Orange County's Rapid Re-Housing Goals and Outcomes

This report explains goals that have been set for Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects by the Orange County Continuum of Care (CoC), what they mean for Orange County residents experiencing homelessness, and the outcome of two cycles of performance data review.

2-1-1 Orange County first published project performance data for RRH projects in April 2019 after deciding on measures and goals in 2018. Performance data was published again in November 2019. The report published in April 2019 looked at data from clients who were active from 3/1/2018 to 2/28/2019 and the report published in November 2019 looked at data from clients who were active from 10/1/2018 to 9/30/2019.

The following goals apply to RRH projects:

**Goal 1: Prioritize Clients Experiencing Literal Homelessness**
Projects are making huge improvements in exclusively serving clients who are experiencing literal homelessness immediately prior to project entry.

**Goal 4: Place Households in Units as Soon as Possible**
Projects continue to make improvements on this goal, but the project type struggles with consistently placing clients in housing units in fewer than 30 days after their enrollment.

**Goal 6 & 7: Help Adult Clients Increase Their Income While Enrolled and as of Project Exit**
In part due to the short term nature of the assistance provided by Rapid Re-Housing projects, the project type struggles to help clients increase their income during their enrollment and by the time they exit the project.

**Goal 8: Help Clients Exit to Successful Housing Situations**
Although there appears to be a significant minority of projects that are not achieving this goal, the majority of clients are exited from RRH projects to successful housing destinations.

**Goal 10: Effectively Use CoC Funds to Place Households in Permanent Housing**
The majority of projects are currently meeting this goal, and the overall project type score for using CoC funds effectively is well under the target for this goal.

**Goal 11: Ensure Clients Do Not Fall Back Into Homelessness After Being Housed**
The majority of Rapid Re-Housing projects are effectively stabilizing clients in permanent housing because 93% of clients who exited to permanent housing do not return to homelessness within two years of their exit date.

*Goals 2, 3, 5, and 9 do not apply to RRH projects.*
Goal 1: Prioritize People Experiencing Literal Homelessness

Why does this goal matter? Our goal is to have 100% of clients in RRH projects coming from literal homelessness situations to ensure that our CoC's limited resources are focused on those with the greatest need. The purpose of Rapid Re-Housing projects is to help individuals and families "living on the streets or in emergency shelters solve the practical and immediate challenges to obtaining permanent housing while reducing the amount of time they experience homelessness" (Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Rapid Re-Housing Brief*, 2014)

Where are we right now? As a project type, RRH projects are very close to meeting the goal of 100% entries from literal homelessness. Clients entering projects from non-literal homeless situations are coming from unstable situations of living with family or friends or in a hotel/motel, and various rental situations.

Any standout project successes? One project nearly doubled their score to meet the goal of housing 100% clients entering from literal homelessness!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April Score</th>
<th>November Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illumination Foundation - TAY State ESG</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are we maintaining our goals? Of the 19 projects that met the goal of enrolling only clients entering from literal homelessness in April, 89% were able to maintain that goal in the November analysis.

What's the bottom line? The majority of RRH projects enroll 100% people entering from literal homeless situations. Of the 9 projects that did not meet this goal in the November analysis, 5 projects were within 9% of meeting the goal. Of 1,096 enrollments included in this analysis, only 35 came from situations other than literal homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieved Goal</th>
<th>Did not achieve goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4: Place Households in Units As Soon As Possible

*Why does this goal matter?* Since a primary goal for Rapid Re-Housing projects is to re-house people in permanent housing from literal homeless situations and reduce the amount of time client remains homeless, it is important to move clients from their literal homeless situation into permanent housing as quickly as possible. Clients may agree to receive services and be found eligible for a program’s assistance before a unit is available. Our goal is for projects to place clients into units within 30 days of the client’s enrollment in the project.

**Where are we right now?**

The majority of projects did not meet the goal of placing households in units within 30 days of their acceptance into the project.

![Achieved Goal 7 (27%)](Chart)

- Did not achieve goal 19 (73%)

**Overall Project Type Score**

48.2

**Any standout project successes?**

One project was able to meet the goal in November after not meeting it in April, and two projects made huge improvements of more than 70 days over their April score!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April Score</th>
<th>November Score</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illumination Foundation - Santa Ana ESG Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - CA State ESG</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - CoC JRHR Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data quality issues, such as misunderstanding of the difference between Project Start Date and Housing Move-In Date (as well as when and how to enter this data) may contribute to the higher scores for this goal. Improving data consistency across all agencies and project types is a current goal for the OC CoC.

**Are we maintaining our goals?**

The majority of projects are improving on this goal, however there are a significant number of projects with longer wait times from April to November.

![Maintained 3 (13%)](Chart)

- Shorter Wait Time 11 (46%)
- Longer Wait Time 10 (42%)

Fewer clients were placed into units within 30 days of enrollment in the November analysis compared to the April analysis period.

**What’s the bottom line?**

While a slight majority of clients are being placed in units within 30 days of enrollment, a significant number of clients are waiting more than 30 days to exit homelessness and enter permanent housing.

![61 - 90 Days 72 (9%)](Chart)

- 91+ Days 133 (16%)
- 31 - 60 Days 148 (18%)
- Within 30 Days 480 (58%)
Goals 6 & 7: Help Adult Clients Increase Their Income While Enrolled in RRH Projects and by the Time They Exit

**Why does this goal matter?** Helping adult clients increase their income so they can maintain the housing they've secured through RRH assistance is a crucial component of stabilizing clients served by RRH projects.

