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ABSTRACT

Homelessness has been a significant issue in California since the 1980s and continues to be a major challenge, especially in urban areas. With housing costs continuing to rise, cities have made attempts to adapt to meet the needs of their homeless population, but have fallen short in providing the necessary services and systemic changes to improve the issue. In 2015, San Francisco implemented a new shelter model called Navigation Centers, intending to support the most vulnerable individuals in the city’s homeless population. These shelters offer an interim solution between the streets and a permanent housing solution while providing services to the clients it serves. The model has spread throughout the country as an alternative to traditional shelters. Upon investigation, the Navigation Centers are useful in helping clients access benefits and find housing. However, to improve outcomes, the city needs to publish an updated report of the Navigation Center’s results, refocus the program on the most vulnerable homeless individuals, increase public education programs to reduce stigmas, and evaluate and expand the affordable housing stock throughout the city.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout my time in college, I have had many opportunities to engage in meaningful work outside the classroom. Of all of the issues within the city of Los Angeles, homelessness has always stood out to me. In a city with such notable wealth, it seems almost implausible that thousands of people do not have a place to call home. I have been eager to learn all I can about how this happened and what can be done to fix the problem.

During the fall of 2017, I had the opportunity to intern with Los Angeles Community Action Network (LA CAN) through Occidental’s Urban and Environmental Policy Community Organizing course. LA CAN is a community organizing non-profit in Skid Row that aims to empower those dealing with poverty, including homeless individuals, to advocate and organize politically. During my time there, I engaged in critical discussions about the problems facing homeless Angelenos and advocated for community-based solutions. My interest in homeless rights in Los Angeles was deepened through my internship in Mayor Garcetti’s Office of Public Engagement in the summer of 2018. My main task as an intern was to build support for an upcoming homeless housing solution called A Bridge Home, which launched in September 2018. A Bridge Home was modeled after Navigation Centers, a program that San Francisco launched in March 2015 (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017). These programs provide an interim shelter solution between the street and permanent housing and provide in-house services. They temporarily house homeless individuals and work with service providers in an environment that is designed to help them transition out of homelessness into a permanent housing solution (Eric Garcetti 2018) (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017).
The state defines homeless individuals as, “People who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence.” This definition includes those whose nighttime residence is not intended for “human habitation,” who are living in shelters or hotels, or who has exited an institution after more than ninety days and previously was considered homeless (Wheeler 2018). In this paper, I will be referring to homelessness as defined by the state. According to the California State Auditor’s 2018 Report, California has the highest number of homeless people in the nation and is home to 24 percent of the country’s homeless population. In addition, greater than two-thirds of the state’s homeless population are unsheltered (Wheeler 2018).

As the homelessness issue persists throughout the state, there is no better time to embark on research of the Navigation Center model, which has been replicated not only in Los Angeles but throughout the country.

This paper aims to answer the question: What changes can be made to Navigation Centers in San Francisco to improve the outcomes of the program? To provide context for the Navigation Center program, I first offer a review of relevant literature on homelessness causes and solutions in the United States. Next, I explain San Francisco’s relationship with its homeless population and homeless shelters to give context to the city’s decision to implement Navigation Centers. To answer the research question, I conducted a content analysis of news articles and city-issued reports in addition to conducting two stakeholder interviews. Based on an analysis of my research findings, I provide recommendations for the Navigation Center program.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Causes of Homelessness in the United States

In the second half of the twentieth century, the United States experienced a dramatic increase in GDP, as it doubled between 1959 and 2004. However, US poverty rates fail to reflect this change. While changes in GDP have proven not to be a reliable indicator of changes in the poverty rate, changes in the labor market such as median wages, unemployment rates and inequality do a better job of reflecting poverty rates. The absence of improvement in poverty rates despite rising living conditions is due to a lack of median wages increases and wealth inequality (Hoynes, Page, and Stevens 2006).

Economic recessions in the later 1970s and 1980s led baby boomers to come of age during a time of depressed wages for unskilled workers, high rates of youth and young adult unemployment and rising rental prices. Additionally, the same period brought about a shortage of housing, shrinking demand for labor, inflation and cutbacks in social services (Benda and Dattalo 1990). The combination of these circumstances caused high rates of homelessness (Kuhn and Culhane 1998). Some argue that on an individual level, many people who became homeless during this time experienced several challenges throughout their lifetimes, often beginning during their childhood, including paths of crime, substance abuse, and mental illness (Benda and Dattalo 1990). However, systemic changes on the federal level that occurred during the same time offer an alternative explanation for the high rates of homelessness.

