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Political Climate Prior to Newsom Administration

- City Controller’s Audit Report: “City Lacks Commonly Accepted Goals and an Effective Plan for Its Homeless Services” (May, 2002)
- California Superior Court Civil Grand Jury Report: “City’s efforts lack leadership, effective management, and coordination.” (May, 2002)
- Mayor Brown, “Homelessness is not solvable, only controllable.”
- Negative media attention: “Shame of the City” Series in San Francisco Chronicle
Political Climate Prior to Newsom Administration

- Lack of public confidence in homeless service delivery system (Hotel Council, Restaurant Association Billboards, Annual City Survey)
- Care not Cash and Anti-Panhandling Legislation passed by voters (60/40)
- Newsom Mayoral Campaign: Homelessness is “#1, #2, and #3 Issue”
Movement to Action

- Implement Care Not Cash – From cash assistance to supportive housing
- Formation of Homeless Cabinet and Designation of County Human Services Agency and lead city department for homelessness
- Focus on “Chronically Homeless”
- Development of “Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness” – Selection of High Profile Chair with Credibility on Issue (Angela Alioto)
Core Strategies of *The San Francisco Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness*

- Client Engagement
- Supportive Housing
- Prevention ("Turn off the spigot")
Client Engagement Strategies

- Past experiences with street engagement failed
  - No coordinated street outreach
  - Less than 1% uptake rate
  - No dedicated service or housing slots
Client Engagement Strategies

- Launched Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT)
  - Assigned neighborhood beats (high concentrated areas)
  - Dedicated slots for treatment/detox, shelter and/or housing
  - Multiple Client Engagements
  - Partnership with police “operation outreach”, fire department (EMS calls), public health (medical, treatment) and human services (benefits, services)
- Positive Results: About 50 individuals off the street each month and over 200 permanently housed
Client Engagement Strategies

- Project Homeless Connect
  - Volunteer-based street engagement effort
  - Comprehensive “One Stop” for services for homeless: Medical (Physical Health, Vision, Treatment), Legal, Housing/Shelter, Public Benefits, Other Services

- Two Goals:
  1) Simplify service access for clients and begin longer-term engagement process
  2) Build understanding and confidence among local citizenry
Supportive Housing
Cornerstone to San Francisco’s Strategy

- Supportive Housing = Affordable, long-term rental housing linked with flexible social and health services.
- A humane, effective and efficient intervention for homeless individuals suffering from serious health, mental health and substance use problems.
- Permanent supportive housing can provide a stable alternative to life on the streets; and can do so as the same costs as it does to keep that person homeless and stuck in the revolving door of high-cost crisis care and emergency shelter.
Supportive Housing
Cornerstone to San Francisco’s Strategy

- Canon Kip/Lyric Study – Reduction in emergency room care, hospitalization, and residential treatment use and incarceration.
- Profile of PAES Recipients – Improved employment outcomes for those in supportive housing.
- Daily cost of supportive housing is about the same as the daily cost of homeless shelters in nine major US cities. (Lewin Group Study, 2004)
- 95% housing retention rate across supportive housing programs in San Francisco
These are the “Chronically Homeless”

- Substance Abuse: 92%
- Mental Illness: 87%
- HIV Diagnosis: 14%
- High Utilization of Emergency Room
- High Rate of Admission to Public Hospital

http://documents.csh.org/documents/ke/PublicHealthPres.ppt
http://documents.csh.org/documents/ke/HHISN02-04.doc
Canon Kip/ Lyric Study -
53% Reduction in Emergency Room Visits

- Two Years Prior to Housing: 610
- One Year Prior to Housing: 620
- One Year Post-Housing: 289

n=279
## Canon Kip/ Lyric Study - Annual Visits to SFGH Emergency Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartiles</th>
<th>Average ED visits 1 year prior</th>
<th>Average ED visits 1 year post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First (1 Visit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second (2 Visits)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third (3-5 Visits)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth (&gt;5 Visits)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canon Kip/ Lyric Study - 46% Reduction in Inpatient Admissions

- Two Years Prior: 105
- One Year Prior: 127
- One Year Post: 68

n=279
Canon Kip/ Lyric Study-
44% Reduction in Hospital Inpatient Days

- Two Years Prior: 619
- One Year Prior: 788
- One Year Post: 439

n=279
Canon Kip/ Lyric Study
Other Positive Outcomes

- Near total elimination of residential mental health care outside of hospitals
- 89 percent decline in days spent in residential alcohol and drug treatment
- 44 percent reduction in days sentenced to incarceration and 88 percent increase in days sentenced to probation
Profile of PAES Recipients and Factors That Influence PAES Outcomes

Housing

- Over a third (1,113) were homeless when they entered PAES
- 1/3 transitioned into subsidized housing – 2/3 remained homeless

![Bar chart showing the distribution of employment, other income, and total for remained homeless, housing subsidized, and entered housed categories.]

