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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In November of 2016, the City of Boulder convened a Homelessness Working Group (Working Group) tasked with addressing the issue of a sustainable, long-term emergency sheltering and services model in Boulder, including community homelessness housing targets. The issue of emergency sheltering has reached a critical point in Boulder; due to lack of clear policies on who the system is designed to serve, lack of clear funding priorities and resource limitations, lack of a comprehensive and coordinated system of services, and that space previously offered to operate day and night overflow shelter is no longer available. The community needs to formulate a comprehensive emergency response strategy for the future, as the emergency “overflow” night sheltering and day shelter will not be available after April of 2017.

While the community is faced with responding to the short-term issue of emergency shelter capacity, it also viewed this as an opportunity to not just look at emergency shelter in Boulder in isolation, but rather to analyze the effectiveness of the homeless services system in the broader county-wide and regional context in order to inform strategic decisions that ensure the system serves the community efficiently and effectively, and moves people back into permanent housing solutions as quickly as possible. The Working Group plan is intended to be incorporated into the City’s Homelessness Strategy, currently in development.

A New Strategic Framework

New investments alone will not be enough for Boulder to visibly reduce the number of people sleeping outdoors. Stakeholders and Working Group members universally acknowledge that the current homeless system is confusing and inequitable. Feedback from several Working Group members was that the housing and service package a client ultimately receives in Boulder is largely dependent on where a person enters the system and the case manager assigned to assist. The Strategic Framework and recommendations laid out in this report provide a road map to re-orient stakeholders toward a more transparent, integrated "systems approach." This systems approach has also been articulated in the City’s Homelessness Strategy Framework and the Boulder County Ten-Year Plan to Address Homelessness (Ten-Year Plan).

In addition to the strategic framework that will serve as a roadmap for a re-envisioned homeless assistance system in the long term, the Working Group has also incorporated recommendations and action steps to respond to the short-term issue of reduced emergency shelter capacity.

The new homeless system design is guided by a shared set of underlying principles that embrace national best practice and incorporate feedback from the Working Group and extended regional stakeholders through a community process supported by City staff and CSH between January and April 2017.

Key to this new systems approach is the creation and implementation of coordinated entry, which requires a standardized, community-wide assessment tool(s) and process and participation by all housing and emergency service providers within a community. Coordinated Entry is recognized as a best practice and is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for communities to receive federal homeless funding. Coordinated Entry will help the homeless system match clients to appropriate housing interventions, create transparency in the prioritization of resources, and establish clearer pathways and "flow" out of homelessness.
Improved data systems will also be key to Boulder’s community approach. As evidenced by the work done by CSH, data about homelessness in Boulder exists in multiple, disjointed systems with varying degrees of reliability and usefulness. The County Department of Housing and Human Services (HHS) will soon have the capacity to open its data warehouse and case management platform to an array of service providers in both the City and Boulder County.

With this system, HHS and its constituents will be able to monitor coordinated entry performance through data dashboards. With this data, the community will be better positioned to adopt a set of success metrics around system performance, provider and program performance, and overall quality improvement.

Next Steps

Importantly, part of the Strategic Framework includes a project management tool, which provides detailed action items labeled with specific roles and responsibilities. These details are essential and an implementation plan will be established over the summer of 2017 to outline a phased approach in collaboration with key stakeholders. This report also surfaces questions that need to be addressed and provides direction as the community approaches major decision points. The Strategic Framework identifies short-term recommendations and strategies to respond to the emergency sheltering challenge (emergency response) and names long-term goals for new housing and services needed to address homelessness. It is meant to be a "living document" that will be updated regularly as new and better data become available. To this end, key next steps include the following:

Emergency-response:

- Prioritize the use of Emergency Shelter and temporary housing beds by offering year-round availability with services offered on site and during the day, to ensure they complement coordinated entry and system flow to rapidly place high-system utilizers in housing and reduce the number of people sleeping on the streets. This does not include the expansion of existing low-barrier shelter beds.
- Co-locate day service within an existing space in the community, and if possible with established safety net services to ensure they complement coordinated entry and system flow to divert light touch system utilizers and keep people in (or reconnect them with) housing; this may also serve as emergency health and safety overflow shelter.

System Re-design:

- Design and implement coordinated entry starting with the VI-SPDAT suite of assessment tools; include a stakeholder process to refine assessment tool(s) for each sub-population and establish standard operating procedures.
- Utilize existing Boulder County HHS data warehouse and case management platform for data integration and access to housing resources.
- As improved data becomes available, ensure better coordination and effective service delivery and case management using better data and continuous quality improvement (CQI).
- Develop a plan for scaling housing interventions in alignment with established milestones and existing analysis (e.g. City homeless housing investments, Regional Affordable Housing Plan, Boulder County Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) study, Working Group data analysis – pace of placements over three years).
- Create a structure for county-wide system governance and monitoring with a primary decision making body; integrate with the Ten-Year Plan Board for county-wide coordinated entry system.
INTRODUCTION

The City’s Homelessness Strategy and Action Plan is the primary driver for the Working Group and its associated goals; however, direction was given to the Working Group to ensure that the new Strategic Framework and emergency-response strategies support and integrate with the county-wide system as articulated in the Ten-Year Plan. This report is to define and clarify the City’s Homelessness Strategy Framework strategy of developing a coordinated entry and common assessment system, in conjunction with building the county-wide coordinated system. More information on the City’s homeless strategy, currently in development, can be found here.

In addition to the two plans noted above, several other local plans and reports were included as part of the analysis and recommendations for emergency response and Strategic Framework in Boulder to ensure alignment with regional efforts. Each of these reports shared alignment with the Strategic Framework outlined here, including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report:</th>
<th>Alignment with Strategic Framework:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County Regional Affordable Housing Plan (Draft)¹</td>
<td>• Goal to increase the number of new permanently affordable housing units including those available to extremely low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County Permanent Supportive Housing Study²</td>
<td>• Identified need in the region to provide Permanent Supportive Housing for at least 225 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Smarter Cities Challenge Report³</td>
<td>• Recommends the use of a coordinated entry system to achieve PSH placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont Homeless Services Assessment</td>
<td>• Recommends the use of a coordinated entry system and a shared database across all agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work has been guided by a shared set of principles established by the Working Group to provide the overarching vision for the approach to the emergency response new strategic framework. These Working Group guiding principles include:

- **ACCESS:** The homelessness assistance system is open and inclusive, transparent, consistent, and easy-to-use; includes solutions from the perspective of those with lived experiences of homelessness
- **PERMANENT HOUSING:** The homelessness assistance system is a strength-based approach with a Housing First approach emphasized; the system can meet diverse housing needs and provide efficient delivery across providers
- **DATA-DRIVEN:** The system is sized appropriately to consider need and to prioritize investment; policy and service decisions are evidence-based and data-informed and oriented toward results

• **REGIONAL:** Local implementation of emergency services is integrated into the county-wide and regional system and consistent with the City of Boulder’s long-term affordable housing goals

• **SUSTAINABLE:** The over-arching goal of the homeless services system is to connect those entering with stable housing; the system is scalable and able to leverage state and national resources; the system aligns with community needs and values

• **SYSTEMS-CHANGE:** The system will be re-envisioned to be bolder, looking beyond agencies and programs, and using new ideas and best practices openly

**Methodology**

The City of Boulder (City) contracted with the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) to conduct analysis to support the development of the Strategic Framework and action plan. CSH’s process had four key components:

1. **Mapping of the Existing and Proposed Homeless System**
   Reviewing and analyzing data from homeless service providers and community partners, CSH designed a map of the existing homeless response system for a range of interventions including emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, and permanent supportive housing for the overall Strategic Framework. The system map illustrates how individuals and families currently enter the homeless response system and where there may be gaps and bottlenecks in the system. To improve client flow from homelessness into permanent housing, CSH developed several design scenarios for the proposed re-envisioned system—illustrating key opportunities for improving throughput in the system for a range of homeless subpopulations. A complete list of service providers that were contacted and a summary of the data included for the system map can be found in the Appendix.

2. **Working Group Facilitation**
   CSH facilitated and shared its analysis and system maps of the existing and proposed systems with Working Group members during regular meetings held two times per month, including representation from homeless and formerly homeless individuals. Additionally, CSH engaged Working Group members outside of meetings to help with local data analysis and elicit feedback. CSH’s Working Group facilitation also included one full-day work session to focus on Coordinated Entry design. These Working Group meetings served as an opportunity to vet early concepts of the Strategic Framework and establish common understanding about the guiding principles and goals for the community. Based on feedback from Working Group members, CSH refined its analysis and design scenarios. A summary of feedback captured from Working Group members, including feedback provided for this final report, can be found in the Appendix.

3. **Calculating Annualized Need**
   To determine the annual demand for homeless housing and services in Boulder, CSH first used the 2015 Boulder Point-In-Time Count (PIT) to compare the numbers of sheltered single adults to the total number of sheltered households (both single adults and families in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing). This comparison produced a multiplier that could then be applied to the sheltered single adult PIT count to calculate an annualized sheltered homeless count for single adults. This same comparison was applied to unsheltered single adults, sheltered families and unsheltered families from the PIT count to find multipliers for each subpopulation, which were used to calculate the annualized homeless count for each. A base multiplier from HUD was used to annualize the chronically homeless numbers from the PIT. Adding the subpopulations together the total annualized sheltered number, annualized unsheltered number, and
annualized chronically homeless number, calculated using the PIT, were then used as the annual demand for homeless services in Boulder. This report recognizes that the PIT is not without limitations—inherently PIT undercounts the homeless population as it is unable to measure the “hidden” homeless population and relies on volunteers to find people on a given night in January. However, the PIT was used here as a starting place to estimate demand because it was the data source available as a proxy for those experiencing homelessness across populations, including single adults, chronically homeless, and families (including chronically homeless families).

Because of the PIT limitations and that the Working Group was primarily focused on the emergency shelter demand and utilization, CSH also used a data analysis between the emergency shelter providers and Boulder County Housing and Human Services (HHS) that was completed prior to the establishment of the Working Group. This analysis, which mapped shelter utilization, intake, and demographic data across providers for both night and day shelter services (see Appendix for details on the Working Group day and night shelter analysis), was critical in determining initial projections regarding emergency shelter capacity and housing targets.

4. **Unit Projections**

Using the information in the System Map and CSH’s Projection Tool, CSH created a projection for re-aligning the community homeless services system with a balance of interventions (diversion, rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing and temporary places to stay) that addresses the needs of households experiencing homelessness in the county. The projections show the current system mix as it relates to a more strategic system mix. To address the emergency response strategy, CSH also completed an analysis on shelter demand and capacity in conjunction with system re-design recommendations.

The final version of the Strategic Framework offers short-term (emergency response) and long-term goals and benchmarks to guide community activities to reduce homelessness and balances long-term housing goals with the appropriate emergency response level needed. Most importantly, the final version of the Strategic Framework reinforces Boulder’s priorities to transform the community’s homeless response system by adopting a greater focus on permanent housing outcomes, building on the culture of client-centered services within the community’s system of care, continuing to move toward a fully coordinated countywide system with greater equity related to access, and transparency, and ending homelessness for the most vulnerable.

**System Design Principles**

The new homeless system design is guided by a set of underlying principles that embrace national best practice and incorporate feedback received from Working Group members. Together, these designs present a cohesive vision and strategy across the entire system that values transparency, equity, and a client-centered approach. The system design principles are as follows:

- Aims to create “throughput” or system “flow” to reduce the length of time that people experience homelessness and to maximize permanent housing placements;
- Establishes clear goals based on data analysis;
- Identifies gaps within the system and projects housing interventions needed to bring resources to scale to meet the goals;
• Assumes that the system will operate on a single data system to maximize coordination and positive outcomes; and
• Embraces Coordinated Entry as a key service for better alignment of resources and improvement of client experience.