In the 1980s the Reagan Administration slashed an inordinate amount of public benefits by $20 billion within his first two years in office including “unemployment insurance, Social Security, and public assistance for families” (Mathieu 1993). These cuts occurred alongside a nationwide wage decrease and a sharp increase in housing cost in cities (Mathieu 1993) which
spurred a change in the landscape of homeless individuals and families by creating a large population of economically homeless individuals, meaning people who simply cannot afford the cost of housed living and do not face other challenges such as substance abuse or mental illness that create barriers to successful housing (Fodor and Grossman 1988).

In 2008, The Great Recession prompted another wave of poverty and housing instability that created even more obstacles to economic and housing stability. Unemployment rates skyrocketed to the highest they have been since the Great Depression (Farber 2012). As a result of high unemployment rates and the housing market collapse, many working-age adults faced housing (Burgard, Seefeldt, and Zelner 2012). In a 2009-2010 study by the Michigan Recession and Recovery on the relationship between housing instability and health, a survey found that one-third of the sample population reported experiencing housing instability since the recession. Economic inequality and high housing costs continue to be a significant reason for the high rates of homelessness in the US.

Government Responses to Homelessness

Prior to the Reagan administration, public housing and Single Room Occupancy (SROs) served as housing options for low-income individuals and families (Mathieu 1993). However, these programs, and other federally funded programs were largely discontinued throughout the 1980s and 1990s after drastic cuts in the federal budget. Cities were then left to solve homeless crises on their own (Lyon-Calloy 2000). As the number of visibly homeless people and families grew in cities, so did voters’ concern. While cities began to open shelters, they were unable to provide an adequate amount to serve the homeless population. In an attempt to relieve some of the pressure on themselves to independently solve their homelessness rate without federal
support, cities began to medicalize homelessness and criminalize homelessness to curve and
distract from voter concern (Mathieu 1993). By doing so, the responsibility fell on the
Department of Mental Health or the criminal justice systems and gave the impression that a
limited the number of individuals specifically required homeless assistance as a result of
economic instability. Furthermore, through criminalization and medicalization of homelessness,
cities diverted attention away from systemic failures that caused high rates of poverty and
homelessness and repackaged the issues as individual problems (Lyon-Calho 2000).

*Shelter Models*

Popular shelters in the 1970s and 1980s focused primarily on providing a place to sleep,
eat and shower (Lyon-Calho 2000). The shelters simply offered the most basic needs that
homeless individuals were not able to meet without a home (Gounis 1992). These shelters were
funded through a combination of federal and private resources. In the early 1980s, private
funding accounted for more than half the shelter funding, but throughout the decade the
government increased their contribution due to increased public concern and support (Burt and
Cohen 1989).

As the shelter system expanded throughout the 1980s, it was not uncommon for cities to
built shelters in armories, old schools, abandoned hospitals (Gounis 1992). While these models
got residents off the street and improved optics of homelessness for the general community, the
model did little to assist homeless individuals in finding permanent housing or viable solutions
for any barriers that prevented them from a successful housing situation. Additionally, the
structure of these shelters made it difficult for those staying to do much else beyond sheep, eat
and shower. Moreover, in order to meet with a case worker, reserve a bed, and get a meal, shelter
residents had to wait in line for significant amounts of time (Gounis 1992). This often interfered with the prospect of securing and maintaining employment, as basic needs had to be met first (Lyon-Callos 2000).

Shelters like these provided a safe place to sleep but ultimately left homeless individuals and families to their own to use their small amount of free time to work through their barriers to escaping homelessness such as access services, housing or employment (Letiecq, Anderson, and Koblinsky 1998). These barriers not only made it difficult to enter the shelter system but also made it difficult to exit the shelter system; once individuals entered the system, they relied on it to meet their basic needs and had little time and support for much else.

In an attempt to more effectively meet the needs of homeless individuals, some shelters adopted the “continuum of care” model. This model offered community development and service programs within the shelter that aimed to identify the needs of individuals that would allow them to maintain a housing situation successfully. This often meant that homeless individuals would undergo physiological examinations ending in an obligatory diagnosis. According to Lyon-Callos (2000), while this model was successful in providing more than just basic needs of homeless people, it created a narrative that homelessness was an individual problem instead of a result of systematic inequities. By diagnosing homeless individuals, cities, states, and the county escaped responsibility for failing to provide adequate housing and social services to prevent homelessness, as it moved the issue from housing services to mental health services.

Due to the high need and lack of resources, cities often lack consistency in shelter models. In 2009 San Francisco, for example, had 1400 shelter beds in 14 shelters across the city with no standards of service (Murphy 2009). In addition, a 2004 referral and intake system intended to help organize the flow of shelter residents increased barriers to entry, according to
interviews conducted in a 2009 study by Stacey Miller of Berkeley’s Department of City and Regional Planning. However, SF continues to run multiple shelter models with a variety of degrees of service provisions.

