016-17 due to the transition from LEADER to LEADER Replacement System (LRS).

Additional trends have been identified for the above interventions in Table 3:
- The percentage of family members receiving prevention services who also were served by DMH and DHS remained fairly constant from FY 2016-17 to FY 2017-18, while those connected to DCFS decreased by a sizable 41 percent.
- Across all HMIS program components, there was a decrease in the number of families accessing DCFS services.
- In FY 2017-18, the largest percentage of families also in HMIS across all program components were connected to DPSS.
DPSS Housing Programs and Referrals to CESF

DPSS data indicate that the DPSS crisis housing program, Temporary Homeless Assistance (HA) Program, served just over 20,000 families (Table 4) in FY 2016-17 and nearly 24,000 families in FY 2017-18. There was also a sizable increase in utilization of the Permanent HA program and Prevention programs. These trends are similar to the CESF in terms of the increased demand for housing resources. As part of the design of the CESF, the co-located HCM and FSC staff coordinate to ensure that DPSS housing resources are maximized by families. In FY 2018-19, LAHSA and DPSS have been working with FSCs and HCMs to reinforce existing protocols or provide additional guidance on coordination across the CESF and DPSS to ensure effective integration.

Table 4: DPSS Housing Program Data FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>DPSS Housing Program</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># of Families Served</td>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td># of Families Served</td>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Housing</td>
<td>Temporary Homeless Assistance (HA) Program</td>
<td>20,091</td>
<td>$13,021,326</td>
<td>23,868</td>
<td>$15,843,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Homeless Assistance Program (THAP)+14</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>$3,857,942</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>$3,548,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Permanent HA Program</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>$2,584,790</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>$3,651,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Assistance (MA) Program</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>$830,664</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>$597,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Permanent HA Arrearages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6,725</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$12,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Assistance to Prevent Eviction (EAPE)</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>$1,043,379</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>$1,123,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Month Rental Assistance (RA) Program</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>$540,871</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>$569,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,685,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,345,798</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The source of the data for the number of families served is a CEO data run that was completed on 2/11/19. The source of the data for the program expenditures is an internal DPSS ad hoc report.*
Table 5: DPSS Referrals to CESF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Type</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Rehousing Referrals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Referrals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The source of the data is self-reported by DPSS District HCMs. FY 16-17 is not available.*

DPSS District Offices are a key referral source for CESF. DPSS refers a family to the CESF when the family is not eligible for any DPSS-administered housing interventions, per the existing contract with LAHSA. According to self-reported data (Table 5), DPSS HCMs provided more than 2,600 referrals to CESF RRH and prevention services during FY 2017-18. Data was not available for prior fiscal years or for any quarters in FY 2018-19. Referrals were directed to the local FSCs. Through the CalWORKs Housing Support Program (HSP), DPSS also provides funding to the CESF to support linkages to crisis and permanent housing for families.

**Gaps Analysis and Projections**

The gaps analysis indicates the constraints the system is currently experiencing in FY 2018-19. As exemplified by the large number of “carry-over” families from FY 2017-18, the system is unable to efficiently move families from enrollment into permanent housing. This has a compounding, negative effect, as the higher the number of households carried over at the start of FY 2018-19, the more the system lacked capacity to absorb new families in need.

At the start of FY 2018-19, all system components (FSC, Prevention/Diversion, RRH etc.) were on pace to become quickly oversubscribed, as carry-overs represented 51 percent of the FSCs annual contracted capacity, 60 percent of prevention and diversion capacity, 88 percent of RRH capacity, and 88 percent of interim housing capacity. Assuming the same pace of new enrollments in Q3 and Q4 as occurred in Q1 and Q2 of FY 2018-19, all CESF program components show a deficit in funds needed to serve the current and anticipated new households for the remainder of the fiscal year. The largest deficit is for interim housing, followed by RRH.

For purposes of comparison, Funding Scenarios (Attachment III) were developed, projecting outcomes based on current funding, and with additional funding recommendations, using global assumptions and system projections. These assumptions, as well as, unknown variables in the system, are included in the Funding Scenarios. Two of the scenarios included represents a shift in the current expectation that all families experiencing homelessness will be served through CESF.
Section 3. Future of CESF

This section consists of two parts:

A.) Recommendations to optimize system function and to improve outcomes for families, at-risk of, or experiencing homelessness, in LA County. Priority recommendations are grouped in the following categories:

1. System Access and Referrals
2. Prevention and Diversion,
3. System Capacity and Coordination,
4. Housing Stability and Retention,
5. Interim Housing,
6. Permanent Housing, and
7. Funding/Advocacy.

B.) A proposed template for the consolidated recurring reporting to enable ongoing monitoring of the performance of CESF.

A. Recommendations

Recommendations presented in this section are not yet implemented unless indicated as “In Progress,” which includes strategies being actively implemented, as well as, those in some stage of planning.

The recommendations presented were developed and prioritized by the Workgroup and the three subgroups of the Workgroup formed to specifically focus on key areas to enhancing the CESF. The subgroup focus areas were: 1) Enhancing Connections to County and LAHSA Resources; 2) CESF and County Partner Data; and 3) Policy and Funding.

Additional recommendations that were not identified as priority by the Workgroup can be found in Appendix III.

1. System Access and Referrals

As noted in Section 2, there are significant increases in families being served in the CESF. This increase is attributable to a rapid expansion of referrals and inflow into the CESF. Responding to the increase in referrals has challenged the current structure of the CESF, in which one centralized agency (FSC) per SPA is funded to serve families. In response to these challenges, the Workgroup put forward several recommendations aimed at: 1) improving referral processes into the system; and 2) enhancing the CESF infrastructure to respond to the increased inflow.
Improving Referral Processes (*In Progress*): Efforts already underway to improve the referral processes into CESF include:

1.1 Launching efforts to ensure appropriate referrals to the homeless services system from other County agencies.
   - County agencies should refer families after a review of potential eligibility for homelessness resources within their respective agencies to maximize mainstream resources.
   - This includes enhancing efforts to educate and train referral partners (service organizations, City and County agencies) on the scope of services provided by CESF and eligibility criteria for those services.

1.2 Establishing screening and referral processes from the Union Rescue Mission to FSCs to increase the number of families on Skid Row who can resolve their housing crises, either through diversion or connection to appropriate housing resources.

The Workgroup recommends the following *additional* strategies to improve referral processes and support CESF lead agencies in managing the increased inflow:

1.3 Develop consistent messaging for various stakeholders regarding the capacity of the CESF, eligibility criteria for services, and expectations of service. Messaging should reflect:
   - The capacity of the CESF and its ability to, or limitations in supporting more than the current 4,500 families being served in RRH as of FY 2018-19;
   - The CESF goal to effectively serve families based on their identified needs and the availability of funded resources to resolve their homelessness;
   - Family accountability in participating in their housing plan.