1. Role of Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing

The Strategic Framework anticipates that the role of emergency shelter and transitional housing will shift to support coordinated entry. The Working Group’s shelter utilization data analysis pointed to the primary challenge of how the current system is functioning in that only about 20% of the emergency shelter population is using over 80% of the capacity and resources. The completed local data mapping efforts confirmed that about 80% of individuals utilizing emergency shelter were averaging 8 nights per year or less in shelter, while about 20% of individuals accounted for the heaviest shelter utilization, with the highest users averaging more than 190 nights in shelter per year. Using this local shelter utilization data CSH completed further analysis (detailed below) to demonstrate that by shifting temporary housing options (emergency shelter and transitional housing) to target those individuals with the highest levels of utilization that are not able to resolve their homelessness and exit the system without significant support, Boulder can create a coordinated path out of homelessness for individuals.

Specifically, emergency shelter and transitional housing will need to shift to a model where:

• The beds/capacity are prioritized for moderate to high-utilizers.
• The services offered within emergency shelter are geared toward connection to permanent housing in the shortest amount of time possible, including navigation to a supportive housing unit or connection to income/supports to allow for self-resolution.
  o For example, eligibility criteria for emergency shelter will consider assessment factors that indicate an individual is likely to be a high utilizer/high need
  o A reservation system is developed to transition those waiting for placement or taking longer to self-resolve for a transitional housing bed.

This is a departure from the current model where emergency shelter services are offered daily to individuals in a “lottery” system for available beds. To accommodate this model, the coordinated entry system is critical; including an assessment method for identifying high need/high utilizer individuals and matching them to either program-based shelter or TH beds.

The Working Group also aims to develop an emergency-response strategy that will:

• Account for the closure of the emergency overflow shelter, the time it takes to maximize current emergency shelter capacity, and add new permanent housing placements into the system.
• Anticipate the use of existing space and safety net services and that the role of day services will shift to support coordinated entry and diversion services:
  o Diversion is a strategy that prevents homelessness for people seeking shelter by helping them identify immediate alternate housing arrangements; and
  o If necessary, connecting them with services and financial assistance to help them return to permanent housing4.

4 https://www.usich.gov/tools-for-action/closing-the-front-door
• Leverage existing space and safety net services to allow for more investment in permanent housing resources.

Therefore, CSH is not recommending the investment of capital funds in purchasing or re-purposing an existing facility for additional ongoing emergency shelter solutions.

2. **Coordinated Entry as a Key Strategy**

Coordinated entry systems are designed to create a more seamless way for people experiencing housing instability to access appropriate housing and services. Coordinated entry is a system, both procedural and technological, whereby clients access housing resources through the same process regardless of entry point. Individuals and families are assessed by their level of risk and or need, using a common assessment tool, and based on their scoring access the same pool of shared housing resources across the community.

Like other communities without fully implemented coordinated entry, CSH’s analysis showed that within Boulder’s current system, a household’s ultimate permanent housing placement is largely dependent on where a client enters the system and whether that entry point has access to permanent housing resources. There is extremely limited housing stock, as well as multiple gatekeepers for interim and permanent housing placements, each with different priorities. To access housing or emergency services a client must access multiple programs or providers. The current approaches are largely “program-driven” rather than “system-driven.” This approach ultimately creates bottlenecks, reduces collective impact, and wastes human resources.

Once implemented, coordinated entry will create defined pathways. Coordinated entry should be able to move clients between programs if a housing placement is not successful. A single system waitlist will match resources based on community-adopted tools and a decision-making matrix to maximize positive exits out of homelessness. Additionally, outreach and other front door workers will be reconfigured to support the new design and complement the overall coordinated entry operation. Key next steps for implementing coordinated entry include establishing coordinated entry teams to implement shared outcomes, begin piloting a shared assessment tool across providers, and a set of standard program models and business rules.

3. **Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and Data Refinement**

Within Boulder County HHS’s single data system for coordinated entry, the community will be able to monitor system performance through data dashboards consistent with countywide performance measurement. With this data, the community will be better positioned to adopt a set of success metrics around system performance, provider and program performance, client outcomes, overall quality improvement and test assumptions. For example, the Working Group has been led through analysis of how to prioritize emergency shelter and transitional housing capacity based on demand assumptions from system utilization data. With reliable, consistent exit data from across the service system and use of a common tool to assess need, stakeholders will be able to continually test and refine demand assumptions to ensure the right amount of resources are available and distributed within the system.

**System Analysis & Conclusions**

To both formulate an emergency-response and create a new Strategic Framework, CSH led the Working Group through a review and analysis of the current system by creating a system map from community partners and service providers which illustrated how people are entering and exiting the homeless system. A detailed full-page version of the system map can be found in the Appendices.
From the systems map, the Working Group could see there was not coordinated flow in or out of the system for households experiencing homelessness. Providers are largely not collecting entry and exit data, so it is difficult to know if households are exiting the system into stable housing, or maybe could have been diverted from the system to begin with. Data from the systems map also suggested that individuals were not able to move on to more permanent situations; for example, many exits from temporary/transitional housing were into another temporary or transitional housing placement.

After reviewing the systems map, CSH led the Working Group through an exercise asking members to re-envision the system from what it was currently to how it would look if it was functioning in the most effective way possible for those experiencing homelessness. The Working Group reached a consensus on the system illustrated below:

The Working Group also noted important components of the re-envisioned system, including:

- System entry-points which can be physical sites in the community or virtual. For example, Working Group members envisioned the system to be able to complete assessments using a common database and/or a call center such as 211.
- Outcome evaluation for housing placement and navigation within the system so this can inform how well the system is functioning and when changes need to be made.
- A common data platform and outcome measures across the system; which will help to guide decisions, recommendations, and policies for the City and countywide system going forward.

The next steps in the analysis included projections presented to the Working Group for re-aligning the system within Boulder County with a balance of interventions (diversion, rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing and temporary places to stay) that addresses the needs of households experiencing homelessness in the county. The re-alignment projections based on the demand analysis outlined in the methodology section of this Framework and include individuals, and families, and chronically homeless, showed the most needed interventions in the systems to be as follows:
*While more detailed analysis of the Working Group focused primarily on homeless single adults using the emergency shelter system, the initial re-alignment projections included single individuals, families, and youth.*

The projections above include projections and housing targets for populations where there is currently a gap between the amount of inventory or resources available for a population, and the annualized demand for such resources. The targets for the diversion intervention are refined further in this report as additional utilization data from the Working Group was considered. The analysis demonstrated a need to add Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-housing for individuals, where such a gap did not exist for families. For diversion, there is a need to add additional resources for both families and individuals, although the largest demand for diversion services comes from individuals. This analysis also includes housing re-alignment recommendations specifically for the City of Boulder, based on the City’s current proportion of permanent and temporary housing inventory within the County, which is approximately 30 percent. The framework and methodology for the re-alignment analysis and unit projections is a tool to set the direction of the system in terms of where additional investment is needed. Also, it provides the framework for the CQI process going forward; as providers link to the Boulder County HHS case management and data platform and test assessment tools, this will enable the ability to test and adjust these demand assumptions.

The CQI process is critical for Boulder to continue to update and refine these housing targets and the need for temporary housing capacity. To implement the Strategic Framework, it is recommended that assessment data informing risk/need level of those touching the Boulder homelessness system be evaluated as well as the housing inventory available at least every six-months. Implementing the CQI process in this way will help the community understand how assumptions about shelter capacity may change based on the capacity to add more PSH over time, or if level of utilization aligns with level of need, and whether those assumptions are proving to be valid.

**Shelter Demand Scenarios**

One of the primary aims of the Working Group is to develop an emergency-response strategy for the emergency sheltering system. As such, the priority population of focus for the more detailed analysis outlined below is single adults that have interacted with the City’s emergency shelter system. An analysis completed by the Working Group of 2015 data included approximately 2,400 de-duplicated individuals that had touched the overnight emergency shelter system with varying levels of utilization. The data available is largely based on utilization, which means that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Intervention*</th>
<th>Additional units/intervention needed: County-wide</th>
<th>Additional units/intervention needed: City of Boulder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSH- Individuals</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing- Individuals</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion –Individuals</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion - Families</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table showing additional units/intervention needed for various housing interventions.*
assumptions based on this analysis will not capture those extremely vulnerable individuals that are not accessing the shelter system frequently or at all. Conversely, there may be some individuals with lower level of needs/vulnerability that are not currently able to navigate the system effectively and are falling into the high-utilizer category. The analysis below outlines scenarios based on the assumption that high-utilizers of shelter resources also have a high level of need and cannot resolve their homelessness without navigation to permanent housing options. As the Strategic Framework is implemented, specifically coordinated entry and a CQI framework, the community will be able to test these assumptions to determine whether they hold true and adjust projections accordingly.

This shelter utilization data confirmed what emergency shelter providers had been reporting in their experience:

- Approximately 80% of individuals touching the shelter system annually fell into the light-user category, with an average of 8 nights in shelter per year;
- Those falling into the heavy/moderate utilization categories made up approximately 20% of the total annual shelter population but were averaging high numbers of nights per year in the system (in other words, only 20% of the shelter population was using over 80% of the resources).
This analysis suggests two things: 1) that individuals not able to easily self-resolve their homeless situation are getting stuck inside the shelter system and not always being navigated effectively to housing placements; and 2) that effectively targeting these heavy/moderate users of the system with housing and navigation services, Boulder can work to get them out of the system as soon as possible, shift to support coordinated entry, and use its shelter capacity more effectively.

CSH completed an analysis to examine existing emergency shelter and transitional housing (TH) capacity and put forth a set of scenarios to the Working Group to illustrate how these interventions can be used in a different way to more effectively connect high system utilizers with permanent housing solutions. This goes back to the re-envisioned system established by the Working Group and the core tenant of this system which is to shift to use coordinated entry and shelter/TH as strategic placements to navigate individuals out of the system and into permanent housing.

The significant challenge for the Working Group was: how does aligning adult shelter and TH with the re-envisioned system impact shelter demand in the short and long term? CSH’s analysis looked at existing shelter capacity, which currently is approximately 100 seasonal beds – not considering the emergency overflow beds that will no longer be available after April 2017. Also, considered was TH capacity within the system for single individuals, which is approximately 165 beds. This analysis illustrated that by re-purposing shelter and TH to prioritize heavy/moderate users supported by coordinated entry, and shifting to a year-round shelter model to allow individuals able to self-resolve to do so, the high-utilizer demand for shelter will decrease steadily over time. However, without adding more permanent housing solutions into the system, high-utilizer demand for emergency shelter will still exceed capacity.

The scenario below outlines several assumptions, including the addition of 60 permanent housing solutions per year countywide and illustrates that shifting to this re-designed system and adding new (PSH and RRH) the emergency shelter capacity will be adequate to meet high-utilizer demand within a three-year time frame. (The complete CSH analysis of emergency shelter demand scenarios can be found in the Appendices).
Assumptions:

- 100 year-round program-based shelter beds (in addition to the current 60 year-round Transitions program-based beds at Boulder Shelter) and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies + 10 new PSH units and 50 new RRH slots each year for three years to produce placements
- All 165 TH beds for singles are used to support long-term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return of individuals to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available

Recommendations

Based on this Strategic Framework, the recommendations are:

1. Using a common assessment tool to target heavy/moderate utilizers for emergency shelter beds and TH;
2. Shift to a year-round sheltering model where individuals can stay at the shelter to be navigated as quickly as possible to housing, or to self-resolution;
3. Co-locate targeted day services at the shelter to support navigation to housing or self-resolution (e.g. income and employment); services provided by existing shelter provider or by a consolidation of the three major shelter providers in Boulder (Boulder Shelter for the Homeless, Bridge House, and BOHO);
4. Locate skilled assessors at this location to determine whether individuals entering here need to be brought into the shelter or directed toward diversion interventions;
5. Using the Strategic Framework outlined above to continually test assumptions through CQI process, including:
   - Assessment tool: is the tool an accurate indicator of high level of need so the system can target shelter beds and housing interventions appropriately? How does the system build a better assessment tool?
   - Sizing interventions: is the assumption that high/moderate utilizers account for approximately 20% of the single adult homeless population correct? Does this account for inflow? How does the system adjust with better data and size interventions accordingly?
   - Data collection: are current data inputs the right indicators to know if the system is working? Can they help to identify gaps or areas for improvement?