Safety has been a considerable concern surrounding shelters in recent years. In a 2007 study by the San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness, 55 percent of shelter residents reported sexual, verbal or physical abuse in shelters. Furthermore, interviews from the 2009 Berkley study above reveal harassment, abuse, extortion, bribery, drug use, violence and other threats inside the shelter both from shelter staff and other residents (Murphy 2009). These safety issues are not only a concern of those utilizing the shelter system but also of those living in the areas surrounding shelters.

As is evidenced by the multiple shelter models over the years, the shelter system is always changing and adapting to attempt to meet the needs of the homeless population, make the most out of funding and adajust to being short-staffed (Gounis 1992). Even when shelter models evolved to provide services through the continuum of care model, the homeless crisis persisted. The shelter system has continued to fall short of meeting the needs of those for whom it is created. Furthermore, the ever-changing nature presents a challenge in itself because it makes it even more ineffective as homeless individuals often lack resources like reliable internet and telephone access that make navigating the already complex system even more difficult (Murphy 2009).

Recent research from the Canadian Journal of Psychiatry has suggested that Housing First, a new solution to solving homelessness is a cost-effective and efficient way to assist homeless individuals (Ly and Latimer 2015). Housing First was created in Europe and used by the Labour government in the United Kingdom. It was initially implemented in the US by the
Bush Administration in response to the persistent homeless crisis (Stanhope and Dunn 2011) and was a unique occurrence of a conservative administration adopting a progressive policy (Stanhope and Dunn 2011). Housing First differs from previous homeless solutions in that it does not require mental health treatment or sobriety as prerequisites to a stable home. (Brown et al. 2016). In a 2016 study conducted by DePaul University and Downtown Emergency Service Center comparing Housing First to traditional services on homeless individuals with mental illness, 90 percent of those in the Housing First model did not return to homelessness while 25 percent of those who received traditional services including supportive housing (Brown et al. 2016). This research suggests housing itself is the primary barrier of homelessness and that services are more effective when individuals have a secure home while dealing with a mental health or substance abuse issue.

City-Run Shelter Populations

As city-run shelters increased, their target populations were not always equitable in their reflection of the homeless population. A 1989 study from The Urban Institute describes a sharp increase in the 1980s in shelters that accommodated families, as the demographics of the homeless population began to change and more families became homeless. The number of shelters increased from 100,000 to 275,000 in the US between 1983 and 1988, to reflect the growing needs of the population. Many of these new shelters focused explicitly on families. This is partially because it was easier to get the public to mobilize around homeless children than it was to get them to mobilize around single homeless adults (Burt and Cohen 1989). The Urban Institute study focused on the homeless populations of New York and Philadelphia and aimed to provide data on which populations were able to access shelter. Of those sampled, 13 percent of
single women, 4 percent of women with children and 27 percent of single men were spending no nights in shelters. Meanwhile, 21 percent of single women, 26 percent of women with children and less than 2 percent of men regularly spent seven nights a week in a shelter. This data reveals that in 1989, single homeless individuals, specifically men, were being excluded from the shelter system and left on the street.

A 1998 study gathered data regarding the makeup of shelter populations. These shelters separated individuals by gender and those staying exited each morning without being promised a bed the next night. The study found that “transitionally homeless,” people, referring to those who are only in the shelter system for a short time, made up 80 percent of shelter users. Transitionally homeless people were generally young, white, and less likely to have mental health, substance abuse, or medical issues. About 10 percent of shelter users were “episodically homeless,” meaning that they transition in and out of homelessness. This group was also young but generally nonwhite and more likely to suffer from mental health, substance abuse, or medical issues. Another 10 percent were categorized as “chronically homeless,” meaning they are homeless for a long period, and were generally old, nonwhite and had higher rates of mental health, substance abuse and medical issues (Kuhn and Culhane 1998). This study reveals a significant flaw in the old shelter system, as groups that had high levels of vulnerable populations including the elderly, people of color and those suffering from a variety of health issues made up only twenty percent of the shelter population.

When state and federal governments tasked cities with providing shelters due to budget cuts, their solutions were inadequate. Even though cities provided shelters for homeless people, certain groups such as men, elderly, people of color and those with health issues were less likely
to secure spots in shelters and find housing solutions. History reviews large-scale equity issue in regards to access to shelter and shelter care.

*Nonprofit Responses to Homelessness*

Nonprofits have been assisting the government in providing services including education, training, housing, counseling, and financial support throughout the United States history (Lipsky and Smith 1989). Nonprofits, including religious organizations, were the first to respond to the homeless crisis (Burt and Cohen 1989). They had a key role in establishing homeless shelters and services, such as soup kitchens before the government took direct actions to attempt to solve the problem (Burt and Cohen 1989). During the first Bush and the Reagan presidencies, nonprofits had to step up their role in addressing social issues when the government substantially reduced its spending on social services (Lipsky and Smith 1989).

