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Housing first/rapid re-housing works great for homeless singles.

- Landmark study by Culhane et al. in 2001
  - Target population: Single, chronically homeless, mentally ill
  - Benefit: Decreased reliance on emergency services

- Beginning in 2002, the Bush administration pushed to end chronic homelessness among singles using housing first.
  - Ten-year plans to end homelessness
  - Targeted funding

- With the success of housing first for homeless singles and increased funding targeted toward rapid re-housing, HUD encouraged providers to use the same model for families.
Homeless Families

- Homeless families are different than singles
  - Domestic violence
  - Lack of employment and underemployment
  - Child care and education-related issues
  - Health crises
  - Lack of affordable housing

- How do we know that rapid rehousing will work for families?
- What do we know about other housing models?
Rapid Re-housing Demonstration Program for Homeless Families

- HUD awarded grants to 23 CoC in 2009 (before HPRP)

- Directed to serve families with moderate barriers: could choose 3–6 months (5 sites), 12–15 months (13 sites), or hybrid (5 sites)

- Communities implemented program differently, makes evaluation challenging

- Sites didn’t give according to need, all the same assistance

- HPRP began before demonstration project even ended; still waiting on interim evaluation report
## Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter Grants Program</th>
<th>Emergency Solutions Grants Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter or street outreach</td>
<td>No cap on spending</td>
<td>Spending limited to either 60% of a grantee’s total allocation or the amount of funds used for those activities in the last year of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program, whichever is greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>No performance measures for funding</td>
<td>Funding allocations tied to communities’ ability to reduce length of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Spending limited to 30% of a grantee’s total allocation</td>
<td>No cap on spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid re-housing</td>
<td>Ineligible activity</td>
<td>Eligible activity, with rental assistance capped at 24 months in a three-year period per client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUD elected to use HPRP as a means to test prevention and rapid re-housing as laid out in the HEARTH Act.

A permanent housing subsidy is the strongest predictor of housing stability.

Does a short- or medium-term subsidy lead to self-sufficiency and housing stability?
Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program: Part II

**Monthly Cash Income of HPRP Clients**
(by percent of clients)

**Income at Exit**
- No income: 27.7%
- $1–$1,000: 39.7%
- $1,001–$2,000: 26.0%
- $2,001+: 6.6%

**Change from Entry to Exit**
- Less income at exit: 2.7%
- Same income at exit: 70.3%
- More income at exit: 6.2%
- Unknown income at exit: 20.9%
### HUD (2010): Average Cost per Family per Month by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Fair Market Rent for 2-Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$2,496 – $3,698</td>
<td>$2,146 – $2,188</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>$1,391</td>
<td>$1,940 – $4,482</td>
<td>$799</td>
<td>$743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>$1,614</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>$881</td>
<td>$612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstate South Carolina</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
<td>$1,209</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Have We Learned So Far?

- Rapid re-housing works for chronically homeless single adults.
- For cost reasons, the government was eager to switch the family homelessness system to rapid re-housing as well.
- A HUD-funded demonstration program on rapid re-housing still hasn’t released results yet.
- HPRP hasn’t yet provided evidence for the success of rapid re-housing.
Housing Stability of Families During the Year After Transitional Housing Exit

- Own housing, same unit whole time
- Own housing after short stay somewhere else
- Always own housing, moved at least once
- One or more moves, at least one to own housing and one to somewhere else
- Never own housing

Two percent of families experienced an episode of homelessness
Life After Transitional Housing for Homeless Families (2010)

- Employment rate of mothers
  - Program entry: 18%
  - Program exit: 61%
  - 12 months after exit: 65%

- 86% of families maintained the same household composition for at least one year after leaving transitional housing.

- Longer stays were associated with:
  - Higher educational attainment rate
  - Higher employment rate
  - Working more consistently after program exit
  - Greater likelihood of having own residence
  - Better mental health among children
Family Options Study (HUD): Part I

- Housing models
  - Community-based rapid re-housing
  - Project-based transitional housing
  - Permanent housing subsidies
  - Usual care (emergency shelter)

- Study quality
  - 2,307 families
  - 12 communities nationwide
  - Random assignment
Family Options Study (HUD): Part II

Timeline
- Project enrollment began September 2010
- Interim report released March 2013 (no outcomes data)
- 18-month follow-up survey to wrap up September 2013
- Final report expected in 2014

Outcome measures
- Housing stability
- Family Preservation
- Self-sufficiency
- Adult well-being
- Child well-being
New York City – a Case Study

- For a six-year period from 2005 – 2011
  - Number of families served increased from 8,986 to 13,543
  - Recidivism rates increased from 26% to 49%
  - Length of stay in shelter decreased from 344 days to 272 days

- Over that period of time, NYC spent $1.05 billion on sheltering families who re-entered the system.
Mercer County – a Case Study

+ Housing Now began in 2009
  + Rental assistance tied to TANF receipt and homelessness
  + April 2012-2013, 47% of families remained in permanent housing after subsidy ended and they exited off of TANF

+ Mercer’s rapid rehousing model is very service-rich
  + Specialized case managers with low caseloads
  + Negotiate below-market rate rents
  + Social services are co-located in one place
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