**Day Services**

The Working Group’s analysis of the day shelter utilization is consistent with the night shelter in that approximately 20% of the population falls into the high-utilizer category. A detailed summary of the Working Group day shelter/service utilization is included in the Appendix. To test this assumption further, the Working Group can examine the types and frequencies of day services by night shelter users. To orient toward the new Strategic Framework, day services can shift to further support coordinated entry by assessing individuals, and for those falling into the high utilization/high need category, directing them to the Emergency Shelter where day services are co-located and specifically toward housing solutions navigation.

For those assessed and falling into the light user category, day services will look distinctly different than those offered at the emergency shelter; day services for light users will be oriented toward diversion and re-connecting individuals with housing as quickly as possible without bringing them into the system.

**Recommendations**

Based on this Strategic Framework, the recommendations are as follows:

1. Using a common assessment tool, including a diversion assessment tool (in which skilled assessors can determine whether an individual or family is appropriate for a diversion-based intervention), direct those heavy/moderate utilizers to emergency shelter and target light users to day services;
2. Invest in permanent solutions consistent with the new Strategic Framework rather than purchasing/creating a new space for light-user day services; explore opportunities to **co-locate** day services within existing safety net services/space (e.g. facilities where people are screened for public benefit eligibility/acquisition);
3. Activate day services as a diversion center with services targeted toward prevention/stabilization to divert, assess, and stabilize people as soon as possible; services provided by current day services provider or consolidated shelter provider network;
4. Locate skilled intake assessors at this location to determine whether individuals entering here need to be directed to the shelter or toward diversion interventions; and
5. Test assumptions regarding assessment tools and sizing interventions through the CQI process.
Emergency Response

While the community implements the re-envisioned system and Strategic Framework, there is still the immediate challenge of the emergency overflow shelter closure and that demand for emergency shelter may exceed bed capacity for potentially a period of up to three years (this may be shorter or longer depending on adjustments to demand assumptions via the CQI process and the pace at which permanent housing is added into the system). In this transition period, the community may need to activate an emergency response strategy during cold-weather nights and to address general health and safety needs for those light users that may be touching the homeless system briefly but are not going to remain in Boulder.

Based on the need for an emergency-response strategy, the recommendations are as follows:

1. Co-locate emergency overflow temporary shelter beds with the location identified for diversion services, if existing space and facilities allow, to continue to leverage existing space and prioritize new investments into permanent solutions; co-location also enables the leveraging of assessment and diversion services;
2. Determine annual target number of emergency overflow/temporary shelter beds based on shelter demand scenarios, the seasonal impact, and rate at which permanent housing solutions are added into system;
3. Services provided by current overnight services provider or consolidate provider network, to be phased out over a transition period where emergency shelter capacity and day services are better positioned to respond to demand; and
4. Connect the crisis response strategy to the CQI process to better forecast how long the transition/crisis-response plan needs to be in place, and the number of beds needed during this transition period

System Transition: Housing and Shelter Placement Targets

Based on the recommendations for responding in the short-term and to implement the re-envisioned system, the City of Boulder recognizes that there will be a period of transition from how the homeless system is functioning today. To illustrate concretely how clients will flow through the system, including short-term solutions that will be phased out as more permanent housing resources are added to the system and access is targeted on the front-end, the City created a flow-chart tool with shelter, housing and time-frame targets as a starting point to be refined as part of the ongoing CQI process. The complete City of Boulder flow-chart tool and detail can be found in the Appendix. A summary of the housing and shelter placement targets is below:

- **Diversion**: Estimated 1,200 individuals annually (City of Boulder)
- **Self-resolution** (no emergency shelter intervention): 600 individuals annually (of the 1,200 City of Boulder)
- **Program-based shelter** (year-round with day and night services): 500 individuals annually based on average length of stay and total number of beds (City of Boulder)
- **PSH**: Years 1-3 of implementation: 21-22 placements annually; years 3-5: 13 placements annually (county-wide)
- **Rapid Re-housing**: Years 1-3 of implementation: 22-26 placements annually, years 3-5: 11 placements annually (county-wide)

---

5 Represents people that would have sought day or night shelter in the City of Boulder in the current system.
Data Framework

The methodology used to assess demand and estimate the size and type of interventions needed in Boulder provide a framework for testing and adjusting the assumptions made as part of this initial Working Group analysis. This will be particularly important to support coordinated entry, assess the effectiveness of current assessment tools, and refine housing targets and projections as the systems knows more about the level of need in relation to utilization. For example, if providers begin to see that individuals with high system utilization are not being effectively targeted toward housing placement, this data will inform the process and trigger the question of whether the assessment tool needs to be changed to better account for this. For this CQI process to be activated and effective for the system, next steps for the community will include:

- Continued efforts toward data integration; and
- The use of a shared data platform across providers

The shared database and case management platform can also be leveraged for implementing system-wide coordinated assessment. With Boulder County HHS as the data lead, the Working Group will need to identify a timeline by which all providers will have access to the data warehouse and case management platform to track outcomes, make and receive referrals, and access housing placement inventory. The integrated case management platform can support provider referrals for specific services in the very near-term and additional capabilities including assessment tool, program enrollment, and housing placement referrals are expected to be completed by June of 2017. Currently, a phased addition of providers into the integrated case management platform is planned with specific providers slated to begin in June – additional providers and prioritization for access will be informed based on the recommendations and conclusions of the Working Group.

This data warehouse and case management platform will also be a critical tool in tracking outcomes to inform whether the Strategic Framework is working and what parts of the system need to be adjusted and when.

Recommendations for outcomes tracking and initial creation for a system dashboard include:

1. The number of permanent housing placements relative to housing targets;
2. Returns to homelessness; and
3. The number of days from referral to housing once a housing opportunity has been identified.

The data integration and CQI process is critical for Boulder to move toward its re-envisioned system and to fully implement coordinated entry; the next steps in the process will be finalized and overseen by a data-integration sub-group made up of some key Working Group members.

Coordinated Entry

As part of the Working Group leadership and facilitation, CSH along with the City hosted an all-day Coordinated Entry System (CES) re-design lab which focused on key action items to fully implement the CES in Boulder across providers and connect CES to broader regional systems. These action steps are outlined in the Project Management Workbook; however, the design lab was a helpful tool in reaching consensus on several key points including:
1. **Assessment tool**: The Working Group decided to use the VI-SPDAT tool\(^6\) for individuals, families, and youth for the CES to begin with and the CQI framework to refine.

2. **System Entry Points**: The Working Group decided on the following system entry points:
   - Day Services
   - Night Shelter
   - Court
   - EFAA
   - Our Center (located outside of the City of Boulder, in Longmont)
   - Sister Carmen (located outside of the City of Boulder, in Lafayette)

   After the CES design lab, several Working Group members expressed that these may not be the right entry points, with some favoring a smaller list to reduce fragmentation and others hoping to focus on other potential safety net service providers in the community for a decentralized model. At the final Working Group meeting on April 19, 2017 the group determined that these questions are best addressed by a smaller implementation team. After these entry points are established, they may be expanded or consolidated based on volume and need, again through the CQI process, re-evaluated every six months for consolidation opportunities.

3. **Data Platform**: There was consensus among Working Group members at the CES design lab to utilize Boulder County HHS’s data warehouse and case management platform across providers for coordinated entry (including tracking inventory and matching) and to connect this data platform to other existing regional CES systems, such as HMIS or ONEHOME.

**Basis for Recommendations**

In addition to the analysis conducted in Boulder with the Working Group, CSH reviewed relevant evidence on the best practices related to emergency shelter systems, including collaboration with other experts in the field, such as the National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH). The recommendations put forth by CSH align closely with those emerging trends in the field being implemented in several communities because of similar analysis, and in some cases, demonstrating positive early outcomes. Examples of this include emergency shelter re-design recommendations and implementation in three communities: The state of Connecticut, Los Angeles, CA, and Napa, CA. Details of the recommendations provided for these communities are outlined below:

**State of Connecticut**

Working with NAEH, Connecticut implemented a learning collaborative pilot including five major emergency shelter providers in the state following the recommended key components of an effective emergency response system:

- A system-wide housing first approach (low-barrier access to emergency shelter & housing resources);
- Immediate and easy access;
- Housing focused services;
- Rapid exits to permanent housing;
- Implement diversion; and
- The use of data to refine & inform the process.

---

The shelter learning collaborative established goals for the shelter system re-design including eliminating barriers to entry into emergency shelter (e.g. drug testing, breathalyzer test), increasing monthly exits to permanent housing, and decreasing the average length of stay in emergency shelter. The learning collaborative began implementation across the five shelters in early 2016 and outcomes so far have included an over 200 percent increase in the average number of households that exited to permanent housing and a 41 percent increase in households served in their system within a 6-month time frame.

Los Angeles, CA

In January 2016, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors launched the Homeless Initiative\(^7\) to combat the homeless emergency faced in their community, which included a comprehensive set of recommended strategies based on emerging trends and best practices in the field to effectively combat and end homelessness. The initiative presented 47 recommended strategies, including those specific to enhancing the emergency shelter system. These recommendations include:

- Keep shelters open 24-hours a day/7 days a week. This would enable the shelter system to serve as a staging ground to triage/assess clients for housing, health, mental health, substance use disorder, and social service needs, particularly for outreach and engagement teams.

- Transform emergency shelters and transitional housing into interim/bridge housing from which homeless families/individuals/youth could transition to the best suited form of permanent housing, such as rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing.

- Housing location search assistance should be provided at each shelter by community-based housing locators, since such assistance is key to ensuring that the shelter system operates as effectively as possible with enough “throughputs” to move people out of the shelter system, thereby creating shelter capacity for additional homeless families/individuals/youth.

- Establish “low threshold” common criteria for shelter eligibility across the county so that homeless families/individuals/youth can easily enter and remain in shelter without restrictive requirements that either preempt entry into the shelter system or force people to leave before they can transition to permanent housing.

- Fully utilize the shelter bed assignment system in the Homeless Management Information System so that any provider seeking a shelter bed could readily identify any available beds.

Napa County, CA

After working in partnership with CSH to complete a homeless system analysis in Napa County, NEAH released a report in July of 2016 entitled “Recommendations for Napa’s Emergency Shelters and Homelessness Crisis Response System”. The system analysis and report that followed presented a new approach to the development of a system in which emergency shelters in Napa use a Housing First, low-barrier approach to shelter access and services that utilizes best practices and is well-coordinated with other programs and services available in the community.

---

Napa County is a community with some parallels to Boulder, including the size and seasonal nature of its emergency shelter system, housing market, and the prevalence of light users accessing the shelter system. The report included the following recommendations for Napa County as they look to re-design their shelter and emergency homelessness response system:

- Develop a coordinated entry system so that people experiencing homelessness can easily navigate the homeless assistance system, access housing supports, and quickly exit homelessness.