More recently, governments have been securing contracts with nonprofit organizations to deliver services. In doing so, the governments have diminished the role nonprofits play as an intermediate body between the state and the individual, as the nonprofits rely on the government and are therefore more easily influenced by the government in the ways they operate.

Community organizing nonprofits also play a role in working to combat homelessness by gathering community members and creating a strong voice in advocating for legislation that positively impacts homeless populations. While homeless individuals encounter many obstacles to mobilization, homeless people have organized and engaged in social movements to improve their lives. Past success of homeless organizing include “secured rights (e.g. to vote or attend school), reduced harassment, expanded housing opportunities, and improved access to services” (Lee, Tyler, and Wright 2010). Homeless organizers also partner with housing advocates (Lee,
Tyler, and Wright 2010) and legal nonprofits (Los Angeles Community Action Network) to strengthen their voice and combine forces for positive change.

**BACKGROUND RESEARCH**

*Homelessness in California*

According to the California State Auditor’s 2018 Report, California has the highest numbers of homeless people in the nation and is home to 24 percent of the country’s homeless population. In addition, greater than two-thirds of the state’s homeless population are unsheltered (Howle, 2018).

*Homelessness in San Francisco*

San Francisco’s housing costs have been skyrocketing in recent years. In 2015, the average rent was $3,995 per month (Bryant, 2015). Meanwhile, the same year, 7,539 people were homeless, and fifty-eight percent of those homeless were unsheltered. This percentage accounts for adults, as ninety-seven percent of families were sheltered in 2017 (ASR, 2017).

More than a third of unsheltered homeless usually slept outdoors, on the streets, in parks or encampments and the rest slept in structures that are not traditionally used for sleeping or in their vehicles (ASR, 2017). In 2015, the primary causes of homelessness were job loss (twenty-five percent), alcohol and drug use (eighteen percent) and eviction (thirteen percent). Though marginally, the rates of homelessness have continued to increase since 2017, despite efforts to get people off the street, including Navigation Centers.

*Homelessness Resources in San Francisco*
San Francisco’s public assistance programs for the homeless have been overcrowded for years now. The waitlists for public housing are several years long and the city’s Section 8 rent subsidies are closed. In the past, many homeless individuals were referred to Single Room Occupancies (SROs), through a rent coverage program, Care Not Cash (Murphy 2009). When the Care Not Cash program reserved the SRO’s valuable housing stock for the extremely low-income population was taken away. Furthermore, waitlists can be as long as six months for these units and living standards in SROs are subpar as tenants often face issues with affordability and reliability of utilities (Murphy 2009).

There are 14 emergency shelters throughout the city, concentrated in the Tenderloin and South of Market neighborhoods. These shelters have no city-enforced standards for providing meals or other the services that homeless individuals may require. While some homeless individuals utilize emergency shelters, others remain on the streets or other public areas, such as Golden Gate Park (Murphy 2009), either by choice or lack of access to shelters. While some may find public places to be a safer option than shelters, homeless individuals who live in public places face the threat of criminalization through San Francisco’s various laws that make public spaces illegal for them.

San Francisco Navigation Centers

In response to the city’s homeless crisis and the high expense of policing encampments, a new type of homelessness solution opened in San Francisco in March of 2015, initially as a single shelter pilot program. The Navigation Centers were spearheaded by the Department of Homeless and Supportive Services in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, and the
Department of Children Youth and Their Families, (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017a).

This model differs from the old continuum of care models and uses a new approach aimed at getting more folks off the streets and into housing. Social workers refer homeless residents in the areas surrounding each Navigation Center on a case-by-case basis. These centers provide on-site case management and health resources for the residents. Additionally, the facilities accept residents alone or in couples, permit pets in the shelters, and allow individuals to enter with their possessions, as opposed to forcing them to lock them up outside or find an alternative solution independently (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, 2017).

Since 2015, five more Navigation Centers have opened, two of which have already closed. Currently, the Navigation Center program houses 247 people each night:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OPENED</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>CURRENTLY SERVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Closed (October 2018)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>Waterfront (Dog Patch)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
<td>South Van Ness</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>84 (20 reserved for women)</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Currently Served: 247

Figure 1: Navigation Center Opening Date, Neighborhood, and Capacity in San Francisco (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, 2017)

Mayor London Breed, San Francisco’s current Mayor, proposed a new location for a 200-bed Navigation Center near the Bay Bridge (Brinklow 2019).
Residents who come into the Navigation center work with a caseworker to secure access as many resources as possible including “income, public benefits, health services, shelter, and housing” (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017a). The residents who enter the Navigation centers come home to the same bed each night until they leave the Navigation Center due to finding a housing solution, voluntarily exiting, or being asked to exit after violating the Center’s policies. Once an individual leaves the Center, their bed opens up for another homeless individual through a case manager’s referral.