Available resources may include diversion, prevention or other housing programs, such as, RRH.

1.4 Identify additional opportunities for improving services to families on Skid Row, including cross-training, reallocation of staffing resources, and strengthening diversion processes.

Enhancing CESF Infrastructure (*In Progress*): LAHSA is undertaking the following to create an infrastructure that better supports providers in responding to the increased inflow into CESF:

1.5 Building on the standardized referral processes (1.1) that include an initial referral form to the CESF Lead agencies (FSCs), LAHSA is developing a referral process from CESF to City, County, or Community Resources to maximize mainstream resources, particularly in times when CESF agencies reach capacity. Other efforts include developing a detailed list of emergency shelter and safe parking locations.
within each SPA, protocols to link to other resources such as HCID’s Family Source Centers, DPSS, etc., and provide additional training to CESF agencies and City, County and community partners on the CESF purpose, process and expectations.

1.6 Create additional Access Points and Centers for families to increase access to screening, and when appropriate, assessment. This will ensure a connection to necessary resources to rapidly resolve their housing crises.

2. **Prevention and Problem Solving/Diversion**

In addition to improving system design and referral processes, enhancing homelessness prevention and problem solving/diversion practices countywide is a critical component of a strategic response to the increasing inflow into homelessness and into the CESF. The Workgroup identified that prevention and diversion-oriented solutions must go beyond the programs currently funded within the CESF and include enhanced prevention strategies that are “upstream” of the homeless services delivery system. The Workgroup recommends additional steps be taken to expand diversion and prevention efforts countywide.

**Expanding Tenant Protections**: The County has recently taken actions to protect tenants in the unincorporated areas of the County and is in support of State action to enhance tenant protections; therefore, it is recommended that the Board take the following action to further protect tenants:

2.1 Advocate for State legislative change to reduce the number of families facing evictions and large rent increases by supporting Assembly Bill (AB) 36, which would give local jurisdictions more flexibility in enacting rent stabilization ordinances, and AB 1481, which would prevent landlords from evicting families without sufficient cause.

At present, jurisdictions are restricted from enacting rent stabilization measures on units constructed after 1995 (or whenever they first enacted a rent stabilization ordinance, if earlier in time) or on units in single-family homes. In addition, in most jurisdictions, landlords can evict tenants without cause.

**Expanding Prevention and Problem Solving/Diversion Practices**: The Workgroup also put forward several recommendations to expand Prevention and Problem Solving/Diversion efforts across system partners, including:

2.2 Integrate Problem Solving/Diversion practices across County agencies and other referral partners, including Skid Row sites. Sufficient training and infrastructure to support integration should be included.

2.3 Establish a prevention focus within County departments with staff who can focus and specialize in Problem Solving/Diversion interventions.
2.4 Identify mechanism and provide flexibility for CESF lead agencies to tailor Problem Solving/Diversion practices to meet family needs onsite or in partnership with other agencies to support self-resolution and problem solving.

3. System Capacity and Coordination

The Workgroup considered various ways to improve the capacity of CESF and its service providers, and to further enhance coordination and alignment with other systems of care. Several efforts are already underway, and the Workgroup recommended additional actions to further support these efforts. Recommendations can be grouped in the following categories: 1) strengthening coordination with mainstream systems; 2) enhancing CESF provider capacity; 3) supporting alignment with domestic violence/intimate partner violence service providers; and 4) improving data sharing.

Strengthening Coordination with Mainstream Systems (In Progress):

3.1 Establishing consistent protocols for co-located mainstream system staff at FSCs to interface with homeless families to support access to mainstream benefits and ensure effective interventions and referrals.

3.2 Identify areas for additional systems collaboration between DCFS and LAHSA through ongoing collaboration and lessons learned from the DCFS/LAHSA One Roof Collaboration.

In addition to coordination efforts currently underway, the Workgroup recommended additional actions, including:

3.3 Maximize access and utilization of DPSS Housing Programs and Services for CalWORKs families before a family enters the homeless system.

- Strengthen integration of the co-located DPSS HCM at the FSC to better coordinate homeless services and access to mainstream benefits, which may include the issuance of DPSS benefits without the need for the family to go to a DPSS district office.

3.4 Evaluate use of prevention resources across child welfare and the homeless services system to identify any improvements in providing appropriate resources to at-risk families such as the Prevention & Aftercare Networks prior to requiring housing crisis services.

Enhancing CESF Capacity (In Progress):

---

8 Part of a national initiative, LAHSA and DCFS, CDC and the CEO’s Strategic Partnerships and Homeless Initiative leaders and others have worked together since June 2017 to establish a Los Angeles County planning focused on developing housing solutions for families at the intersection of homelessness and child welfare involvement. The LA One Roof team completed an initial action plan in 2018 and began to convene monthly core team meetings. Results include supporting the city and county housing authorities in securing new federal Family Unification Program housing vouchers, creating a draft referral screening tool, completing a system map and analysis of DCFS housing resources.
3.5 Providing additional training to support CESF staff effectiveness in service
delivery to families with unique needs. Training modules should include serving
families with young children, serving families with disabilities and special needs,
and providing trauma informed care for children.

3.6 Developing a CESF Operations Guide to support implementation of core CES
policies approved by the CES Policy Council to streamline and standardize
practice across all SPAs. The Operations Guide will be released in July 2019. It
will focus on providing guidance for how families across the system are
consistently assessed, prioritized for resources, and matched to housing across
SPAs, which will ensure that each FSC operates under the same guidelines.

In addition to enhanced training and operational guidance, the Workgroup recommends
actions to improve the infrastructure of CESF, including:

3.7 Ensure that RRH and Access Centers are each funded separately and sufficiently.
FSCs are currently utilizing RRH funding to support other system components,
including screening and assessment, which are generally Access Center
components. This has reduced the overall effectiveness of both Access Centers
and RRH services.

- Ensure messaging to the community about any service delivery changes
  resulting from the implementation of Countywide uniform practices
  implemented through the CESF Operations Guide.

Improving Data Collection and Supporting Alignment with Domestic
Violence/Intimate Partner Violence (DV/IPV) Service Providers (In Progress): A
critical component of system coordination emphasized by the Workgroup is the need to
establish greater alignment between DV/IPV service providers and the homeless
services system to ensure that the needs of families at risk of, or experiencing
homelessness, and impacted by DV/IPV are met, and that LAHSA and its partners can
make data-informed resource allocation decisions. One effort currently underway to
address this is:

3.8 Implementing a confidential database for DV/IPV providers to enter de-identified
client information and allowing the CESF to do more effective and equitable
matching of housing and services for this population.

Improving Data Sharing: The need for improved data sharing across system partners –
and particularly with mainstream County departments - was emphasized throughout
the Workgroup process. A persistent challenge is differing agency data definitions
and the lack of systemic reporting of various data elements around family homelessness.

3.9 Incorporate County department data for the identified data elements in the
Quarterly CESF Report (see Section B below).