- Develop a system-wide diversion process that is connected to the coordinated entry system to help people experiencing a housing emergency stay in their current housing when it is safe and appropriate to do so, and use coordinated entry to triage, screen, and connect them to available resources.

- Provide immediate and easy access to shelters 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for anyone experiencing homelessness in Napa by eliminating restrictive eligibility requirements and transitioning to a low-barrier shelter system that provides shelter and support services to people, regardless of their challenges.

- Provide housing-focused services that include housing search and housing stability case management to shelter participants to support a rapid exit to permanent housing.

- Use data to measure the performance of the shelter programs and the system.

- Increase the accessibility and availability of rapid re-housing to create “flow” in its shelter system by moving people through shelter and into housing much more quickly.

Following this analysis and recommendations, Napa County hired a homeless services coordinator to oversee the implementation of these recommendations, which began in early 2017 starting with the emergency shelter changing its operations.

These examples from the field illustrate that the recommendations put forth in this report for Boulder are very much aligned with current thought leadership and best practices, particularly when it comes to the emergency homelessness response system.

**Questions & Issues**

*Diversion*

This initial Working Group analysis assumes that a high percentage (approximately 80%) of individuals touching the homeless system in Boulder will not actually need to enter the system, but can be diverted from the system. This assumption is predicated on knowing more about two key issues:

- Using the CES process and common assessment tool, the community will learn more about this 80% portion of homeless individuals and whether current assumptions hold true or need to be adjusted up or down in terms of the percentage of single individuals needing to be navigated to housing vs. diversion.

- What does diversion entail, and how is this portion of the homeless population described further to better target with the right intervention?
In terms of the second issue, there are several recommendations that will enable the City to implement a formal diversion program, including:

1. Implement diversion screening tool as part of the common assessment;
2. Train and locate skilled intake assessors at system entry points, including day services, shelter, and a diversion center;
3. Diversion strategies may also include homeless prevention and emergency rental assistance resources; and
4. Allocate a portion of funding earmarked for diversion services from a flexible pool to provide emergency assistance to keep people housed or quickly reconnect them with stable housing.

Diversion Plan

The high percentage of light-touch users in the homelessness system leads to the assumption that some of these individuals and families do not need to enter the system to be connected to housing. By implementing a diversion strategy, shelters, outreach, and system entry point locations interfacing with people experiencing homelessness will be trained to use a diversion assessment tool. Examples of diversion assessment tools can be found in the Appendix.

The addition of skilled assessors (either existing day services staff or re-purposed case management staff) specifically focused on diversion will enable implementation as diversion has a slightly different framework than traditional case management. Examples of diversion staff methodology include:

- Listen to the story
- Affirm, reflect, de-escalate, and pay attention to housing strengths, resources, resilience and needs (not services) expressed. Do not leap to solutions before hearing their need
- Move from crisis to brainstorming solutions, empowerment
- Prioritize immediate plan (where to be tonight), with attention to safety; engage their resources
- Initiate plan (30-60-day max) with minimal assistance (mediation, housing search, temporary financial assistance)

Common diversion solutions include:

- Re-establish rental housing with minimal one-time temporary financial assistance with a cap
- Mediate with family/friends to stay short or long-term, possible flex temporary financial assistance
- Mediation with landlord/property management
- Shared housing
- Housing search
- Connection to mainstream services (outside of homeless services, such as human services)
- Relocation to out-of-area support system

Once assessed, individuals and families typically meet with a case manager to start housing stabilization planning immediately after being assessed and deemed appropriate for diversion. Housing planning involves both finding immediate housing and planning for longer term housing stability. If an immediate alternate housing arrangement cannot be made, a shelter stay is likely the most appropriate option.

---

8 http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/closing-the-front-door-creating-a-successful-diversion-program-for-homeless
A coordinated entry implementation team will inform diversion program design, participate in service delivery, and report outcomes, which will be critical to inform and refine assumptions regarding the demand for diversion services. Temporary financial assistance (amount to be determined) will be established for targeted assistance to connect or reconnect individuals to stable housing.

There is a growing evidence base that diversion is an effective intervention for re-connecting individuals and families with stable housing including successful pilot projects in Tacoma, WA, Chicago, IL and Columbus, OH. As an example, a detailed report on the Washington pilot project and outcomes can be found in the Appendix.

**Governance Structure**

For the community to implement the Strategic Framework there needs to be a governance structure in place that outlines the process for decision making, since that is not clearly defined.

City staff recommends aligning governance of the coordinated entry system with the countywide system. The oversight of system performance can be monitored and reported on through this mechanism. An ongoing city specific review and oversight group could be considered for city specific policy-related issues in conjunction with the implementation of coordinated entry and the Homelessness Strategy. The most efficient structure deliberately engages decision makers and stakeholders in specific ways to support the creation of and implementation of policy as well as balanced accountability. Such a structure supports:

- Action-oriented facilitation that will drive forward-progression and decisiveness in policy creation; and
- Phased implementation that will equip stakeholders to make a series of incremental changes over a short period of time while contributing to the collective goal and being accountable for implementation and progress.

Technical expertise is most often needed in the design and transition from the current governance model to this new structure of combined governance and implementation. Most often this is achieved through the following support activities:

- Small and large stakeholder conversations;
- Creation and presentation of a proposed structure and transition plan;
- Community conversation to finalize design and initiate transition;
- Creation and presentation of proposed structure and operating agreements; and
- Assignment and training of project managers; creation of the implementation leadership team.

The current Boulder County Homeless Systems Management (formerly known as the Ten-Year Plan Board) is undergoing a Governance re-structure that can accommodate this model, in which an executive committee is in place to approve policies and systems changes once they have been tested and refined in the community, and led by project-specific working groups. While the Boulder Homelessness Working Group will be dissolved after April 2017, the Homeless Systems Management Board represents key stakeholders from which the Working Group was comprised—including City, County, services providers, and representatives with lived experiences of homelessness. The Governance structure is illustrated below with key topic areas that test and inform recommendations for adoption to the Executive Board via the Advisory Board.
This structure already in place in Boulder will lend itself to approve policy for the homeless system to function under collective alignment. It’s important to note that policy is not created at the Executive Board level; rather it is approved once it has been tested on the ground. Implementation working groups will drive the testing and refining of the recommendations within this report.

Policy Considerations

The recommendations contained within the report speak to the aim of the Working Group to develop an emergency response strategy as well as to shift to a new Strategic Framework, which will involve operational shifts within the system as well as city policy changes regarding the implementation of resource prioritization for those with the highest level of need in the community. The recommendation to move to a year-round shelter model where residents are permitted to stay during the day and offered specific targeted services may entail a change to the Boulder Shelter for the Homeless’ (Shelter) current policies and operations, as well as additional neighborhood and community engagement regarding the proposed changes and how they relate to the larger systems vision within the City and Boulder County. Considerations for this process and timeline will need to be incorporated into next steps.
for implementation. The recommendations would also entail changes to how Bridge House currently provides services. Changes to policies, services and operations need to be identified through further implementation planning.

Lastly, these recommendations may impact how the community makes decisions regarding investment and funding in terms of re-directing the funding of the former overflow and day shelter programs into permanent housing interventions or CES activities.

**Key Next Steps & Timeline**

Boulder City Council will review the Working Group and CSH report and provide city-specific feedback on the recommendations. Depending on City Council direction, the proposed next steps are:

- In the immediate-term, an implementation leadership team will be convened by City and County leadership to determine key next steps in implementing both the short-term transition strategy as well as the long-term strategic framework.
- The final Working Group meeting was held on April 19, 2017 and in closing of that meeting it was established that the implementation leadership team would be convened as soon as possible, the first week of May.

CSH has provided a framework for implementation, including a Project Management Workbook tool and recommendations on important initial action steps. The implementation leadership team will determine for which of these action steps there need to be implementation teams established, and which of the action steps can be integrated into work/groups already established in the community.

Key initial steps to begin implementation include:

- Implementation Leadership Team meets to establish implementation plan, implementation teams, and work leads; and
- A temporary implementation team is formed (comprised of City and County leadership and service providers) to answer the specific questions below and necessary to move forward with implementation, as established by the Homeless Working Group:
  1. Where (what location) do diversion/assessment activities take place in Boulder? Is this a single site location or will these services be offered at existing locations in the community? And, if so, which specific sites?
  2. Are Day Services (shelter, meals, etc.) needed in the community on a transitional or long-term basis for those working toward a diversion plan or awaiting a shelter-bed while the system is transitioning to meet the capacity to serve high-utilizers? If so, where will these Day Services be provided?

Additionally, based on feedback gathered from the Working Group, CSH has summarized the following identified critical action steps for implementation to be integrated into existing work/groups or assigned to project leads in the community:

- Begin using common assessment tool across providers and establish CQI process
- Add more permanent housing solutions to the system (e.g. PSH, rapid re-housing)
- Establish coordinated entry system policies and procedures, system governance
- HHS to connect system providers in Boulder with the backbone case management platform and data warehouse
- Define common system outcome metrics
- Implement diversion: set realistic targets and determine location/procedure for short-term stay for those working on a diversion plan

The community can begin to transition the system and some of the emergency shelter beds, as well implement diversion over the summer of 2017, which will provide a framework to begin testing some of the recommendations and assumptions. The timeline for identifying a provider and a location for emergency shelter needs that are beyond the system’s current capacity will be critical by the fall of 2017; since the current seasonal overflow provider will no longer be operating as usual and all the shelter beds may not be fully transitioned at that time, nor will a significant amount of additional permanent housing resources have been added.

In the immediate-term, the City will work with its partners to identify a short-term option for a small number of individuals during this transition period to meet the immediate health and safety needs of those identified as highly vulnerable in Boulder.

**Conclusion**

Boulder is well positioned to not only respond to the emergency sheltering challenges, but more importantly drive toward a new Strategic Framework for which there is an established shared vision across community partners. By focusing on leveraging coordinated entry and the existing data platform, the Working Group set the foundation for increased coordination and measurable decreases in homelessness. The community is solidly moving in the direction of implementing coordinated entry, and committed to using data to provide a more transparent and equitable process for resolving a person’s housing challenge. These are significant milestones.

To ensure that Boulder can tackle the issue of homelessness, it will be essential that resources needed to fund the system as proposed be evaluated with funding partners and that resources are aligned with the Strategic Framework. Moreover, the City, stakeholders and funding partners will need to revisit the Strategic Framework as data quality improves and the environment shifts. The projections herein are initial calculations that will benefit from further refinement as data systems improve. Continuous quality improvement will be essential if Boulder is to meet its goals.

This Strategic Framework represents one step in the path towards ending homelessness in Boulder.
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## Appendix A - CSH System Map: Boulder Homeless Working Group - data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Requested</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Program/Project</th>
<th>Report Received</th>
<th>In Map?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent Point-in-Time Count (PIT)</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Lindsay Parsons</td>
<td>PIT with overall sheltered and unsheltered</td>
<td>PIT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PIT numbers are not broken down for each intervention, specifically between ES and TH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent AHAR - Utilization and turnover rates</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Joe Baker</td>
<td>AHAR Data for TH and PSH</td>
<td>AHAR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ES data &quot;does not meet data quality threshold for reporting&quot; so is not included in AHAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent Housing Inventory Chart (HIC)</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Joe Baker</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Housing Inventory Worksheet doesn't match HIC, need to work on reconciling versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Housing Inventory from Working Group</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APR:** current year, separate report for each intervention
- Data on prior residence upon entering each intervention
- Data on length of stay for each intervention
- Data on system "leavers"/exits from each intervention
EXHIBIT B
Workgroup Feedback: Report and Strategic Framework

The following is a summary of the feedback CSH received from Workgroup members for the Strategic Framework. CSH has organized Workgroup feedback into 4 main themes.