The San Francisco Navigation Centers also partnered with Homeward Bound, a program that provides transportation to homeless people with family outside the city that have offered to house the individual (Hunter et al. 2016). Homeward Bound staff make phone calls with their clients to family or friends outside of the city in the weeks leading up to their departure to ensure the clients will have a place to stay when they arrive at their destination. There is no follow-up protocol in place for the program to ensure the clients have remained in their living situations.

Despite the implementation and expansion of the Navigation centered, between 2015 and 2017, 58 percent of homeless people remained unsheltered and the total number of homeless individuals increased by 1 percent. The State Controller performed an audit when the Navigation Centers hit their one-year mark, but the audit did not significantly improve homeless count numbers for the 2017 year.

The city departments that collaborate to run the shelters (Department of Homeless and Supportive Services in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, the Human Services Agency, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development) work together to provide services along with the Episcopal Community Services, and the St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017). The
organizations put their various available funding together, along with state funding and private donations, to build, resource and staff the navigation centers.

The program costs $69 per bed per day compared to $36 for the average shelter bed cost. The pilot program was funded by an anonymous donation that cost $1.7 million in the first eight months (Patterson et al. 2015). The various partner agencies that collaborated to create and run the program use their resources to fund it. In 2017, the city reported an annual budget of $15.3 million on the Navigation Center program to support 358 beds across the four shelters (SF Mayor 2017).

The most recent demographic available for Navigation Centers shows the most up to date information available regarding the racial breakdown for demographics of the Navigation Centers. This information was collected in a different way than the San Francisco Homeless Point in Time Count and Survey (SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing 2017). Both the Navigation Center and SF homeless population data can be found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigation Center Population</th>
<th>SF Homeless Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race or Ethnicity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to State</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017). Both the Navigation Center and SF homeless population data can be found below:

*Figure 2: Client Characteristics (San Francisco Navigation Center Year-end Evaluation & San Francisco Homeless Point in Time Count and Survey).*

Although the nature of the collection of this information makes it difficult to compare, this table shows that white people are over-represented in Navigation Centers and black and
Hispanic/Latino people are underrepresented. The Navigation Center’s gender breakdown closely resembles that of the general population of San Francisco.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Navigation Center Percentage</th>
<th>SF Homeless Population Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Client Characteristics (San Francisco Navigation Center Year-end Evaluation)

Although Navigation Center populations loosely represent the general population, women are slightly underrepresented in Navigation Centers. However, Navigation Centers only served 9.6 percent LGBTQ clients, which did not reflect the 29 percent LGBTQ homeless population within the city.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the extent to which the San Francisco Navigation Centers have been effective and ineffective in providing permanent housing for their target population, high need homeless individuals, to provide recommendations for improved outcomes. This research used qualitative methods with content analysis and semi-structured interviews.

To assess the successes and shortfalls of the Navigation Centers, I first conducted a content analysis of news articles and city-issued reports. I collected fourteen news articles published between June 27, 2017 and February 18, 2019, to track issues that Navigation Centers have been facing most currently. These articles came from multiple local news publications including SF Chronicle, SF Examiner, SF Gate, Curbed SF and SF Public Press. The reports I collected consisted of all the available reports regarding Navigation Centers
published from the City Controller’s Office. The six reports were published between November 4, 2015, and August 25, 2016. A full list of articles and documents can be found in Appendix A.

To bring more perspectives to my research, I conducted two semi-structured interviews. The goal of the interviews was to gain insight from those involved in homeless housing in San Francisco how Navigation Centers have and have not been effective in providing equitable services and finding permanent housing solutions for the San Francisco homeless population. I interviewed Kelley Cutler, Human Rights Organizer for SF Coalition on Homelessness via phone and Randy Quezada Communications & Community Relations Manager for SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing in person. Both interviews took place in January and lasted approximately 45 minutes. The list of interview questions can be found in Appendix B.

LIMITATIONS

Although my research identifies areas for improvement within the Navigation Centers, there are some aspects of the research that limited my ability to conduct ideal research. The city of San Francisco has limited reports and data regarding Navigation Centers. The most recent report regarding the Navigations Center was written two and a half year prior to my research. This lack of documentation limited my ability to adequately assess the progress of the Navigation Centers, as years of data has not been made available.

In addition, by only interviewing two individuals, my research contains strong biases towards the opinions of the individuals I talked with, rather than representing SF City Employees or SF Community Organizers as a whole. Additionally, it would be ideal to include the perspective of the Navigation Center clients and employees to gain their perspectives. However,
including a sensitive population would have required an extended research process. Finally, my research was limited in my small sample size of interview subjects.

**FINDINGS**

Through my qualitative research of content analysis and interviews, I identified three key finding that reveal challenges for San Francisco Navigation Centers: 1) Homeward Bound is an obstacle to serving high-need individuals 2) Encampments and Navigation Centers cause neighborhood safety concerns 3) Long stays in Navigation Centers are a result of low affordable housing supply.