3.10 Develop common data elements for tracking of homelessness across County
agencies and the CESF to support evaluation of data.

3.11 Further identify strategies and approaches for making overall data collection
more efficient, such as, automating data pulls across HMIS and County data
systems and eliminating barriers to data sharing across agencies through AB 210 and other opportunities.

4. **Housing Stability and Retention**

Workgroup participants recognized a holistic strategy to address family homelessness must include an emphasis on factors that contribute to housing stability and retention. Therefore, alongside recommendations to expand services to families and increase the availability of housing resources, the Workgroup also identified several recommendations focusing on sustaining housing stability among families experiencing homelessness.

**Supporting Efforts to Increase Economic Stability (In Progress):** Initiatives currently underway that aim to support housing stability for families include:

4.1 Launching a Shallow Subsidy Program to provide limited income support to families exiting RRH who are still working to increase their income and/or secure affordable housing. The Shallow Subsidy program, which will begin by the end of FY 2018-19, will serve households exiting RRH programs who require a housing subsidy to maintain housing stability while they continue to increase their income and/or secure affordable housing.

**Additional** recommendations for supporting families in efforts to increase their income through stable employment include:

4.2 Creation of policies to enhance collaboration between the homeless service delivery system and public workforce development programs, including DPSS Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) and public workforce agencies (American Jobs Career Centers). Prioritize workforce resources for participants experiencing/exiting homelessness.

4.3 Evaluate the existing CalWORKs Transitional Subsidized Employment (TSE) program and develop additional training and support to ensure programs sufficiently prepare homeless/recently-homeless TSE participants for placements and match participants to sustainable long-term employment.

**Expanding Access to Child Care:** Workgroup participants emphasized the central role that child care plays in families’ stability and in further supporting efforts to increase income. Recommendations to address the existing gap in affordable, accessible child care include:

4.4 Support State budget advocacy to increase funding for free or affordable child-care programs for low-income families.

4.5 Ensure consistency in access to and referrals to childcare resources in all SPAs by expanding current DPSS Child Care Pilot and LACOE Early Head Start Pilot. Analyze eligibility barriers to current childcare resources.
5. **Interim Housing**

Among the next steps needed to improve the effectiveness of the CESF, Workgroup participants identified recommendations relating to expanding interim housing capacity, improving services quality and controlling system costs.

**Interim Housing Capacity (In Progress):**

5.1 Develop congregate interim housing sites for families. This will address the gap between families in need of interim housing and the number of interim housing beds for families currently available. Congregate housing will shelter approximately 20-30 families per site, in a shared space. Efforts are underway to identify locations that can be repurposed, or are underutilized, including private and public (City, County or LAUSD) sites. LAHSA is currently working with a real estate broker who has identified a list of 15 potential private sites in the City of Los Angeles and Unincorporated Areas of the County and is working to add more locations. An action plan was created to be able to operationalize a site within 72 hours of the site being determined suitable and ready for interim housing.

Additionally, a recent Board Motion directed the CEO to engage the San Gabriel (SGV) cities to identify space that can be used for interim housing within their cities.

Given the continued need for additional interim housing capacity, additional recommendations to be pursued include:

5.2 Augment efforts to streamline development of interim housing and explore ways to use publicly-owned properties, including state-owned armories and city properties, to increase the number of interim housing units available to the family system.

5.3 Dedicate a portion of funding from the new Los Angeles County Interim Housing Capital Funding Pool to develop additional interim housing units specifically for families.

5.4 Work with DMH and DHS, who also administer interim housing for families, to develop a streamlined process to access these interim housing beds for families, as needed.

**Managing the Use of Motels (In Progress):**

5.5 Implement master-leasing of individual motels. Master-leasing will ensure units are available, on a more reliable basis, while creating economies of scale that may drive down the per unit cost, potentially from $110 per unit, per night to $80-$90 per unit, per night.

5.6 Implement centralized administration of motel vouchers. Currently, the demand for interim housing is so great that non-profit agencies are often competing against each other to secure motel rooms as interim housing. This demand
allows motel owners to increase unit costs for competing providers. Centralized motel administration, which is planned for FY 2019-20 implementation, would eliminate non-profit agencies competing against each other, resulting in lower and more standardized rates for motel rooms.

**Setting Policies for Participants in Interim Housing (In Progress):**

5.7 Continue piloting and evaluating a cost-sharing model for families living in motels, whereby a family residing in a motel pays 30 percent of their income towards their motel stay. This policy shift, being piloted in SPA 2, is intended to incentivize families to exit a motel if they can safely reconnect with family and friends or connect with other housing options (including subsidized permanent housing).

In addition to increasing the stock of interim housing, the Workgroup highly recommends augmenting the services that help interim housing participants exit to permanent housing.

**Augmenting the Quality of Services:**

5.8 Develop County-led teams to address the needs of families with higher barriers, especially those housed in motels, to support a quicker exit out of homelessness.

5.9 Increase funding for case management staff specific for families in interim housing. This will ensure that high need families residing in interim housing or motels are in regular contact with case management staff and are working to connect to permanent housing resources.

5.10 Ensure consistent bed rates across the County to ensure high quality services at all interim housing sites, including for “high-barrier” families. The FY 2019-20 Measure H Funding recommendations include an increase to $80/night for LAHSA-funded interim housing beds.

6. **Permanent Housing**

Workgroup participants highlighted that the most vital piece of the CESF is the ability to offer permanent housing solutions to which families can safely exit. Without additional permanent housing capacity, families remain in interim housing, return to dangerous living situations and/or cycle back into homelessness.

**Improving Usage of Vouchers and Subsidies (In Progress):** Several current initiatives to improve deployment of existing rental subsidies include:

6.1 Matching high-acuity families through CES that are awaiting a housing resource to available Permanent Housing resources as well as pairing these resources with families that have been housed through RRH but need a longer term rent subsidy.
6.2 Strengthening source of income protections at the County level to increase voucher-holders’ access to market rate units. At present, CDC is developing a Source of Income Discrimination Ordinance, that would apply to the unincorporated areas of the County. The County has also sponsored SB 329, State-level legislation to create uniform protections against source of income discrimination Statewide.

Despite the above initiatives, more changes are needed to facilitate the use of rental subsidies in market-rate housing units including:

6.3 In collaboration with all Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) in the County, advocate for changes to Federal policy, which places occupancy restrictions on family units rented with federally-subsidized RRH and Housing Choice Vouchers. These restrictions, though intended to create reasonable standards for housing quality, limit what units are available to homeless families. These restrictions require that some families live in larger units that are not affordable or economically sustainable after a RRH subsidy phases out, placing families at risk of becoming homeless again.

6.4 In collaboration with PHAs across the County, advocate for changes to Federal policy that currently makes adding a family member to a subsidized unit an onerous and lengthy process. This process should facilitate quick reunification in housing for family members exiting the justice system or child welfare system.