1. Analysis and Methodology
2. Evidence and Data
3. Change Management
4. Coordinated Entry System

Analysis and Methodology:
The “Demand” or “Needs” approach to analyze our community’s homeless picture is not appropriate. Another method following a “Responsibility” approach should be used for recommendations using another methodology to set targets, such as population numbers.

The recommendations in the report will do little if Boulder does not address the large number of people seeking services and the limited availability of exit options. Important topics at this point are how do we limit services and how can we produce more PSH?

Questionable whether Boulder is facing a “crisis”, as referred to in the report, could perhaps be referred to as a need for “short-term response”.

Evidence & Data
The only recommendation in the report known to be highly evidenced is the recommendation to add more PSH. Opinion and pilot projects in other cities are not evidence. HUD has sanctioned coordinated entry so this is a requirement and falls outside of the evidence requirement.

The bifurcation of light vs. heavy system users in the report is too subjective. If Boulder is going to determine who gets services and who does not, we need to use a much more objective standard. For example, only serving those who can engage, only those who can be sober, only those who can produce an ID, those on the high utilizer list from the courts, etc.

Quantitative assumptions are off, unless Boulder is really saying that we are not going to serve 80% of the population. By only talking about 20% of the population, we have created unrealistic expectation.

The use of annualized data in the report to project the tradeoffs from sheltering to housing imply a predicted resolution of near-term sheltering needs, which are not in fact resolved. Boulder’s homeless community are at risk in the winter from weather and in the summer from fire, in addition to provoking much political ire for unsheltered living. While it is true that housing clients who consume a substantial number of bed-nights would lower average or annualized usage numbers quickly, the removal of such clients from actual short-term shelter demand would be a relatively small change in actual winter shelter bed demand numbers.

On peak nights in the last three winters, BOHO and the Boulder Shelter together have provided for 350 persons (400 this past winter with the addition of Bridge House capacity) – housing 45 of these high-use
clients will leave an ongoing need for about 350 actual winter beds, not the 175 or so annualized beds implied in the report.

**Change Management**
The level of change is significant, since one might describe Boulder’s current adult homeless system as shelter-focused, agency-centric, and shelter-driven while the envisioned system is housing-focused, client-centric, and services-driven. A summary of getting from the final proposed state in the report from the current state of the system is below:

- **Long term Goals:**
  - Combine day shelter and services in a single facility with overflow night shelter
  - Convert night-by-night shelter to multi-night for those prioritized for housing
  - Dedicate housing availability to prioritize those with greatest need
    - Emphasis on Housing First and Rapid Rehousing
    - Emphasis on diversion and self-resolution for non-prioritized
    - Coordinated data systems and single-point entry for all services

- **Immediate Actions/Transition Plan:**
  - Still unknown

The plan for immediate actions and transitional stages will be hard to develop, as it will require massive changes to Boulder’s existing single adult homeless sheltering system.

Funding is always an issue. Without a clear transition plan, it is not at all likely that the costs of change can be funded, at least not in the scale envisioned for a three-to-five-year transition.

Boulder’s principal single-adult-sheltering agencies are private non-profits, operating as their boards see fit in pursuit of their respective missions, funding, and results. Each has a history of arising from grass-roots response to crisis to serve an unfilled gap in the safety net, and evolving without a strong framework of policy and direction. The assets deployed in their work (buildings, primarily) are privately owned – many by third-party congregations. While the desire for mutual collaboration and alignment with City goals is present, commitments to change will be very difficult to make and change will be very difficult to implement across so many involved parties without a clear plan for change.

The short term transition plan is extremely important and requires immediate attention, as next winter’s emergency sheltering will require detailed planning very soon.

**Coordinated Entry System**
The central systems that identify clients and report on client activities are key to making the operation work. While you have proposed a coordinated entry system that is housing-focused, you have discovered that only one of the involved agencies is engaged with the Metro Denver Continuum of Care HMIS system, which system is failing and currently not accepting new agency enrollments. The Continuum is engaged in two data systems projects, one to acquire a new HMIS system and one to implement an architecture of County-mediated client record entry and agency reporting systems, which link to HMIS. Boulder’s principal adult homeless sheltering agencies have made progress in combining data for decision support, but not for client entry. It is likely that a multi-stage systems plan will have to be developed or re-shaped to complement the overall transition plan and to interface with the planned implementation of the continuum of care systems.
# 2015 FY Night Shelter Data Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segments (% of total pop’n)</th>
<th>Unique Persons (2,337 total)</th>
<th>Cumulative Nights at Boulder Shelter + BOHO</th>
<th>Case Mgt intakes at Boulder Shelter + Resource Center</th>
<th>Definitions: (# of nights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic (3%)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18,360 (26%)</td>
<td>59 (83%)*</td>
<td>193 to 348 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative (20 %)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>37,839 (53%)</td>
<td>276 (61%)</td>
<td>35 to 192 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Users (77%)</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>14,878 (21%)</td>
<td>586 (32%)</td>
<td>1 to 34 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Now 100% after 2016 institution of Welcome Meetings
## Mid-Year Day Shelter Data Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segments (% of total population)</th>
<th>Unique Persons (1,893 total)</th>
<th>Cumulative “Touches” at Day Shelter &amp; Community Table</th>
<th>Welcome Meetings (1,445 total)</th>
<th>Definitions / # of touches (visits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic (1%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,524 (18%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>120 to 271 per person ($x to $x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagers (heavy users) (20 %)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>14,949 (61%)</td>
<td>380 (99%)</td>
<td>15 to 118 per person ($x to $x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Users Transients (79%)</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>5,174 (21%)</td>
<td>1,038 (70%)</td>
<td>14 or fewer per person ($x to $x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C 2
Appendix D - Boulder City & County Homeless System Map

Emergency Shelter
1697 exited in 2016
319 Total Beds
100 Family Beds (including DV)
22 Youth Beds
69% on System Map
1096 people (PIT) 2016

Among Leavers:
56% LOS < 30 days
44% LOS 1 - 3 mo
0% LOS > 3 mo

11% (14) back to Transitional Housing
8% (10) Detox/Jail
7% (9) Hotel/Motel
7% (8) Emergency Shelter
4% (5) Temporarily Staying with Family/Friends

93% Exit to:

Exit to TH
2% Exit to TH

7% Exit to:

Transitional Housing
123 exited in 2016
273 Total Units/Vouchers
16% on System Map
86% Average Utilization
11 people (PIT) 2016

Among Leavers:
29% LOS < 6 months
35% LOS 6 mo - 1 yr
46% LOS > 1 yr

29% (36) Rental by Client, No Subsidy
7% (9) Permanently living with family/friends
4% (5) Owned by Client
2% (3) Exit to PSH

7% Exit to:

Exit to:

Permanent Supportive Housing
13 exited in 2016

Among Leavers:
20% LOS < 6 months
35% LOS 6 mo - 1 yr
46% LOS > 1 yr

29% (36) Rental by Client, No Subsidy
7% (9) Permanently living with family/friends
4% (5) Owned by Client
2% (3) Exit to PSH

61% Exit to:

Unknown Destinations
0% From TH
83% From ES

Rapid Re-Housing
Entering From:
36% (13) Emergency Shelter
28% (10) Rental, no subsidy
17% (6) Place Not Meant for Hab.
8% (3) Transitional Housing
6% (2) Rental, with subsidy
3% (1) Staying with family/friends
3% (1) PSH

Permanent Supportive Housing
13 exited in 2016

Entering From:
67% (45) Emergency Shelter
19% (13) Place Not Meant for Hab.
4% (3) Hospital/Psych/Jail/etc.
4% (3) Information Missing
1% (1) Transitional Housing
1% (1) Staying with Family/Friends
1% (1) Rental, with subsidy

Homelessness
10% From ES
37% From TH

62% (76) Emergency Shelter
14% (17) Place Not Meant for Habitation
10% (12) Detox/Jail
6% (7) Other
2% (3) Hotel/Motel
2% (3) Staying with Family/Friends
2% (3) Safe Haven
2% (3) Owned by Client

15% Literally Homeless
85% Other

6% (7) Emergency Shelter
14% (17) Place Not Meant for Habitation
10% (12) Detox/Jail
6% (7) Other
2% (3) Hotel/Motel
2% (3) Staying with Family/Friends
2% (3) Safe Haven
2% (3) Owned by Client

76% Literally Homeless
24% Other
Boulder Shelter Demand Scenarios
Challenge:
~20% of single individuals will need a housing intervention and/or temporary bed.
### 2015 FY Night Shelter Data Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segments (% of total pop'n)</th>
<th>Unique Persons (2,337 total)</th>
<th>Cumulative Nights at Boulder Shelter + BOHO</th>
<th>Definitions: (# of nights)</th>
<th>Average # of Shelter Nights</th>
<th>Assumptions Used for Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic (3%)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18,360 (26%)</td>
<td>193 to 348 per person</td>
<td>261 night average</td>
<td>All these individuals will need PSH and will remain in shelter until they get it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative (20%)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>37,839 (53%)</td>
<td>35 to 192 per person</td>
<td>80 night average</td>
<td>The longest stayers will get TH and the others will continue to reside at the shelter at average of 70 days and then self-resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Users (77%)</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>14,878 (21%)</td>
<td>1 to 34 per person</td>
<td>8 night average</td>
<td>These individuals can be diverted and/or will find other options if shelter is not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Points for the Analysis:
1. Annual demand for shelter is 71 Chronics + 454 Normatives = 525
2. Assumptions about use as stated in the chart.
Solution #1:
Prioritize all 100 year round beds for the 20% who can’t self-resolve quickly

Assumptions:
- 100 year round shelter beds and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies to produce placements
- All 165 TH beds for singles are used to support long term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available
Solution #1  
+  
30 New Permanent Housing Options (PSH/RRH) each year

### Assumptions:
- 100 year round shelter beds and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies + **10 new PSH units and 20 new RRH slots each year for three years** to produce placements.
- All 165 TH beds for singles are used to support long term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate Users Remaining in Shelter</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate Users Placed in TH/RRH</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Users Remaining in Shelter</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Users Placed in PSH</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Shelter Capacity</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Shelter Demand</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution #1

+ 60 New Permanent Housing Options (PSH/RRH) each year

Assumptions:
- 100 year round shelter beds and all placements target longest stayers
- Uses existing PSH and TH annual vacancies + **10 new PSH units and 50 new RRH slots each year for three years** to produce placements.
- All 165 TH beds for singles are used to support long term placements and only produce a 5% rate of return to homelessness (big shift in operations)
- Inflow of 20 individuals per year (rough estimate) become part of the 20% who can’t self-resolve
- Formal diversion program implemented or self-resolvers will self-divert when no shelter is available
Solution #2: Add Shelter Capacity

Things to Consider:

- If additional capacity is achieved through the expansion of PSH and RRH, is adding shelter capacity beyond 100 year round beds a good investment? If so, how many shelter beds versus RRH/PSH?
- Do you think those light users will sleep outside if shelter is not available? How many?
- If yes, is a formal diversion program a better investment and better for individuals than more shelter beds? Will diversion be enough to keep them from needing shelter or sleeping outside?
- What could diversion look like?
Day Shelter Service Demand Scenarios
First Glance: Day Shelter Use Consistent with the 20% Theory*

*Need to examine the types and frequency of day services by night shelter user type to be certain.
Assumptions:

- 2 distinct populations with distinct day shelter needs
- Decision today is about the best way to deliver those distinct needs in the context of your system vision
- Difficult to deliver both in a single environment
Solution #1:

Use the Day Shelter for Chronic and Moderate Users

- Within your new system design, orient services to match the path as identified via coordinated entry
- Focus on chronic and moderate users residing within shelter and those chronically homeless that still remain outside
- Focus on navigation services for those slated for housing
- Focus on increasing the pace of self-resolution for the moderate users
- Introduce diversion services for light users at a separate location or as a separate path
Solution #2:

Use the Day Shelter for Light User Diversion Services

- Use the co-location of services to support a formal diversion strategy that aims to help return light-touch individuals to their last stable housing environment (or an equivalent environment)
- Retool services to deliver intensive diversion case management for those with fewer options
- Use co-located safety net services to support ongoing prevention and diversion activities to housed individuals
Solution #3:

Use the Day Shelter for Light User Diversion & 24/7 Night Shelter for Chronic and Moderate Users

- **Activate Night Shelter** environments to support day shelter activities tailored to chronic and moderate users
- Co-locate assessment and navigation services to quickly identify intervention path (including income) and support the journey to resolution
- **Activate Day Shelter** as diversion center for light users
COORDINATED ENTRY - Individuals
Assess & Triage
Locations:
- MHP
- BSH
- Outreach Team
- OUR Center
- Jail

Diversion Services
(Year Round, Light Services)
Est. 1800 YR 1
At coordinated entry site or other location(s) if capacity
Provider: Existing or RFP
Est: 1800 YR 1

Diversion Plan
Rental Assistance
Reunification/Transportation
Housing Search
Landlord/Tenant/Family Facilitation
Est: 1200 Annually COB

Self-Resolve
With little assistance
No shelter
Est: 600 Annually COB

Short-Term Shelter Placement
- Few at BSH: focus on high-need day of
- Seasonal extreme weather days (~20 days per year) ongoing, Faith or other location
- Up to 50 Beds, Up to 7 days; One season, - Location TBD
- Phase out after year 1
- Possible Amenities, if in Diversion Plan (shower/locker)
- Provider - ?

Income & Housing Resolution
Short- or medium-term rental assistance for some
Est.: 450 Annually

Permanent Supportive Housing
County-wide Target: 10/year for 3 years
City-wide Target: 5/year for 3 years
Providers: Housing Authorities
Estimate
Years 1-3: 21-22 Placed Annually countywide
Years 4-6: 13 Placed Annually countywide

Rapid Re-Housing/Transitional Housing
County-wide Target: 50/year for 3 years
City-wide Target: 20/year for 3 years
Providers: Housing Authorities
Estimate
Years 1-3: 23-26 Placed Annually countywide
Years 4-6: 11 Placed Annually countywide

COORDINATED ENTRY - Youth/Young Adults
- Attention Homes

VI-SPDAT
More intensive services

Housing & Services

Program Based Shelter
Year Round, Day and Night
Moderate/High Needs Support
Provider BSH
160 Daily Beds
Est: 500 Annually COB

Separate Path for Families TBD

Appendix F
As diversion planning, housing capacity increases, demand for short-term term shelter decreases.
Diversion Assessment Overview

1. What brings you here today?
   - This question can bring out many of a new guest’s issues, barriers, and possible hints to whether diversion can be an option. Specific attention must be made to DV victims, where diversion may not be an option due to proximity and safety concerns.
   - Why today and not another day? What happened recently that brought them to needing shelter?

2. Are you alone or do you have a partner or children seeking assistance with you?
   (If children are seeking assistance, go to question 3.)

3. Has your family ever had involvement with Department of Children and Family Services?
   3a. Is there a current case pending with your household?
   3b. Is there a custody order in place?

4. What is/are your income source(s)?
   - Depending upon the income, this can lead to a hotel, SRO, or doubling up option. It can also lead to the revealing of other issues, i.e. substance abuse.

5. Where are/were you currently staying?
   (If it is a safe environment like with a friend or family, go to question 6.)
   (If it is not a safe environment like streets, or a shelter go to question 7. Also if unsafe due to Domestic Violence concerns)
   - If guest is on the streets or already in an emergency shelter, diversion can be more difficult because all options may have been exhausted. But other questions may reveal a diversion option.
   - Also probe to see if they were in a doubled up situation that was not working out and why?

6. Can you continue to stay there? And for how long?
7. Is there a family member or friend that you could stay with temporarily?

(If yes, go to question 8.)

(If no, go to question 9…except for those currently in a shelter.)

◦ For those already residing in the shelter system, you may go to your regular assessment and intake process and decide what services guest is eligible for. Or re-probe to see if the guest could benefit from family reunification, which could lead to a future divertive effort if bridges could be mended.

8. How is the relationship with that person? And would you allow a case manager to call that individual on your behalf?

◦ Having a compassionate individual, attached to a service oriented entity could soften the request of allowing a family member or friend stay in their home. It may also aid in mending any bridge that may have been damaged in the past.

(If no success, go to question 9.)

9. Have you ever stayed at an overnight shelter?

(If no, go to question 10.)

10. Would you consider staying at an overnight shelter in the event you have no other options?

◦ Here, an education of the shelter system can ensue with hopes to deter guest from staying at a shelter. In this case, revisiting previous questions may be necessary.

Once diversion has been ascertained to be feasible for this family, incorporate an individualized exit strategy. Explain to the guest that we are not advocating this diversionary arrangement as a permanent fix and that this strategy is necessary to move them toward independence.

This plan can be part of the general service plan and should include, but not be limited to, increase in income, childcare, job training, mental health/substance abuse screening and treatment, time frame goals (generally 3 – 4 mo. base with weekly accountability calls), transportation, and housing resources (i.e. landlord outreach, LIHEAP, rapid re-housing funds, food pantries, supper programs, community voicemail, drop in centers, benefit screening, etc.).
Appendix G 2

Early Diversion Screening Tool-Draft

1. Is there anyone in your network that may be able to help you find somewhere safe to stay?
   
   If yes, what is their name and contact information: _______________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________

   If yes-would you like me to help you contact them? ______________________________

2. Is there anyone that you think would allow you to stay with them?

   If yes, what is their name and contact information: _______________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________

   If yes, would you like me to help you contact them? ______________________________

3. Do you need financial assistance to help you resolve your housing crisis/situation?

   ___________________________________________________________________________

   If yes, if you got help with first month’s rent and damage deposit would you be able to pay for rent? _______________________________________________________________________________

   If yes, if someone was able to help you with back rent/utilities would you be able to stay in your housing? _______________________________________________________________________________

Notes Section: Please be sure to document any known information about supports/supportive persons including how long the youth think they would be able to stay/live with this person, etc.
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Program Guidelines Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide grantees with a high level background on the Shelter Diversion Pilot, and guidance on pilot model, process, data collection and reporting procedures. For specific details about the grant parameters, such as restrictions on use, please refer to the Washington Families Fund System Innovation Grant Agreement that each grantee signed.

Grant Background

DIVERSION OVERVIEW
Diversion is an emerging practice being tested in communities across the country used to divert families who are experiencing homelessness (who are currently unsheltered/living in a place not meant for human habitation) from emergency shelter when safe and appropriate, by providing individualized support BEFORE families enter the shelter system. Diversion programs assist families seeking shelter to identify immediate, alternate housing arrangements and, if necessary, connect them with services and financial assistance to help them obtain or return to housing.

Diversion provides an opportunity to assist those who are requesting homeless housing resources (e.g. shelter) in finding possible housing options outside of the traditional homeless system, ensuring that immediate and alternative arrangements are fully explored and supported while reserving shelter beds for those families that are the most vulnerable and have no other options.

Diversion services offer light-touch services with minimal financial assistance to families who are homeless, and whose housing options may likely include less-than-ideal housing situations. It does not necessarily ensure that families will have housing that meets the standard affordability standard (meaning housing where the household pays only 30 percent of their income toward housing costs), nor is it designed to eliminate poverty or housing mobility.

DIVERSION SERVICES
Diversion case managers will provide a combination of direct services and financial assistance to families for up to 30 days resulting in an alternate safe and stable housing arrangement. This removes the immediate need for additional homeless services including emergency shelter, rapid re-housing or transitional housing services.

Case managers will identify solutions and alternate housing arrangements to immediately resolve a family’s housing crisis such as re-establishing lease terms with recent landlord or identifying a viable doubled-up situation with family or friends.

Additionally case managers will provide ongoing assessment for health and safety risks that may indicate diversion services are not an appropriate intervention. This includes situations when a family indicates they do not feel safe remaining in their current housing situation or that one or more
members of their household have a chronic health or behavioral health condition that is being exasperated by their current housing situation.

For up to 30 days, case managers will provide diversion services to identify a viable housing solution for families. If within 30 days the family cannot identify a housing solution, or a newly identified safety and/or health risk impacts their ability to remain in their housing, the case manager will consult with Family Housing Connection to develop an appropriate next step for the family including a referral to rapid re-housing services or placement in an emergency shelter.

For more detailed information on the specific scope of work for diversion services, see section “Exhibit B- Scope of Work” of the Washington Families Fund: Systems Innovation Grant Agreement that each grantee signed or the FAQ section of these guidelines.

TARGET POPULATION
Homeless families whose housing situation has been assessed by 2-1-1 as being either unsheltered (i.e., living in places not meant for human habitation or in a non-participating shelter) or residing in a domestic violence shelter; and have been assessed by Family Housing Connection as being appropriate for Diversion services.

ELIGIBILITY FOR DIVERSION
All families who are eligible for FHC and come in for an initial assessment are eligible and will receive diversion services.

Any family that is referred to a partner agency for a deeper level of diversion services will be considered eligible with no additional requirements needed.

Diversion partner agencies are asked to maintain several openings at any given time in the FHC database, will receive referrals in rotating order between all four partner agencies, and are expected to serve all families referred for diversion from FHC.

ELIGIBLE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND FINANCIAL EXPENSES
The Diversion Pilot Model is structured to provide light-touch services and limited financial assistance to help families explore other possible options for securing housing outside of the traditional homeless housing resources (shelter).

These services include:

- Initial meeting with the family to brainstorm/explore possible non-traditional options
- Mediation and/or dispute resolution with previous landlords, family or friends
- Referrals to mainstream services or other community resources
- Post exit follow-up (up to 30 days)
The pilot is intended to offer very flexible financial assistance in order to allow creative solutions that may assist the family in obtaining housing and eliminating the need for shelter or other homeless housing resources.

Eligible financial assistance includes:

- Payment for background and credit checks
- Landlord fees
- Move-in costs (including deposit and first months rent; cost of moving truck; storage)
- Utility deposits and arrears
- Previous housing debt/rental arrears
- Transportation (including bus tickets for both local transportation and relocation)
- Grocery card
- Interpreter costs
- Fees for assistance securing ID’s, birth certificates, social security cards
- Certifications or license fees related to school or employment
- Work or education related assistance
- Other types of financial costs that will help the family obtain housing
Data Collection

SAFE HARBORS HMIS SYSTEM OVERVIEW
Grantees will enter data into Safe Harbors’ Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Safe Harbors has excellent resources on their website at www.safeharbors.org. Grantees can find information on data quality tips, help desk contacts, and even data dictionaries for Universal and Program Specific Data Elements (HUD data standards reference guides). Building Changes will pull grantee data reports from Safe Harbors to satisfy family level reporting requirements.

Should grantees need to amend staff who have access to enter data into Safe Harbors, Safe Harbors must be contacted directly via the “Contact Information” section on the last page of this document. All Safe Harbors users will need to complete and submit the “User Responsibility & Code of Ethics Agreement” located on the Safe Harbors website in addition to any necessary training required. Safe Harbors staff can provide guidance on required trainings should grantees have any questions regarding what trainings to attend.

TYPES OF DATA COLLECTED
There are two main distinctions between the types of data collected; 1) what is required by HUD, and 2) Diversion specific activities.