Through coding fourteen news articles and six city-issued reports in Dedoose, I was able to identify phrases and topics that were most commonly mentioned in the documents I analyzed. The most common occurring codes include can be found below:

![Figure 4: Code Occurrences, Generated from original research using Dedoose.](image-url)
The most frequently found codes were “Encampments” (found 14 times) and “Homeward Bound” (also found 14 times). These codes were proportionately found in news articles and city-issued reports. Discussion surrounding encampments were often negative and highlighted community concern or police interaction with encampments. The Homeward Bound program was often depicted in a positive light, as articles and documents describe the rates of individuals taking part in the program. While these code occurrences reveal themes that caught the city and the public’s attention, they do not show areas for improvement within Navigation Centers on their own.

To provide more context and for the most commonly found codes, I used Dedoose’s analytics tool to generate the most frequent code co-occurrences. Code co-occurrences show the codes that were most commonly together within an excerpt of a document. The most common occurring codes included can be found below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Co-occurrence</th>
<th>Number of Co-Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful Outcome</td>
<td>Homeward Bound</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Safety</td>
<td>Encampments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Outcome</td>
<td>Long Stays</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeward Bound</td>
<td>Need for Improved Data</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Outcome</td>
<td>Encampments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5: Code Co-Occurrences, Generated from original research using Dedoose.*

These code occurrences and co-occurrences, along with my interviews, offer insight into the significant problems that exist within the Navigation Center model.

*Homeward Bound Is an Obstacle to Housing High-Need Individuals*

The most common co-occurrence, “Successful Outcome” and “Homeward Bound” were found together when reports and articles highlighted the fact that a majority of what the city has
been considering successful outcomes from the Navigation Center have been residents who have taken part in the Homeward Bound program. Since the Homeward Bound program gives people bus tickets outside of San Francisco, instead of housing them within the city, some articles argued that this does not fix the problem, but rather moves the problem elsewhere (Kaplan and Arroyo 2017). Furthermore, neither Homeward Bound nor the city follows up with those who take part in the Homeward Bound program to see if they are securely placed, as articles and the “Navigation Center Year-End Evaluation” point out. The high numbers of SF’s former homeless residents taking part in Homeward Bound can make it seem as though the Navigation Center is housing more residents than they have confirmed to have housing. This issue is also highlighted by the code co-occurrence “Homeward Bound” and “Need for Improved Data.”

Navigation Centers are intended to help the highest-need homeless individuals in the city, which is why the city decided to spend the money to implement services on location. Kelly Cutler, Human Rights Organizer at the SF Coalition on Homelessness, pointed out in our interview that while the services are expensive, they are useful. Cutler even argued for the expansion of these services to other shelters across the city.

It is clear that the services are effective, but they not being utilized by Homeward Bound participants, who take up beds in the Navigation Centers. Those who require the level of services provided in Navigation Centers best utilize these expensive spots. As such, Homeward Bound is an obstacle to the success of the A Bridge Home Program. Furthermore, the city classifies a Homeward Bound’s exit from the Navigation Center in the same way they classify a high-need non-Homeward Bound client’s exit to housing within the city. In doing so, the city muddles the perception of the success of the Navigation Center in housing high-need clients.
Encampments and Navigation Centers Cause Neighborhood Safety Concerns

The high frequency of the co-occurrence of “Neighborhood Safety” and “Encampments” highlights the relationship between homeless residents and housed residents within SF. Housed residents have voiced opposition to Navigation Centers in their neighborhoods due to fear of decreased safety and security, although Navigation Centers bring increased security to areas where homeless residents already live. However, Navigation Centers have been known to draw in nearby homeless residents in hopes that they may be referred into the center by a caseworker. Cutler identified this as a major concern regarding combatting homelessness in San Francisco. She pointed out that those who live in communities with encampments fear homeless individuals, even if they have not had a negative encounter. SF Coalition on Homelessness does work to improve the relationship between homeless individuals and the community to decrease the homeless populations’ interactions with the police force.

Neighborhood safety concerns were a common concern in articles, reports and interviews. Through my analysis, I determined that encampments have troubled many San Francisco residents. This has led to increased policing, which has been costly and left many homeless individuals with nowhere to go. Navigation Centers are working to decrease the number of encampments in a practical way, despite the fact that their presence can increase the size and prevalence of encampments.