Increasing Available Housing Resources (In Progress): Many members of the Workgroup noted the protracted process to site and open new housing resources. Current efforts to address this include:

6.5 The development of an Interim and Supportive Housing Ordinance by Regional Planning that include provisions to allow interim housing uses in residential zoning areas designated as R1 and R2 zones. This Ordinance, once approved by the Board, would streamline production of supportive housing in unincorporated areas of the County by reducing the time for supportive housing units to receive appropriate permitting, zone changes, and plan amendments.

In addition to improving the utilization of existing resources, the County and cities should seek to increase housing resources by:

6.6 Requiring that a portion of any new housing funded by the County be dedicated to families experiencing homelessness. The Board should direct DMH and CDC to ensure a portion of new units funded through the No Place Like Home program and the Los Angeles County Housing Trust Fund are dedicated to families experiencing homelessness.

6.7 Advocate for additional State funding for RRH, prevention, diversion and other permanent housing interventions.
6.8 Advocating for increased Federal funding for the Continuum of Care program, the Housing Trust Fund program, the Family Unification Program, and other key programs that fund permanent housing solutions for families.

7. **Funding Agenda**

In addition to local policy and program changes, the Board should pursue changes to local funding and advocate for changes to State and Federal policy to increase housing access for homeless families.

*Funding*

7.1 Provide increased resources for Prevention and Diversion to address system capacity.

7.2 Ensure DPSS maximizes its HSP to position DPSS/LAHSA to seek an allocation increase through the annual California Department of Social Services HSP application that can be applied toward RRH and other CESF housing programs for FY 2019-20.

8. **Advocacy Agenda**

8.1 **State Policy:** The Board should direct the State legislative advocates in Sacramento to support the following State budget action and legislation that supports families:

- Support increased funding for free or affordable child care programs for low-income families. This is consistent with existing policy and February 5, 2019 Board Motion supporting investments that increase access to early child care and education programs.

- Support increases to the CalWORKs grant for families to 50 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This is consistent with the County's current “support” position on the Governor's $13.1 million State General Fund proposal to increase CalWORKs grant levels by 13.1 percent, effective October 2019, and bring CalWORKs grants to 50 percent of the FPL.

- Support new/increased funding for local jurisdictions to address homelessness and ensure that such funding is not hindered by undue restrictions on program uses that would exclude interventions such as RRH, that such funding sufficiently supports agency administration of any new/increased funding.

- Support AB 36, which would partially repeal the Costa-Hawkins Act, and give jurisdictions more flexibility to enact rent stabilization policies that protect families from sharp rent increases. This is consistent with the County's current “support” position adopted on April 11, 2019.

- Support AB 1436, which would increase the State Earned Income Disregard (EID) for CalWORKs grant recipients. This is consistent with current County efforts, in partnership with the California Welfare Directors Association and
Western Center on Law and Poverty, to increase the State EID for CalWORKs grant recipients.

- Support AB 1481, which would institute just cause eviction protections throughout the state and potentially reduce the number of families facing eviction.
- Support SCA-1, which would place a measure on the 2020 ballot to repeal Article 34 of the California Constitution, which creates barriers to construction of affordable and supportive housing.
- Support SB 18, which would create additional funding for homeless prevention programs, including legal services, which can prevent families from falling in to homelessness. This is consistent with the County’s “support” position adopted on April 16, 2019.

8.2 Federal Policy: The Board should direct the Federal legislative advocates in Washington, D.C. to support the following:

- Support efforts to increase funding for homeless families in the Federal budget, including but not limited to:
  - The Continuum of Care program,
  - The Emergency Solutions Grant program,
  - The Housing Choice Voucher program,
  - The Federal Housing Trust Fund program, and
  - The Family Unification Program.
- Support H.R. 1856 (Waters-CA), which would significantly increase Federal resources to address homelessness. This is consistent with the County’s current efforts to pursue a “support” position on this bill.
- Support efforts to streamline voucher use by easing occupancy requirements for use of Federally-funded RRH and Housing Choice Vouchers to ensure they do not create barriers to safely housing large homeless families.
- Support efforts to streamline the process to add family members to a Housing Choice Voucher to enable family members to reunite with other family members, including but not limited to family members exiting the justice system, the child welfare system, and other systems who would otherwise be at risk of homelessness.
- Oppose efforts to place restrictions on public assistance that vulnerable families rely on to maintain their housing, including but not limited to:
  - The Administration’s Making Affordable Housing Work Act (MAHWA), which would impose additional work requirements on housing assistance. This is consistent with the County’s current “oppose” position on this proposal.
H.R. 84 (Biggs-AZ), which would penalize Federally-assisted families that fail to comply with certain community service or self-sufficiency requirements.

H.R. 2179 (Rouzer-NC), which would require that recipients of Federal assistance be drug tested and denied benefits in the event of a failed drug test.

B. Recurring Report on Enhancing CESF

As requested by this Board motion, LAHSA and its partners have developed and propose the following implementation plan for the recurring report that will enable the Board to conduct ongoing monitoring of the functioning of CESF.

It is important to note that the recurring report will show a point-in-time snapshot of what is happening in the CESF system. The recurring report is not a full systemwide evaluation but rather a tool for monitoring system effectiveness. This section highlights key information on the frequency, format, metrics, and key milestones of the implementation of the recurring report.

**Frequency:** The report will be shared with the Board, CES Policy Council, and LAHSA’s Policy and Planning (P&P) and Program and Evaluation (P&E) committee quarterly, with the first report being shared at the end of May 2019. Thereafter, at the end of each quarter (i.e., March, June, September, December), data validation, analysis and development of a report will take approximately two months.

Below is a proposed full-year cycle of reporting dates and period each report will cover:

- End of May 2019 (reporting on FY 2018-19, Q1-Q3)
- End of August 2019 (reporting on FY 2018-19, Q1-Q4)
- End of November 2019 (reporting on FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, Q1)
- End of February 2018 (reporting on FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, Q1-Q2)

**Format:** The Quarterly CESF Progress Report will be in a dashboard-type format containing metrics that will be in the CES System Dashboard that LAHSA is developing. The proposed metrics and their definitions are included at the end of this section. Most of the metrics were included in the CESF analysis presented in this report. The overall format of the report will be as follows:

- An overall summary dashboard highlighting key elements of: 1) how families are connected to CESF; 2) what happens to families while in the system; and 3) what happens to them when they exit the system.
- Each additional dashboard will be a separate program, or system component, covering the same themes, as above, as applicable.
- Brief narrative summarizing themes in the dashboard and any important changes or trends and other contextual information to understand the data.
Comparative data covering the same timeframe from the previous fiscal year will also be included. Any factors, including increased funding or implementation of a recommendation, that may have impacted the change in trends will also be highlighted in the recurring report. SPA data will also be included wherever it is feasible to do so.