### Where are we right now?

The majority of projects did not meet the goals for stayers with increased income (at least 40%) or leavers with increased income (at least 42%).

- **Stayers**: Achieved Goal 5 (42%), Did not achieve goal 7 (58%)
- **Leavers**: Achieved Goal 7 (26%), Did not achieve goal 20 (74%)

### Any standout project successes?

Three projects that did not meet the goals in April were able to meet the goal in November. VOALA and Family Assistance Ministries increased their respective performance to 50% or more!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOALA - SSVF Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Assistance Ministries - Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - ESG Orange County RRP</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are we maintaining our goals?

Relatively few projects achieved the goal for leavers or stayers in April. Of those that met the leaver goal, the majority were able to meet the goal again in November. Unfortunately, half of projects that met the stayer goal in April were not able to maintain the goal in November.

- **Stayers**: Did Not Maintain Goal 2 (50%), Maintained Goal 2 (50%)
- **Leavers**: Did Not Maintain Goal 3 (43%), Maintained Goal 4 (57%)

### What's the bottom line?

Projects continue to struggle with helping clients to increase their income while enrolled in the project or by the time of project exit. Just over half of projects are improving or maintaining the total percentage of clients who increase their income while enrolled or at the time of project exit.

- **Stayers**: Improved 2 (22%), Maintained 3 (33%), Decreased 4 (44%)
- **Leavers**: Improved 3 (13%), Maintained 10 (4...), Decreased 11 (46%)
**Goal 8: Help Clients Exit to Successful Housing Situations**

*Why does this goal matter?* The goal of Rapid Re-Housing projects is to help clients "move as quickly as possible into permanent housing and achieve stability in that housing," (Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *FY2020 HMIS Data Standards*, 2019). Successful outcomes, meaning exits to permanent housing situations, are an important indication that a CoC’s RRH projects are operating effectively.

Where are we right now?

The majority of projects helped at least 80% of their clients exit to permanent housing during the analysis period.

![Pie chart showing 63% achieved goal and 37% did not achieve goal.]

Any standout project successes?

Two projects that did not meet the goal in the April analysis period were able to exit at least 80% of their clients to permanent housing destination in the November analysis period!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health America Los Angeles - SSVF</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Healthy Homecoming RRH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways of Hope - Paths Together Collaborative</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are we maintaining our goals?

Of the 16 projects that met the goal in the April analysis period, 88% were able to meet the goal again in November!

![Pie chart showing 88% maintained goal and 13% did not maintain goal.]

Successful 1180 (78%)

Unsuccessful 338 (22%)

What's the bottom line?

Although some projects are not meeting this goal, the majority of clients exit to successful destinations. When clients exit to destinations other than permanent housing, most end up on the streets or at Emergency Shelters.

![Pie chart showing destinations of exits.]

Not completed: 54 (16%)

On the Streets: 115 (34%)

Emergency Shelter: 92 (27%)

Other Destination: 77 (23%)
Goal 10: Effectively Use CoC Funds to Place Households in Units

Why does this goal matter? With limited amount of CoC funding to serve Orange County residents experiencing homelessness, households must be served as efficiently and prudentially as possible while not compromising the quality of service provided to clients.

Where are we right now?

Overall Project Type Score

$11,790

Per Successful Outcome

Of the 6 total CoC Funded projects, 4 were able to meet the goal of spending $19,040 or less to successfully house a single household!

Did not achieve goal

Achieved Goal

2 (33%)  
4 (67%)

Any standout project successes?

One project was able to cut their cost per successful outcome by 54% and meet the goal in November when they were unable to meet the goal in April!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - CoC JRHR Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>$23,127</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>($12,527)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three projects were able to get their cost per successful outcome under $10k during the November analysis period!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families Forward - HUD Rapid-Housing</td>
<td>$9,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Interfaith Emergency Service - Rapid Re-Housing for Families</td>
<td>$7,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval House - Rapid Re-Housing Project</td>
<td>$2,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are we maintaining our goals?

Of the four projects that met the goal in the April analysis period, 3 maintained the goal in the November analysis period!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Did Not Maintain Goal</th>
<th>Maintained Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From April to November, the project type score has decreased by $528!

What's the bottom line?

In the November analysis period, two projects improved their cost per successful outcome and one project maintained their score. This goal is difficult to measure due to accurate and up to date funding information not being required in HMIS. 211OC has access to CoC funding amounts through the publicly available NOFA Grant Inventory Worksheet, but because agencies receive funding from many varied sources, CoC funding is the only source able to be accurately analyzed.
Goal 11: Ensure Clients Do Not Fall Back Into Homelessness After Being Permanently Housed

Why does this goal matter? When a client has been permanently housed and then falls back into homelessness, they experience a severe setback in their housing stability. It is crucial that every effort is made to keep clients from experiencing homelessness again after being permanently housed. This goal cannot be met solely by individual projects, but must be a community wide effort.

Where are we right now? The majority of projects exit clients to permanent housing destinations with no more than 10% of those clients returning to the Orange County CoC.

Any standout project successes? Three projects that were not able to meet the goal in April did meet the goal in November. Two projects saw their score go down to 0% of clients returning to homelessness and one project cut their score nearly in half!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1736 Family Crisis Center - SSVF Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - CoC Rapid Re-housing (HO)</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy House - ESG Orange County RRP</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>-5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of projects that were able to meet the goal in April also met the goal in November!

Are we maintaining our goals? RRH projects consistently meet the goal of fewer than 10% of clients returning to homelessness after being permanently housed. Of the 440 clients who returned to homelessness in the November analysis, the majority went to Emergency Shelter projects.

What's the bottom line?