Long Stays in Navigation Centers Are a Result of Low Affordable Housing Supply

Based on my content analysis and my interviews, the co-occurrence of “Unsuccessful Outcome” and “Long Stay” were common for a couple of reasons. One, when Mayor Lee initially introduced the Navigation Center program, residents were supposed to be housed within
10-days. A year into the program, residents were staying an average of 70 days, with some residents staying over 200 days (Navigation Center Year End Evaluation). As such, after the first year, a 60-day maximum stay was imposed. This caused many people to be pulled out of the Navigation Center system after 60 days, often leading them back to encampments on the street. This is also the reason for the “Encampment” and “Unsuccessful Outcome” co-occurrence.

The reason for the extended stays has much to do with the low supply of housing that San Francisco has to offer. To accommodate the volume of housing-ready residents that Navigation Centers referred to housing in its first year, 22 percent of SF’s affordable housing portfolio for single adults would need to be reserved for Navigation Centers. This housing shortage, coupled with the 60-day limit, has forced many to leave the Navigation Center after a long stay without a plan – hence the co-occurrence “Unsuccessful Outcome” and “Long Stay.” Additionally, my articles revealed that some individuals refuse offers for housing solution because they are concerned with the area in which they are placed will not support their success in a permanent housing solution. For example, if an individual was a recovering drug addict, they might refuse a housing option in an area in which drug use is prevalent.

Cutler pointed out the fact that the Navigation Centers have already been shut down to provide supportive housing since residents were promised that the shelter would only be temporary. She believes the pattern of building Navigation Centers across the city knowing that they will be shut down is a waste of valuable time and money, not to mention shelter that could be utilized by those who need it.

Randy Quezada, Communications and Community Relations Manager for the SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, identified housing supply within the city as his primary concern for combatting homelessness. One way he suggested finding more open
slots is through moving people who are stable out of supportive housing units into other units to make room for Navigation Center residents to take over those spots. He pointed out that the city’s new coordinated entry system will be beneficial in the coming years as more shelter beds and housing is built through Mayor London Breed’s initiatives.

Overall, my research determined that long stays constitute a significant concern for Navigation Centers. My analysis showed that this is due primarily to the limited affordable housing stock.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

*Create an Updated Navigation Center Evaluation Report*

Due to the limited information available for the recent activity of Navigation Centers, my first recommendation is for the Controller to create a report that includes information regarding the first four years of the program. This report should include information similar to that which was released in the “Navigation Center: Year-End Evaluation” including point in time information regarding current shelter location and demographics of clients within each shelter. Additionally, this report should clearly show the client outcomes from each shelter, showing where clients have been placed, including where those who have taken part in Homeward Bound are now. The report should follow up on past clients to determine if those housed from Navigation Centers were more successful in maintaining housing compared to those housed from other shelters or referral systems. By creating this report, the city will increase transparency and provide much-needed data that can guide the future of Navigation Centers in SF.
Remove the Homeward Bound Program from Navigation Centers

I recommend that the Homeward Bound program be removed from Navigation Centers. This is for three reasons. First, because Homeward Bound participants often stay for a short time and do not need or take advantage of services provided within the Navigation Centers thus, wasting the funding. Second, removing the program from the centers would create room for the high-need individuals for which the program was developed. Third, this will clarify the actual results of the Navigation Center, as many of the city-published results include the successful Homeward Bound numbers who are not housed within the city.

Implement Public Education on Homeless Population and Navigation Centers

In terms of concerns for neighborhood safety, I recommend the City implement a public education program to increase public awareness and support for the A Bridge Home program and encampments. This program should focus on the security measures that have been put in place to make Navigation Centers safe in order to make residents in areas with encampments feel safer. Through public education, the city can increase public support for more Navigation Centers and the encampments that surround them and hopefully keep the centers of time to decrease the cost of the already expensive program.

Evaluate Housing Stock and Develop New Affordable Housing

Finally, I recommend that the city re-evaluate the available affordable housing stock and identify ways to increase the availability of public housing. This could be through the development of new housing or, as Randy Quezada suggested, through evaluating those who are currently utilizing city housing and assisting them in finding market-rate housing, should they be
able to relocate. Ideally, both would take place in order to increase the quantity of housing to accommodate the number of clients that are ready to move out of Navigation Centers and into permanent housing solutions. I recommend that this housing stock be made available in a variety of locations around the city to increase economic diversity and address concerns for continued success after Navigation Center (i.e. addicts who do not want to move to neighborhoods where drug use is more common and more affordable housing is available).

CONCLUSION

Past shelter models have fallen short in providing the necessary resources to help individuals find appropriate housing solutions and eliminate their barriers to maintaining housing. In addition, previous shelter models have struggled to provide equitable accessibility. As such, certain groups have struggled with the criminalization of homelessness that continues to exist today.

The recent development of Navigation Centers and other similar models have greatly increased the accessibility to resources that can improve the lives of homeless individuals by treating them with more respect and trust and providing access to services, benefits, and housing. Navigation Centers also better reflect the city’s homeless population than previous models. While this model is expensive, it is a necessary step toward solving the homeless crisis.