**Phases:** The recurring report will be developed in two phases.
- **Phase 1** – starting in May 2019: this report will include metrics used in this initial report to the Board and HUD system performance measures that are relevant to the Board’s request. All data will be from the Los Angeles Continuum of Care (CoC’s) HMIS that LAHSA maintains. See below the CES Families Recurring Report Proposed Metrics and the Definitions of Recurring Report Metrics for Phase 1.

- **Phase 2** – from April through November 2019: county partner agencies will continue to meet to discuss metrics proposed for the recurring report and ensure data is pulled and interpreted the same way across agencies. In addition, county partner agencies will review what data could be provided through the Los Angeles Countywide Master Data Management system to reduce data duplication and effort. Beyond metrics provided in Phase 1, additional data will be added including average wait time from screening to first appointment, county services accessed while in the program, and average length of time from assessment to housed/placed. See below the CESF Recurring Report Proposed Metrics for Phase 2.

**Key Milestones:** Below are the key milestones for Phase 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Key Milestone</th>
<th>Proposed Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First recurring report</td>
<td>End of May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second recurring report</td>
<td>End of August 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Key Milestones</th>
<th>Proposed Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate meeting to discuss potential of ELP match with county partners</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with county partners to further discuss metrics to include in recurring report including metric definition and alignment</td>
<td>June – August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize metric definition and alignment</td>
<td>August 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather county partner agency data (any data covering FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, Q1)</td>
<td>October 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate all county partner agency data in CESF recurring report</td>
<td>End of November 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CESF Progress Report Proposed Metrics**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metrics</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW WERE FAMILIES CONNECTED?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Point of Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families seeking housing assistance/# referrals to CES</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families screened</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown on where families were referred from</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAs where families screened, if known</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families in the system for the first time*</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families diverted</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families receiving prevention services</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families returning to homelessness*</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of time families remain homeless*</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average wait time from screening to first appointment</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT HAPPENED WHILE FAMILIES WERE IN THE SYSTEM?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people assessed</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuity level of those assessed</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAs where families assessed, if known</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families served</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Metrics</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: * = HUD System Performance Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families served in each SPA</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age breakdown</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average family size and range</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average income or median income, and range</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity breakdown of households</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income type (e.g., single, dual, no income households)</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs: (Interim housing, RRH, PH, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families active</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of newly enrolled</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length in the program</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County services accessed while in the program, if known</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of time from assessment to housed/placed</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Metrics (Note: * = HUD System Performance Measures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHAT HAPPENED WHEN FAMILIES EXITED THE SYSTEM?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families exited</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families exited to permanent housing*</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown by exit destination</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#/% of people that increased their income from entry to exit*</td>
<td>LAHSA Data</td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families that gained (received any new) public benefits either while in the program or at exit</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAHSA &amp; any County Partner data available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions of Recurring Report Proposed Metrics for Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Current Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOW WERE FAMILIES CONNECTED?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Point of Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families seeking housing assistance/ # referrals to CES</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families initially screened</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households that have been assessed with the “CES for Families – Screening Tool v3”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown on where families were referred from</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households broken down by referral method (c_Referral_Method_Family) as tracked in the assessment “CES for Families – Screening Tool v3”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAs where families screened, if known</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households broken down by the SPA of the agency that entered the assessment “CES for Families – Screening Tool v3”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families in the system for the first time</td>
<td>Based on the HUD System Performance Measure #5.2: Out of the persons with entries into ES, SH, TH, or PH (including RRH) during the reporting period, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH, or PH (including RRH) in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Metric</td>
<td>Current Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families diverted</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households that were diverted as tracked at screening (c_Outcome_of_Screening in screening tool) or as an enrollment into a diversion program (program name like “%FSC Diversion%”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families receiving prevention services</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households that were enrolled in a prevention program (program name like “%FSC Homelessness Prevention%”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families returning to homelessness</td>
<td>Based on the HUD System Performance Measures #2a &amp; #2b: Out of the clients who exited to a permanent housing destination (from SO, ES, TH, SH, or PH (including RRH)) in the date range two years prior to the report date range, how many of them returned to homelessness as indicated in the HMIS system for up to two years after their initial exit during the report date range. See HUD’s SPM Programming Specifications for more details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># length of time families remain homeless</td>
<td>The number of clients active in the report date range along with their average and median length of time homeless across the relevant universe of projects (ES, SH, TH, and PH (including RRH)). This includes time homeless during the report date range as well as prior to the report start date, going back no further than 10/01/2012. This measure includes data from each client’s Living Situation (Data Standards element 3.917) response as well as time spent in permanent housing projects (including RRH) between Project Start and Housing Move-In. See HUD’s SPM Programming Specifications for more details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAPPENED TO PEOPLE WHILE IN THE SYSTEM?**

**Assessments**

# of families assessed Unduplicated head of households that have been assessed with the “CES for Families – VI-FSPDAT v2”.

Acuity level of those assessed Unduplicated head of households broken down by the Acuity Score as calculated by the assessment “CES for Families – VI-FSPDAT v2”.

**Demographics**

Age breakdown Unduplicated clients broken down by Age range.

Average family size and range The average count of clients in each household, as well as a breakdown of clients by household size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Current Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average income or median income, and range</td>
<td>The average household income and AMI ranges as of program entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity breakdown of persons</td>
<td>Unduplicated clients broken down by Race and Ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Unduplicated clients broken down by Gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families active</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households that are active in an FSC program during the reporting period, broken down by program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate</td>
<td>Average occupancy during the reporting period broken down by program. Average occupancy is calculated based on the number of total nights clients stayed in the program during the period, divided by the total number of bed nights available during the report period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of newly enrolled</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households with a program entry date in the report period, broken down by program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of program enrollment</td>
<td>The average of the number of days active in an FSC program. Based on the program’s tracking method; Entry/Exit will be based on days between program entry and exit, and Night-by-Night (ES programs only) will be based on number of nights with a bed service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHAT HAPPENED WHEN PEOPLE EXITED THE SYSTEM?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families exited</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households where they’ve exited from their latest FSC enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of families exited to permanent housing</td>
<td>Based on the HUD System Performance Measures #7a.1 and #7b.1: Count of leavers who exited SO, ES, SH, TH, PH – RRH, and PH (without moving into housing) during the report range and how many of those exited to permanent housing destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown by exit destination</td>
<td>Unduplicated head of households where they’ve exited from their latest FSC enrollment, broken down by destination types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#/% of families that increased their income from entry to exit</td>
<td>Based on the HUD System Performance Measure #4.6 (expanded beyond just CoC programs): - A count of families who:  • Have exited from one or more of the relevant projects between [report start date] and [report end date] and who is not active in any of the relevant projects as of the [report end date].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Metric</th>
<th>Current Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 | • Have an adult member  
|                 | • Increased income based on each system leaver’s income assessment at project exit compared to the client’s income assessment at project start. |
Families in Skid Row Data

To demonstrate progress on reducing the number of families on Skid Row and success of its efforts to strengthen connections between Skid Row and CESF, LAHSA began tracking and reporting data in November 2018 (Table 2).