HUD Required Data Elements
HUD requires the entry of two types of data elements:

1) **Universal data elements** that focus on demographics such as date of birth and race, and
2) **Program Specific data elements** that focus on elements such as employment and income.

Detailed descriptions of HUD required data elements are provided on Safe Harbors website and also hyperlinked in this document.
Diversion Data Elements

In addition to HUD required data elements, Building Changes also requires data entry on Diversion specific activities which is located in the “Services Provided” section of Safe Harbors. This section captures three types of data elements otherwise known as “Program Components” in Safe Harbors:

1) **Services Provided** by the case manager:
   a. Date service was provided, and
   b. The type of service provided.

   The types of services case managers can choose from are:
   - Mediation and dispute resolution services
   - Housing placement
   - Other type of service (NOTE: You must record what type of other service was provided in the description section online.)

2) **Referrals** made to mainstream services:
   a. Date referral was made, and
   b. The type of referral made.

   The types of referrals case managers can choose from are:
   - Basic needs (i.e., food, material goods)
   - Child care assistance or subsidy
   - Criminal justice and legal assistance
   - Education
   - Employment
   - Food stamps or Benefits Card (SNAP)
   - Medicaid
   - Mental health counseling
   - Money management counseling
   - Physical health
   - Substance abuse counseling
   - TANF Assistance
   - Utility bill payment assistance
   - Other type of referral (NOTE: You must record what type of other type of referral was provided in the description section online.)

**Reminder**
Don’t forget to enter the $$ dollar amount $$ of financial assistance provided.

**Reminder**
All activities must also have a date entered indicating when they were provided.

**Important Note!**
Choose only the 1 or 2 referrals that had a direct impact on the family’s ability to be diverted from shelter.

**Reminder**
If you choose “other” as an activity, you must also record what “other” was in the description section.
3) **Financial Assistance** provided to families:
   a. Date the financial assistance was provided,
   b. The type of financial assistance provided, and
   c. The dollar amount.

The types of financial assistance case managers can choose from are:
- Background check payment assistance *(Note: Includes credit and criminal background check fees)*
- Certification/license fees related to employment
- Criminal justice and legal assistance
- Food card
- Interpreter payment assistance
- Landlord fees *(Note: Includes application fees, holding fees and any other administrative fees)*
- Moving cost assistance *(Note: Includes the cost of renting a moving truck and any supplies needed for moving such as boxes, tape or renting a dolly)*
- Rental assistance *(Note: Includes rental arrears)*
- Security deposit
- Transportation *(Note: Includes bus, train or plane tickets; gas cards; and car repairs)*
- Utility bill payment assistance *(Note: Includes utility arrears)*
- Work or education related materials
- Other type of financial assistance *(Note: Please record the type of financial assistance provided in the description field in Safe Harbors)*

**Follow-Up (30 days post-exit)**
It is also possible that families may return to the program seeking additional assistance. If this occurs within 30 days after exiting the program, the case manager will record services provided in the “Program Exit” section of Safe Harbors. There will be a “Follow Up” button in the upper right hand side of the screen, which you will click on. The “Follow Up” section captures all of the services that a case manager can provide in addition to referrals to mainstream services as “Activities.”

It’s important to note that financial assistance cannot be provided to families at follow-up.

4) **Follow-Up** provided to families:
   a. Date the service/referral was provided,
   b. The type of service/referral provided, and
   c. If the family was referred back to Family Housing Connection.

All services and referrals are provided in one large list and are the same services and referrals described above.

If an “other” is chosen as an “Activity” from the drop down list, then the case manager must also answer “Follow up Questions” to record what the “other” service or activity is.
WHEN DATA ARE COLLECTED
Grantees will collect data from families when they enter and exit the Diversion pilot; and at follow-up if the family returns 30 days post program exit. The table below describes different types of data and the timeframe for which they are collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>PROGRAM ENTRY</th>
<th>PROGRAM EXIT</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUD required data elements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion specific activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up specific activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFE HARBORS’ STEP-BY-STEP GUIDE FOR ENTERING DIVERSION SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
As previously mentioned, Diversion specific activities are collected through the “Additional Questions” section in Safe Harbors. Safe Harbors has provided a step-by-step guide including screen shots that walks users through the process of entering data in this section. See Appendix A to view the step-by-step guide.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Building Changes will only receive de-identified data through Safe Harbor reports to satisfy grant reporting requirements and inform Learning Circles. Building Changes will not share grantee data unless mutually agreed upon by Building Changes and the grantee, data will only be provided in aggregate form.

For more detailed information around confidentiality see section “13. Privacy” of the Washington Families Fund: Systems Innovation Grant Agreement that each grantee signed.

Reporting Procedures

SAFE HARBORS GENERATED REPORTS
Building Changes and grantees will access reports through Safe Harbors’ reporting feature. Reports generated will be used to satisfy grant reporting and to gain information to be used in Learning Circles. Reports will be pulled at a mutually agreed upon date.

Please note that reports may be changed to improve their use by grantees.

Ad Hoc Reports will provide information on:

- Basic demographics;
- Number of families served by diversion, referred to diversion partners, successfully diverted, and returned 30 days post-exit, referred back to Family Housing Connection;
- Types of services provided to families by case managers;
• Types of referrals to mainstream services;
• Types of financial assistance provided and the cost associated; and
• Types of services provided at follow-up.

NARRATIVE REPORTS
Grantees will provide Building Changes with narrative reports as identified in section “8. Reports” of the Washington Families Fund: Systems Innovation Grant Agreement that each grantee signed. Narrative reports specific to the grantee are provided as Exhibit D-2 in the grant agreement along with the schedule for required reports provided as Exhibit D.

Evaluation & Learning Activities

GOALS
This grant is exploratory in nature allowing Building Changes, the City of Seattle Human Services Department, partners, and grantees to learn more about the types of families being served by Diversion services, along with what types of services provided to families (i.e., services provided by the case manager, referrals made to mainstream services, and financial assistance provided), and what types of families return for additional services at follow-up and what types of services they need.

WHAT IS CONSIDERED A SUCCESSFUL DIVERSION?
For evaluation purposes, a family will be placed into three categories at program exit: 1) successfully diverted, 2) unsuccessfully diverted, and 3) not applicable. The categories are defined as follows:

1) Successfully Diverted
   a. Owned by client, no housing subsidy
   b. Owned by client, with housing subsidy
   c. Rental by client, no housing subsidy
   d. Rental by client, other (non-VASH) housing subsidy
   e. Rental by client, VASH Subsidy
   f. Staying or living with family, permanent tenure
   g. Staying or living with family, temporary tenure (e.g., room, apartment or house)
   h. Staying or living with friends, permanent tenure
   i. Staying or living with friends, temporary tenure (e.g., room, apartment or house)

2) Unsuccessfully Diverted
   a. Emergency shelter, including hotel or motel paid for with emergency shelter voucher
   b. Foster care home or foster care group home
   c. Hospital (non-psychiatric)
d. Hotel or motel paid for without emergency shelter voucher

e. Jail, prison, or juvenile detention facility

f. Permanent housing for formerly homeless persons (such as SHP, S+C, or SRO Mod Rehab)

g. Place not meant for habitation (e.g., a vehicle, an abandoned building, bus/train/subway station/airport or anywhere outside)

h. Psychiatric hospital or other psychiatric facility

i. Safe Haven

j. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center

k. Transitional housing for homeless persons (including homeless youth)

3) Not Applicable

a. Deceased

b. Don't know

c. Other

d. Refused

LEARNING CIRCLES
Grantees will participate in Learning Circles initiated by funders where Safe Harbors data will be used to better understand:

- The types of families being served through the Diversion Pilot,
- The types of service provided by case managers,
- The types of referrals being made to mainstream services,
- How Financial Assistance is being used, and
- The type of families returning at follow-up and their identified needs.

Additionally, Learning Circles provide an opportunity for peer learning and will help identify areas where Building Changes can support grantees through capacity building to ensure the success of the grant.
Appendix A: Step-By-Step Guide to Data Entry

Diversion Pilot Guide

This section was authored by Safe Harbors and provides you with a step-by-step guide to entering data. Should you have any questions about any section in Appendix A, please contact Safe Harbors directly at the number provided on the contact page.

The standard Services Provided page in HMIS has only one container visible on the page – the Activity container.

Figure 1.

For Diversion, another container has been made visible. Diversion Programs use multiple types of Services (Referrals, Services Provided, Financial Assistance, Follow-up). In order to reduce the number of Programs required to keep each Service type discreet, each Diversion Program has been created with multiple Program Components. A Program Component can be thought as a sub-Program.

The use of a Program Component adds only one step to the process for providing a service. By choosing a Program Component, you are able to designate the Service type.

The Program Component container is shown in Figure 2.
Providing Services

1. Select the “Services Provided” page (see Figure 3).
2. In the grid on the right, select the Program Component that corresponds to the service type. In the example below, the service type is Financial Assistance. 

**NOTE:** There is no need to use the Save button.

![Figure 4](image)

3. Select the New button in the Activity container and assign the Activity (Service) as usual.

![Figure 5](image)

4. Complete the Service by entering a Date. If you choose a Service that is an “Other type of service” please provide a brief description of what the “other” service is in the Description. For all other services, please leave the Description section blank. If the Program Component called Financial Assistance is chosen, an Amount will also need to be entered.

![Figure 6](image)

**Important Note!** If you choose an “other” option in the Activity field, don’t forget to provide a brief description of what “other” is in the Description field.

5. Select Save.
Follow-up Questions

Clients may return for additional assistance within 30 days of their exit from the Program. In order to record any referral of services received at that time, the **Follow Up** function can be used. The **Follow Up** button is found on the **Program Exit** page.
An additional set of Services and questions has been added to collect information about any referrals or services.

1. Click the **Follow Up** button and a pop up pane will appear.
   
   **Figure 9.**

2. In the **Follow-up Activity** container, select the **New** button.
   
   **Figure 10.**

3. Select the **Follow-up done after exit** Program Component (**Prog Component**).
   
   **NOTE:** Only the **Follow-up done after exit** Program Component has Activities.
   
   **Figure 11.**
4. Select the **Activity** from the drop down list.  
   ![Figure 12](image)

5. Enter the date on which the Referral or Activity (Service) was received.  
   ![Figure 13](image)

6. Select **Save**.

7. If applicable, answer the questions that appear in the **Follow-up Questions** container. If the Activity “Other” is selected, use these questions to indicate what type of Activity is provided.  
   ![Figure 14](image)

8. Select **Save**.
Appendix B: Step-by-Step Guide to Posting & Responding to Referrals in FHC Database (updated 5.8.14)

In order to post, receive and respond to referrals from FHC, agency intake coordinators should follow the following steps:

Getting Started

- If you are downloading the database for the first time: [http://www.ccsfhc.org/for-providers/reports/](http://www.ccsfhc.org/for-providers/reports/)
- For questions and set-up support, please contact Karl Jenkinson: Karlj@ccsww.org or 206.328.5920

Logging In

Figure 1.
NOTE: As of May 12, 2014, agencies no longer need to enter a resource opening in to the FHC database. As new families are identified through FHC for diversion partner services, referrals will be sent to each of the four agencies on a rotating basis via the database.

STEP 1: When a referral is sent to an agency, the primary agency contact will receive an email notification that a referral has been sent.

STEP 2: Retrieving Referrals

- Go to “Referral Response” tab
- In Organization drop down, select your agency
- In Program drop down, select your Diversion program (“Diversion Pilot”)
- Highlight the family in the right-hand grid
- Click the “Housing Assessment” button at the bottom of the blue screen
- Note: you will not receive a full “assessment” as part of the referral, however you will still need to click on the “housing assessment”; you will see the family’s most recent contact information in the “Household/Demographics” table as well as notes from the FHC Diversion Specialists.