San Francisco’s current mayor, London Breed, has promised to create 1000 new shelter beds in the city by 2020 (Mayor’s Office of Communications 2018) and has already planned to open up a new 200-bed Navigation Center near the Bay Bridge (Brinklow 2019). And, beyond the San Francisco city limits, Navigation Centers are being run across the country from Seattle to San Diego to Minneapolis (Wilson 2018). San Francisco is known to be progressive and cutting
edge in many aspects of the city. With Navigation Center bring replicated in other cities, it is imperative that San Francisco take the necessary steps to solve the existing problems that exist and increase the efficacy of the program.
APPENDICES

Appendix A – City-Issued Reports and News Articles

City-Issued Reports
4. Perspectives from the Navigation Center, Report #4: The Future of the Navigation Center – Location, Scale and Scope (December 2, 2015)
5. More than a Shelter: An Assessment of the Navigation Center’s First Six Months (December 10, 2015)
7. Reinvesting in Shelter: Lessons from the Navigation Center

News Articles
Appendix B – Interview Questions

City Employee

• Can you briefly describe what brought your to your job?
• What does your role entail on a daily basis?
• How does your role contribute to the overall success of the city?
• What have you heard about Navigation Centers?
• How do you think Navigation Centers differ from other types of homeless shelters, if at all?
• How does the Navigation Center work with other city services, if at all?
• What do you think makes the city’s homelessness strategy effective?
• Are there any aspects of the city’s homelessness strategy do that you think could be improved upon?
• Have you noticed any patterns in indicators that an individual will be successful in finding a permanent housing solution within your city?

Community Organization Employee

• What does your organization do?
• Can you briefly describe what brought your to your job?
• What does your role entails on a daily basis?
• How does your role contribute to the community as a whole?
• What have you heard about Navigation Centers?
• What interactions have you had with individual who have stayed in Navigation Centers? Have you heard about their experiences?
• What do you think makes the city’s homelessness strategy effective?
• Are there any aspects of the city’s homelessness strategy do that you think could be improved upon?
• Have you noticed any patterns in indicators that an individual will be successful in finding a permanent housing solution within your city?
Appendix C - Codes

Deductive Codes

1. Addicts
2. Encampments
3. Expensive
4. Homeward Bound
   a. Neutral
   b. Positive
   c. Negative
5. NC Staff
   a. Neutral
   b. Positive
   c. Negative
6. Need for Improved Data
7. Neighborhood Safety
   a. Neutral
   b. Improved
   c. Worsened
8. Services
   a. Neutral
   b. Positive
   c. Negative
9. Successful Outcome (Housed After NC)
10. Tension Amongst NC Residents
11. Unsuccessful Outcome (Not Housed After NC)

Inductive Codes

1. Inadequate Housing Supply
2. Insufficient Capacity
3. Intergovernmental Tension
4. Long Stays
5. Mental Illness
6. “Shopping” for Housing
7. Unwilling Residents
### Code Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Addicts</th>
<th>Encampments</th>
<th>Expensive</th>
<th>Homeward Bound</th>
<th>Inadequate Housing Supply</th>
<th>Insufficient Capacity</th>
<th>Intergovernmental Tension</th>
<th>Long Stays</th>
<th>Mental Illness</th>
<th>NC Staff</th>
<th>Need for Improved Data</th>
<th>Neighborhood Safety</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Successful Outcome Housed After</th>
<th>Tension Amongst NC Residents</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Outcome Not Housed</th>
<th>Unwilling Residents</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Benjamin, &quot;After City Cears</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Blumberg, &quot;As Shelter Wait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinventing in Shelter - Lessons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives from the Navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives from the Navigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives from the Navigation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives from the Navigation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Arroyo and Hannah Kaplan,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation Center 1 Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Wenus, “Neighbors sound off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Fagan, “SF’s first Navigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Fagan, “SF opens new full-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Sebabiti, “SF’s first ever</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Sebabiti, “Many wait in hope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Kaplan, “Nomads by the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Keeling, “Former Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Makovec, “San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Pinkin, “Newest Homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code Co-Occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Addicts</th>
<th>Encampments</th>
<th>Expensive</th>
<th>Homeward Bound</th>
<th>Inadequate Housing Supply</th>
<th>Insufficient Capacity</th>
<th>Intergovernmental Tension</th>
<th>Long Stays</th>
<th>Mental Illness</th>
<th>NC Staff</th>
<th>Need for Improved Data</th>
<th>Neighborhood Safety</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Successful Outcome Housed After</th>
<th>Tension Amongst NC Residents</th>
<th>Unsuccessful Outcome Not Housed</th>
<th>Unwilling Residents</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shopping for housing&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encampments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeward Bound</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Housing Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Stays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Improved Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Outcome Housed After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension Amongst NC Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Outcome Not Housed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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