The number of homeless families residing at Union Rescue Mission has decreased by 45% since September 2018 (Table 1). Of the 96 families who entered URM at any point between November 2018 – February 2019, 77% were screened and 61% were assessed by an FSC (Table 2). Of the 34 families who had exited URM by the end of February 2019, only 18% moved directly to permanent housing. Another 38% exited to a different interim housing program, while 44% exited to an unknown destination.

Table 1: Point-in-Time Census of Families at Union Rescue Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep-18¹</th>
<th>Dec-18</th>
<th>Mar-19</th>
<th>% Change (Sep-18 to Mar-19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Tracking of Families over Time at Union Rescue Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entered URM at any point during reporting period</th>
<th># of Families</th>
<th>% of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screened by FSC</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined FSC services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed by FSC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC Interim Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCFS housing program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Permanent Housing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited URM</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited to Interim Housing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38% of total exits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited to Permanent Housing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18% of total exits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exited to unknown destination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44% of total exits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Macro Environmental Forces that Influence Family Homelessness

A number of macro environmental trends function as drivers of family homelessness and contribute to the increased number of families entering the homeless service delivery system. These trends can be summarized broadly in four themes:

A) Rising housing costs and scarcity of existing affordable housing;
B) Stagnant income and employment barriers;
C) Safety net policies that are insufficient or too slow to respond to macroeconomic conditions;
D) Rising child care costs and scarcity of affordable options.

A) Rising housing costs and scarcity of existing affordable housing

Housing dynamics have been the primary macroeconomic driver of family homelessness. These factors include significant rises in rental housing costs in recent years and scarcity of available rental units for families with low and very-low incomes.

1) Housing Costs

High rental housing costs are a significant issue for low-income families. In 2018, the average rent in Los Angeles County was $2,267, an increase of 46 percent from only five years ago, when the average rent was $1,558.1 Limited affordable housing stock further affects the ability of low-income families to find housing. In Los Angeles County (the County) in 2017, 89.1 percent of rental housing units cost more than $800 per month,2 a rise from 2012, when 82.5 percent of rental housing units cost more than $800 per month.3

2) Scarcity of Available Units for Families

Low vacancy rates, especially in more affordable neighborhoods, further squeeze low-income families. In 2018, the vacancy rate was 4 percent in the County.4 Low vacancies are further compounded as the County has a shortage of 568,255 affordable housing units.5

The County is also losing affordable units. Over 5,000 restricted units in the County lost their affordability restrictions from 1997-2018.6

---

2 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 102B.
3 2012 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 102B.
5 California Housing Partnership Corporation. (April 2018). Los Angeles County Annual Affordable Housing Outcomes Report.
6 California Housing Partnership Corporation. (February 2019). California’s Affordable Rental Homes At-Risk.
B) Stagnant income and employment barriers

Income levels and unemployment rates directly affect the ability of families to secure and maintain housing.

1) Family Income

Household income has been fairly stagnant. Median family income in the County was $64,051 in 2012 and rose to $72,816 by 2017, a 13.7 percent increase.7 However, household income remained very low for the lowest quintile of households. The 20th percentile of households earned $25,264 in 2017, meaning a full 20 percent of households earned less than $25,264 in that year.8This represents an improvement from 2012, as the number of households earning less than $25,000 shrank 10.2 percent from a total of 729,318 households in 2012 to 654,782 households in 2017.9 Despite this improvement, rents have increased over this time at a faster rate than incomes, meaning that overall affordability has not improved even as more households have increased their incomes. The standard definition of affordability is paying no more than 30 percent of a household’s income towards rent. Paying over 30 percent of one’s rent is considered being “cost burdened,” while paying over 50 percent of one’s income is considered being “severely cost burdened.” In 2017, 519,536 households (or 28.9 percent of the 1.8 million renter households in the County) were severely cost-burdened, paying over 50 percent of their income of rent.10

2) Employment

Unemployment has fallen considerably over the last five years in the County. In 2012, the overall unemployment rate was 11.6 percent, but fell to 6 percent by 2017.11 However, unemployment remains higher than average for demographics that are overrepresented in the homeless population; among African Americans in Los Angeles County, the unemployment rate was 9.7 percent in 2017.12

C) Safety net policies that are insufficient or too slow to respond to macroeconomic conditions

In general, safety net policies and benefits that keep families out of deep poverty have not nearly kept pace with rising costs of living.

---

7 2012 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 61; 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 61. All figures adjusted for inflation.
8 Ibid.
9 2012 & 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 56A. All figures adjusted for inflation.
10 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 103.
11 2012 and 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 37.
12 2017 American Community Survey One-Year Estimates for Los Angeles County. Table 41.
1) Low Benefit Levels

Effective April 1, 2019, the maximum CalWORKs grant will increase by 10 percent to $785 per month for a family of three. However, this income amounts to only 43.6 percent of the Federal poverty level. Prior to this increase, cost of living adjustments (COLA) to CalWORKs participants had been suspended during the Great Recession, meaning the real value of the CalWORKs grant declined slightly from $723 for a family of three in 2009 to $714 for a family of three in 2018. The COLA will be restored beginning in the 2022-23 State budget.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI) has annual cost of living adjustments, but average rents in the County rose at triple the rate of the SSI increase from 2012 to 2017.

Note: additional restrictions around benefits will be discussed in next section (“Other Policies that Influence Family Homelessness”).

2) Current Rent Control Policies & Eviction Policies

The State’s Costa Hawkins Act, enacted by the legislature in 1995, placed restrictions on local jurisdictions' authority to enact rent stabilization policies, effectively limiting the number of housing units that can be covered by rent stabilization. Due to the Act, properties excluded from local rent stabilization ordinances include rental units built after 1995 or after the jurisdiction enacted their rent stabilization ordinance (whichever is earlier), as well as, single-family homes being used as rental units. In addition, the Costa Hawkins Act mandated that landlords be permitted to raise rents to market rates once a rent-stabilized unit is vacated.

Rental units in the unincorporated areas of LA County built before 1995 are now covered by a temporary rent stabilization ordinance adopted by the Board but the County’s ordinance is still subject to the limitations imposed by the Costa Hawkins Act.

Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) units in the City of Los Angeles, unincorporated areas of the County and the cities of Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, West Hollywood and Inglewood are covered by Just Cause eviction policies. However, non-RSO units in these cities and the unincorporated areas, and all rental units in other cities in LA County are not covered by Just Cause, meaning tenants can be evicted without cause at any time.

Recent research shows families are especially vulnerable to eviction, as women with children have the highest risks of eviction.

---

D) Rising child care costs and scarcity of affordable options

Affordable child care allows parents to secure employment and/or attend school, two common mechanisms for increasing income. Yet recent research suggests that child care may be prohibitively expensive and inaccessible to families experiencing homelessness.