STEP 3: Updating Outcomes

- Go to “Referral Response” tab
In the drop downs, select your agency and your Diversion program
Highlight the family on the right-hand grid
Select the appropriate staff person who is entering the update
Enter the date of the outcome
Select the appropriate “Diversion outcome” (see Diversion Outcome options)
Enter any additional information or notes in the “Response” field
Click “Save” button

Figure 4.

Diversion Outcome Response Options

When entering an outcome for your referral, please select from one of the following response options only:
• **Diversion in Progress**: Agency and family are working together, exploring diversion opportunities. *This option/response should be updated as soon as you begin to work with the family.*

• **Successfully Diverted**: Family has obtained housing and will not be added to the FHC placement roster.

• **Unable to Divert**: Diversion is not an option at this time. The family will return to FHC to complete the housing assessment.

• **Unable to Contact**: Provider is unable to reach the family after the referral was sent. The family will need to call 2-1-1 to make a new appointment with FHC to complete a housing assessment.

• **Obtained Other Housing**: Family identified housing on their own and is not in need of diversion or FHC support.

**ALL REFERRAL OUTCOMES MUST BE UPDATED AS SOON AS THE ACTION OCCURS. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT WHICH OUTCOME OPTION IS APPROPRIATE, CONTACT FHC FOR GUIDANCE.**

*Note: At the 5/1/14 Learning Circle it was decided that agencies will enter “Successfully Diverted” when the family has moved in to their housing situation AND when you are exiting them from Safe Harbors (within 3 days of actual move-in).*
Appendix C: Frequently Asked Questions

1. I’m working with a family that needs extra time to find a new apartment. Do I have to stop providing Diversion services after 30 days?
   If you haven’t been able to identify a housing solution with a family within 30 days, they should be referred back to FHC. If you are able to identify a housing solution within 30 days, you may continue to work with the family to implement the solution for more than 30 days if needed.

2. Do I need to conduct an inspection if I’m using Diversion funds to assist a family?
   You need to conduct an inspection if a family member will become a lease holder through Diversion. Use the inspection forms provided in your City of Seattle Homelessness Prevention contract.

3. May I provide financial assistance to assist a family that wants to move to Pierce County?
   Yes. You may help families secure housing outside of the City of Seattle through the Diversion Pilot Program. If you’re providing out-of-area relocation assistance, the family must have a stable place to stay for at least 30 days.

4. Can more than one month of rent assistance be provided through Diversion?
   If a family will need more than a deposit/move-in assistance and one month of rent assistance, then they may be a better candidate for the Rapid Rehousing program. See FAQ #21 for determining if a family should be shifted to Rapid Rehousing.

5. If I try to divert a family, will they lose their place on the FHC placement roster?
   No. If a family is not successfully diverted they will return to the placement roster and retain their original date. If you have questions about where a family is on the roster, you may contact the referral supervisor at FHC.

6. Do I need to update a family’s status in FHC’s database after our first meeting?
   Yes. As soon as you have your first appointment with a family, please update their status to "diversion in progress" if you are going to attempt diversion or "unable to be diverted" if diversion won't be an option (this is what triggers the family to reactivated on the FHC waiting list for available shelter). Once you finish working with a family, please change their status to "successfully diverted" or "unable to be diverted." If Diversion isn’t successful and the family’s status isn’t changed to “unable to be diverted,” they could miss the opportunity to be placed into shelter through FHC.

7. I have a question about the eligibility of a family that was referred to my agency for Diversion. Who should I contact for assistance?
   All members of the Diversion Funders Group have an open door and are excited to hear questions and feedback. However, billing and contract specific questions should go to Nick Codd of Building Changes. Program and policy questions should generally be directed to Courtney Velazquez of the City of Seattle. Courtney will share first-time program policy questions with the Diversion Funder’s Group.
8. If a family has participated in Diversion, can they also participate in my agency’s Homelessness Prevention Program?
   Homelessness Prevention and Diversion are separate programs. You should not enroll a family in Diversion if they will not be able to sustain housing without ongoing rent assistance. If a family is successfully diverted and later experiences a new housing emergency, Prevention services may be an option. Contact Joy Hunt, Contract Specialist for City of Seattle Homelessness Prevention Contracts, to discuss the family’s circumstances before enrolling a family that has been through the Diversion Pilot in your agency’s Prevention program.

9. Do I need to verify a family’s income before providing Diversion services?
   No. Any literally homeless family referred for Diversion by FHC may participate in the program. You do not need to verify their income before providing services.

10. Am I required to house families in units below Fair Market Rent?
    No. It is a best practice to try to help families find affordable units, but there is no Fair Market Rent requirement for the Diversion Pilot.

11. I’m working with a family who would like to be reunited with relatives living out-of-state. Is Greyhound the only transportation option?
    Not necessarily. Families should generally use whichever option (bus, train or plane) is most cost effective. If the costs are comparable, please consult the family to determine which transportation option best meets their needs. If a family member has a medical condition that makes travel difficult, or there are other extenuating circumstances, it may sometimes be appropriate to choose a more expensive travel option. Please contract Nick Codd or Joy Hunt with questions about specific cases.

12. One of the families I’m working with is moving into a new apartment and a member of the household will be the lease holder. Do I need to conduct a unit inspection if the apartment is outside of the City of Seattle?
    You need to conduct a unit inspection if a family is moving into a unit anywhere in King County. If a family is moving outside of King County, please reach out to at least two local government agencies or nonprofits to ask if a member of their team is available to conduct the inspection. If a local partner is not available to do the inspection, a landlord or property manager may complete the unit inspection as a last resort.

13. Do I need to do a Safe Harbors entry for all clients who are referred to my agency for Diversion, or just for the clients who are successfully diverted?
    Everyone you attempt to divert should be entered into HMIS (regardless of whether Diversion is successful). However, if you meet with a family and decide not to attempt Diversion, then you do not need to enter them into HMIS.
14. When should Diversion participants be exited from Safe Harbors?
Please exit families from Safe Harbors within three days of being “housed” – when they actually move in to their housing, move in with family/friends, get on a bus to relocate, etc. It is appropriate to wait for the 3 days after move-in to make sure the situation is going to work out and to provide any additional financial assistance the family may need to stay housed.

15. Are there any reports I can run in Safe Harbors to check my data entry for Diversion?
There are 2 Diversion-specific ad hoc reports in HMIS that can be used to check your data:
   a) Diversion Main Report (provides demographic information)
   b) Diversion Services Report (provides information on services received by participants)

Instructions for running the Diversion ad hoc reports:
1. In HMIS, go to Reports.
2. In the Reports navigation tree, select ‘Inventory’ under the heading ‘AdHoc Report’
3. In the tab labeled ‘AdHocReport[Inventory]’ in the ‘Category’ field, select ‘All’ from the pull down, then click the ‘Search’ button
4. The names of ad hoc reports will display in the tab
5. To run the ad hoc reports, click on the name of the report that is listed in the ‘Report Name’ column, then click the ‘Display’ button
6. When the report results have finished displaying, export the results to Excel format

16. We have a number of Diversion clients who do not have any household items (furniture, dishes, cleaning supplies, etc.). Can those items be purchased through Diversion?
Basic household items may be provided through the Diversion program. This could include an appointment with Sharehouse, or other low-cost options. Assistance purchasing any needed household items should be provided as soon as families secure housing so that families have access to the needed items and can be exited from the Diversion program quickly.

17. I’d like to pay for a background check to help a family I’m attempting to Divert apply for housing. If the family’s housing application isn’t ultimately approved and Diversion isn’t successful, will my agency still be eligible for reimbursement?
Yes. You may be reimbursed for limited expenses directly tied to the housing search process, such as background checks and interpretation fees, even if Diversion is not ultimately successful.

18. A new family has been referred to my agency for Diversion. Are there any expectations regarding how quickly I should make contact with the family? Also, what’s the best way to get up-to-speed on their situation before our first meeting?
It is expected that partner agencies will call families within 72 hours of referral. FHC staff will use the case notes feature to give an overview of each families’ situation prior to referral. If case notes are not provided or if other client information appears to be missing, please email the families’ identifier to Emily Harris-Shears of FHC.
19. I work at FHC, and I'm diverting a family to a partner agency. How do I best describe Diversion to families without making commitments on the partner agency's behalf?

FHC staff should focus on the range of things Diversion can potentially do to assist families. In general, staff should say things like, “it sounds like the agency I’m referring you to may be able to help you with that...” rather than making specific commitments.

20. What do I do if a family that was unable to divert returns to my agency and wants to work with me again?

There are two scenarios that would require different responses:

a) The family was unable to divert and they were referred back to FHC. FHC contacts the family to start the housing assessment, but the family says no, they still want to do Diversion.
   -- FHC contacts the Agency Case Manager with whom the family last worked and then sends the family back to work with you.

b) The family was unable to divert, referred back to FHC, and FHC completed the housing assessment. The family contacts you and says that they want to do Diversion again.
   -- Inform the family that they should contact FHC and tell FHC that they want to be taken off the housing list and that they want to do Diversion again. FHC will refer the family to the Wellspring Non-pilot Diversion program.

21. When is it appropriate to shift a family from Diversion to Rapid Rehousing? What is the procedure for making this shift?

Shifting a family from Diversion to Rapid Rehousing should only occur after Diversion has been explored as an option. Even families with “high” barriers to housing have been diverted successfully; there isn’t a set group of criteria that determines if a family will or won’t be successful in diversion. Success in Diversion is defined as safe, stable housing that the family can maintain.

If Diversion has been explored and it is clear that the family would not succeed with one-time assistance, the case manager and supervisor may consider shifting a family to Rapid Rehousing. In order to be transferred from Diversion to Rapid Rehousing, the family must have a housing plan that can be achieved and the housing plan must specify that additional short-term assistance is needed for the family to obtain safe, stable housing that can be maintained.

Note: Any family who might be successful with one-time assistance should remain in Diversion. The possible shift to Rapid Rehousing should only be considered where the family has an achievable housing plan, but one-time assistance is not sufficient to end the family’s homelessness. If the family does not have an achievable housing plan in place and Diversion would not be successful, then the family should be referred back to FHC.

Exit procedure for shifting a family from Diversion to Rapid Rehousing:
• In FHC, select “Successfully Diverted” as the outcome; then enroll the family in “Rapid Rehousing.”
• In Safe Harbors, exit the family to “Rental by client, other (non-VASH) ongoing housing subsidy.”

22. How much financial assistance is available for a family that is re-referred to Diversion from FHC (the family had been in Diversion before and was exited)?

A family that is re-referred to Diversion based on an informed, updated referral from FHC is considered “new” and financial assistance of up to $2,500 is available to assist them. The family must be able to build or expand upon their previous housing plan in order to develop their new housing plan.
Contact Information

If you have any questions about the HMIS data collection or reporting for this Building Changes Washington Families Fund Systems Innovation Grant, please contact Nick Codd directly at 206.805.6133 or nick.codd@buildingchanges.org.

If you are experiencing any technical difficulties with Safe Harbors, please contact the Safe Harbors Help Desk (Monday through Friday between 8:00am and 4:30pm) at 206.386.0030 or SafeHarborsHMISHelp@Seattle.gov. Additional information can also be found on Safe Harbors’ website at www.safeharbors.org.

If you need support or assistance with the FHC referral database, please contact:
Database questions – Karl Jenkinson at Karlj@ccsww.org or 206.328.5920
General Diversion referral questions – Danielle Winslow at DanielleWi@ccsww.org or 206.328.5703.