- Remained Homeless: 12% Employment, 15% Other Income, 27% Total
- Housing Subsidized: 16% Employment, 54% Other Income, 71% Total
- Entered Housed: 16% Employment, 44% Other Income, 60% Total
Profile of PAES Recipients and Factors That Influence PAES Outcomes

Joint Effects of Housing and Behavioral Health

Employment FORs - Relationships Between BH History and Housing Status

- Employ FOR - All
- Employ FOR - No Known
- Employ FOR - Only MH
- Employ FOR - Only SA
- Employ FOR - Both

1. Entered Homeless - Remained
   - 15%
   - 16%
   - 20%
   - 14%
   - 10%

2. Entered Homeless - Hsg Subsidy
   - 43%
   - 46%
   - 48%
   - 44%

3. Entered Housed
   - 32%
   - 34%
   - 30%
Prevention Strategies - “Turn off the Spigot”

- “Homeward Bound” Program
- Eviction Prevention and Rental Assistance
- SSI Advocacy - Increasing income among the disabled housed and homeless
- Addressing Needs Among Emancipating Foster Youth
- Welfare Reform Initiatives - Treatment, Domestic Violence, and Self Sufficiency Services
- Institutional Discharge Planning
Prevention - “Homeward Bound” Program

- Implementation of out-of-region reunification program to all persons experiencing homelessness, as well as to “at risk” persons who wish to be reunited with verified family and other support systems.
- 1260 individuals served since February 2005.
- Half of those served by the program had been in San Francisco less than 105 days.
Prevention - Discharge Planning Goals

- All homeless individuals and their families will be discharged to a housing/treatment setting and will not be discharged to the street.
- All homeless individuals will receive a clinical screening if requested by individual patient/client or determined by HOT or other city programs who has worked extensively with patient/client in the community.
- All homeless individuals screened as appropriate by clinical staff will receive a face-to-face assessment in a standardized fashion with a strong focus on collaboration among providers rather than repetition.
- All homeless individuals will have their need for a conservatorship evaluated.
- Development of “citywide patient/client treatment plan”
Supportive Housing Financing Strategies

- Federal McKinney Funds – Shift application towards housing and “mainstream” other programs.
- Use savings achieved from reduced use of hospitals, emergency rooms, behavioral health treatment beds, and other crisis interventions.
- SSI Advocacy – Recoup funds for medical services and cash assistance
- Food Stamp Employment and Training Program (FSET) - 50% uncapped federal match for supportive housing services
- Cash Assistance Programs – TANF/General Relief
- Partner with affordable housing developers
SSI Application Advocacy

- Advocacy Pilot Project - Every dollar invested in SSI advocacy returned five dollars in federal reimbursements
- SSI and MediCaid coverage is retroactive to date of application - county receives retroactive payments for cash assistance and medical services.
- 227 (69% homeless) SSI awards (86% award rate) returned $3.2 million to San Francisco as reimbursement for cash assistance, mental health treatment, and other medical services.
- Cost of advocacy services totaled less than $650k
Progress Toward Ending Chronic Homelessness

- Consensus on strategy among key stakeholders
- Increased housing unit production
- Significant reduction in homeless on the street
- Positive media coverage and increase in public confidence
Increase in Supportive Housing Production

Supportive Housing Units for Homeless Single Adults

Number of Units

June 2000: 919
June 2001: 1089
June 2002: 1133
June 2003: 1,334
June 2004: 1,728
June 2005: 2,347
June 2006: 2,980
June 2007: 3,159
June 2008 (projected): 3,652
Homeless Count: 2002 - 2005

- Number of street homeless decreased by 41% between 2002 and 2005 (from 4,535 to 2,655).
- Number of homeless (shelter, jail, residential treatment, hospital, and street) decreased by 28% over this same period (from 8,640 to 6,248).