1) High Cost of Child Care

Child care in the County continues to be a burden on families. The average cost for full-time infant care at a licensed child care center rose 19.7 percent from $12,823 in 2012 to $15,351 in 2017. Similarly, full-time infant care at a licensed family child care home rose 14.3 percent from $8,095 in 2012 to $9,251 in 2017.16

2) Limited Availability of Child Care

Alongside cost, the supply of child care is limited. There are not enough physical slots in licensed child care programs.17 In addition, subsidized child care programs have tight eligibility requirements that may preclude some families from utilizing them. For example, mandatory participation in work or educational activities may be an obstacle for families especially those who are at-risk or experiencing homelessness.18

Other Policies that Influence Family Homelessness

A number of policy barriers exist for families that may contribute to homelessness. These include barriers to receipt of public assistance that increase the likelihood of a family of falling into homelessness, as well as, logistical and policy barriers to accessing subsidized housing that decrease a family’s flexibility to exit homelessness. In short, these barriers can be characterized as follows:

A) CalWORKs Restrictions;
B) Restrictions on use of Federal resources for undocumented family members;
C) Occupancy and family size policies for subsidized housing.

A) CalWORKs Restrictions

For adults to receive CalWORKs grants, most parents must participate in Welfare-to-Work (WtW) activities at a minimum of 20-30 hours per week for single parents and 35 hours per week for two-parent households. While there are exemptions to these requirements, families in crisis may struggle to meet the weekly hour requirements. Homelessness is considered “good cause” for failure to meet WtW requirements, but a

housing crisis falling short of literal homelessness may not be sufficient cause to suspend the WtW restrictions.

CalWORKs adult participants are subject to a maximum of 48 months of benefit receipt (with some exceptions). This has resulted in a reduction in aided adult participants on CalWORKs caseloads every year between FY 2010-11. Much of this is attributed to the expanding economy, but for other programs such as, the less restrictive CalFresh Program, the number of aided adults and households receiving CalFresh has grown over that same period. This suggests that program restrictions, such as time limits and welfare-to-work restrictions could play a role in the CalWORKs declines.19

B) Restrictions on Undocumented Family Members

Recent estimates suggest there are over 800,000 undocumented immigrants living in the County.20 While many homelessness resources, such as Federally-funded shelter programs and locally-funded Measure H programs, are available to people regardless of documentation status, certain safety net programs, such as the Housing Choice Voucher program and CalWORKs, have documentation restrictions. The Federal government has also recently proposed further restrictions for undocumented immigrants. This proposal has been associated with disenrollment from needed public benefits, even in cases where immigrants were lawfully entitled to continue receiving benefits without impact on immigration status.21

C) Occupancy Policies and Other Housing Restrictions

Several Housing and Urban Development (HUD) policies limit the ability of jurisdictions to efficiently move families out of homelessness and into housing. Housing Quality Standards limit assistance to units with a least one bedroom per two household members, confining the range of housing options for CoC-funded Rapid Re-Housing programs, among other programs. In addition, children of the opposite sex may not be permitted to live in the same bedroom or living/sleeping room.22 An unintended consequence of this policy is that it serves as an impediment to housing families in a competitive housing market where units with multiple bedrooms are both rare and expensive.

Adding family members to a HUD-subsidized unit is a challenge, especially for families with children in the child welfare system. At present, if a family member is separated from a child due to homelessness, qualifying for an appropriately-sized unit can be a challenging process.

---

22 24 CFR § 982.401 – Housing Quality Standards.
## Additional Enhancing the CESF Recommendations: Non-Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>System Capacity and Coordination</td>
<td>Enhance CESF Capacity</td>
<td>Provide stronger management and support from CES LAHSA coordinators to better assist the providers with technical assistance to support regional infrastructure and SPA workplan priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>System Capacity and Coordination</td>
<td>Improve Service Coordination</td>
<td>Evaluate how the Health Agency (DPH/DMH/DHS) health records can be connected to the vulnerability index (VI-FSDPAT) so that the participant’s acuity and need can more accurately reflect a family’s barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>System Capacity and Coordination</td>
<td>Enhance CESF Infrastructure</td>
<td>Provide guidance on mechanisms that can be used to improve staff pay and benefits to increase recruitment and retention of specific homeless service positions that experience high turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Retention and Stability</td>
<td>Support Efforts to Increase Income</td>
<td>Seek State legislation to increase the earned income disregard for TANF/CalWORKs participants to allow for families to gain employment and increase income without abrupt benefit loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>Increase Interim Housing Capacity</td>
<td>Utilize incentives for families to support exits from Interim Housing to Permanent Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>Increase Interim Housing Capacity</td>
<td>Create policies that allow for site-based interim housing in R1 single family zones to facilitate use of shared housing as bridge housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>Increase Interim Housing Capacity</td>
<td>Explore development of a local policy establishing parameters and/or limitations on the ability of a family to reject available housing and remain in system-funded interim housing and in the queue for permanent housing. This may include incentivizing acceptance of appropriate permanent housing placements when they become available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>Increase Interim Housing Capacity</td>
<td>Advocate for change to Federal policy to expand eligibility to SAPC’s Recovery Bridge Housing beds to include fathers with children and families with children over age 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Improve Use of Vouchers and Housing Subsidies</td>
<td>Expand use of RRH holding fees that can be paid to landlords to hold vacant units to increase access to private market housing units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Increase Available Housing Resources</td>
<td>Explore use of government-owned properties, including LAUSD properties, to increase stock of affordable housing sites with minimal zoning restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>Increase Available Housing Resources.</td>
<td>Explore implementation of shared housing strategies for families. Engage in robust research around best practices for family shared housing and develop clear technical assistance for providers to implement shared housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNDING SCENARIOS

The following scenarios outline different funding options for the CESF in FY 2019-20. These scenarios are based on full year implementation; however, depending on which scenario is selected, implementation might begin at some point during FY 2019-20 and/or might not be implemented all at once.

The scenarios are as follows:

A. Maintain current system capacity, inclusive of increases already proposed for FY 2019-20

B. Increase funding for problem solving/diversion and prevention, while establishing an annual system capacity of 3,500 each for RRH and interim housing

C. Increase funding to be able to serve all households that need assistance through interim housing and RRH

Scenario A: Current System Capacity
Outlines system capacity based on continuing operations, utilizing the proposed FY 2019-20 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2019-20 Proposed Measure H Funding</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 Proposed Non-Measure H Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Solution Centers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>$6,529,880</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>$24,330,794</td>
<td>$27,067,048</td>
<td>$37,033,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>$35,465,227</td>
<td>$34,823,628</td>
<td>$44,680,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Subsidy</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Regional Coordination, DV, etc.)</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,123,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,103,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,427,350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total to be served 5,993 Households
Total successfully diverted 748 Households
| Total not successfully diverted and not able to connect to services | 0 |
| Total enrolled in RRH | 5,245 Households |
| Total placed in Housing | 1,372 Households |
| Total enrolled in Interim Housing | 4,786 Households |
| Total Annual Costs | $102,163,996 |
| Total to be served | 5,993 Households |

**Scenario A: Cost methodology**

- **Case Management Staffing**: Adds an additional 33 Case Managers for a total of 99 (baseline of 66) case managers, which means a case management ratio to 61:1.

- **Interim Housing/RRH Costs**: Based on current FY 19-20 proposed budget through Measure H and other projected funding sources, which includes the additional City of LA HEAP funds.

**Scenario B: Increased Funding for Diversion & Prevention**

Outlines system capacity with additional funding being dedicated to the Coordinated Entry System for Families (CESF) to include funding for Problem Solving/Diversion, Prevention and Family Solution Centers (FSC).

### B. Increased Funding for Diversion & Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>FY 2018-19 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Scenario Funding</th>
<th>Difference between Scenario Funding and FY 2019-20 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2019-20 Proposed Measure H Funding</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 Proposed Non-Measure H Funding</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 Total Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Solution Centers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$7,135,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>$6,529,880</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>$24,330,794</td>
<td>$27,067,048</td>
<td>$9,966,320</td>
<td>$37,033,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>$35,465,227</td>
<td>$34,823,628</td>
<td>$9,857,134</td>
<td>$44,680,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Subsidy</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Regional Coordination, DV, etc.)</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,123,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,103,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,323,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,427,350</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            |      |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total to be served | 5,993 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total successfully diverted | 997 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total not successfully diverted and not able to connect to services | 1,496 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total enrolled in RRH | 3,500 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total placed in Housing | 1,750 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total enrolled in Interim Housing | 3,500 Households |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total Annual Costs | $111,973,164 |            |      |            |            |      |
| Total to be served | 4,248 Households |            |      |            |            |      |

**Scenario B Cost methodology**

**Case Management staffing**
Adds an additional 46 Case Managers for a total of 113 (baseline of 66) case managers, which creates a case management ratio of 31:1.

**Interim Housing cost Assumptions**
- Used the base population of 3,065 families
- 80% expected to have the avg. interim housing length of stay (133 days) and cost of ($95 which is an avg. of site based and MV)
- Congregate shelters will self-resolve 15% of newly enrolled clients
- We estimate a savings in operation costs from doing congregate

**RRH Cost Assumptions**
- Used the cap of 3,500 families, based on the model scenario
- Move-in Success rate of 50%
- Avg. cost to house a family $21,824 through RRH
Scenario C: Serve All Families
Outlines system capacity with additional funding being dedicated to the CESF to include funding for Problem Solving/Diversion, Prevention, RRH, and FSCs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>FY 2018-19 Budget</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Scenario Funding</th>
<th>Difference between Scenario Funding and FY 2019-20 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$7,135,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Solution Centers</td>
<td>$6,529,880</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>$24,330,794</td>
<td>$27,067,048</td>
<td>$9,966,320</td>
<td>$67,236,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>$35,465,227</td>
<td>$34,823,628</td>
<td>$9,857,134</td>
<td>$40,387,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>$24,330,794</td>
<td>$27,067,048</td>
<td>$9,966,320</td>
<td>$30,203,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$8,989,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Subsidy</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
<td>$2,916,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Regional Coordination, DV, etc.)</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$2,797,220</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,123,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,103,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,323,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,462,654</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total to be served: 5,993 Households
Total successfully diverted: 1,217 Households
Total not successfully diverted and not able to connect to services: 0
Total enrolled in RRH: 4,776 Households
Total placed in Housing: 2,388 Households
Total enrolled in Interim Housing: 4,786 Households
Total Annual Costs: $140,462,654
Total to be served: 5,993 Households
### Scenario C: Cost methodology

**Case Management staffing**
Adds an additional 174 Case Managers for a total of 240 case managers which creates CMs a 25:1 ratio.

**Interim Housing cost formula**
Assumptions applied:
- Used the base population of 4,786 families
- 80% expected to have the avg. interim housing length of stay (133 days) and cost of ($95 which is an avg. of site based and MV)
- Congregate shelters will self-resolve 15% of newly enrolled clients
- We estimate a savings in operation costs from doing congregate

**RRH cost formula**
Assumptions applied:
- Used the base population of 4,776 families
- Move-in Success rate of 50%
- Avg. cost to house a family $21,824

### Scenario Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Scenario C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total to be served</td>
<td>5,993 Households</td>
<td>4,497 Households</td>
<td>5,993 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversion of 15% or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total successfully</td>
<td>748 Households</td>
<td>997 Households</td>
<td>1,217 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not successfully</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,745 Households</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverted and not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to connect to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrolled in RRH</td>
<td>5,245 Households</td>
<td>3,500 Households</td>
<td>4,776 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total placed in housing</td>
<td>1,372 Households</td>
<td>1,750 Households</td>
<td>2,388 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrolled in</td>
<td>4,786 Households</td>
<td>3,500 Households</td>
<td>4,786 Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Costs</td>
<td>$104,427,350</td>
<td>$111,973,164</td>
<td>$140,462,654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Scenario Assumptions & Unknowns

This section outlines the key assumptions made when developing each funding scenario. Additionally, this section identifies several unknowns, which have not been accounted for in the development of funding scenarios, as their impacts on the system are unquantifiable at this time.

### Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption #1 →</th>
<th>Success and System Costs are positively correlated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption #2 →</td>
<td>It is projected that 7,041 families(^1) will seek RRH Services in FY 2019-20. Many of these families are also likely to need interim housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption #3 →</td>
<td>Of the 7,041 families seeking services, it is projected that 1,048 families will be initially diverted from the system in FY 2019-20 across all scenarios. This results in 5,993 families who will need services through CESF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption #4 →</td>
<td>Program success is defined as the placement of families into permanent housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption #5 →</td>
<td>There is a baseline of 66 Case Managers serving in the CESF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption #6</td>
<td>All Scenarios have an applied diversion rate of 15% to the projected screenings of 4,091 new families. In addition to the 15%, scenario B &amp; C have another assumed diversion rate of 40% of the projected new enrollments based on the amount of resources that would be applied to diversion, which is included in the Scenario Comparison Chart, p. 5. This diversion rate was determined based on current diversion experience in the CESF as well as national program estimates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unknowns

| Unknown #1 → | Impact of Problem-Solving/Diversion services on the CESF |
| Unknown #2 → | Impact of properly funding FSC/Access Centers on system inflow and Problem Solving/Diversion activities |
| Unknown #3 → | Impact of congregate shelters on the length of stay in Interim Housing |
| Unknown #4 → | Impact of market factors on housing placements and program success |

---

\(^1\) Based off linear regression model, using 3.5 years of program data