



City of Seattle
Human Services Department

Date: July 1, 2013

To: Councilmember Nick Licata, Chair
Seattle City Council Housing, Human Services, Health and Culture Committee

Sally Clark, Council President
Sally Bagshaw, Councilmember
Tom Rasmussen, Councilmember

From: Catherine L. Lester, Interim Director
Seattle Human Services Department

Re: Response to Statement of Legislative Intent #104-2-A-1, Report on Out of City Homeless

This memorandum transmits the Seattle Human Services Department's (HSD) response to the City Council's Green Sheet #104-2-A-1 included in the 2013 Adopted Budget, a Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) requesting the Human Services Department to obtain information locally and from other communities regarding policy and program options for the provision of services for homeless individuals and families who have come from outside the city.

The SLI also requests HSD to provide data on where individuals and families in Seattle's shelter system are coming from, as provided by Family Housing Connection, Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), and social service providers, with potential policy or program changes ready for implementation in 2014.

The attached report found that **regional shelters are primarily serving single adults and families with children who are from Seattle and King County**. HMIS data from participating emergency shelters in the City of Seattle (during the period from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012) indicates that the majority of single adults (70%) and just over half of families with children (51%) report a last permanent address from inside City of Seattle limits. Additionally, single adults tend to stay for a short period of time (30 days or less) and exit the shelter system relatively quickly.

Based on available data, HSD recommends the City of Seattle continue to focus on a regional approach in partnership with King County, other funders and stakeholders.

The attached report describes:

1. Local data from Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System, Family Housing Connection, and other sources;
2. Residency Requirements in Other Jurisdictions;
3. Shelter Diversion and Out-of-City Relocation Assistance; and
4. Policy Considerations and Recommendations.

I appreciate your continued support of individuals and families experiencing homelessness in our communities. I am happy to answer any questions you may have about HSD's attached report.

Cc: Beth Goldberg, Director, Seattle City Budget Office
Jeanette Blankenship, Seattle City Budget Office
Ben Noble, Council Central Staff
Traci Ratzliff, Council Central Staff
Susana Serna, Council Central Staff
Jaline Quinto, City Council Liaison, Mayor's Office

Attachments: *Seattle Human Services Department, Response to Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent: 104-2-A-1, Report on Out of City Homeless*

Seattle Human Services Department Report on Out of City Homeless Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) 104-2-A-1

In adopting the 2013 Budget, the Seattle City Council approved Green Sheet 104-2-A-1, a Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) requesting that the Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) obtain information regarding policy and program options for the provision of services for homeless individuals and families who have come from outside the city. HSD was asked to collect information from other jurisdictions that have implemented policies or programs to serve out of city residents.

In addition, City Council requested HSD to provide data on where individuals and families in Seattle's shelter system are coming from, as provided by Family Housing Connection, Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), and social service providers. The report is due to Council no later than July 1, 2013, with potential policy or program changes ready for implementation in 2014.

Summary

Local data indicates that a high percentage of single adults (70%) and roughly half of families (51%) served in Seattle emergency shelters system report a local last permanent address in the City of Seattle.¹ Regionally, Safe Harbors reports that between 72% to 75% of single adults and families served in Seattle and King County Shelters report a last permanent address from either Seattle or King County. This data does not capture how long someone has been in Seattle, or why they came here.

City-funded emergency shelters do not currently have residency requirements. Seattle is one of many public and private funders of emergency shelter programs located in the City. If a proof of residency were required to access shelter across the City, all funders must agree to a policy change. HSD is not proposing changes to shelter intake/eligibility requirements. HSD recommends a continued focus on a regional approach, in partnership with King County and other funders and stakeholders.

HSD looked at the residency policies for shelter in several communities. Jurisdictions such as New York City, Columbus, and Denver, require proof of residency to access certain emergency services. In addition, communities such as New York City and San Francisco provide diversion programs to assist with long distance transportation to communities where the client has a support system. Relocation assistance is provided on the belief that clients are best served in communities where they have support systems. New York's Department of Homeless Services offers a variety of shelter division services, including family mediation, anti-eviction legal services, and out-of-city relocation assistance.

¹ Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), Report on Last Permanent Address, using the 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) data set (October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012).

I. Local Data

Local and regional shelters are primarily serving individuals and families whose last permanent address was in Seattle/King County. The following data sources provide information on prior residency of people served by shelter services in the city of Seattle and King County. Sources reviewed include data collected by:

- **Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).** Through Safe Harbors, publicly funded shelter programs collect information from clients who agree to inclusion in the HMIS system. Shelters enter the zip code of the **last permanent address** of a household. Programs are not required to collect any additional data or verify the residency of the individuals who are seeking shelter.

Zip Code of Last Permanent Address is defined as the zip code of the apartment, room, or house where the client last lived for 90 days or more. It is important to note that high volume emergency shelters have difficulty collecting this data element and may be defaulting to the program's zip code instead of the zip code of the client's last permanent address.

- **Family Housing Connection (FHC).** FHC is the coordinated entry project for homeless families seeking emergency housing in King County. King County, United Way, and Building Changes provided funding to create a coordinated entry system, launched in April 2012. Family Housing Connection (FHC), operated by Catholic Community Services, coordinates entry into the homeless housing system for families throughout King County. FHC help homeless families access emergency housing (shelter), transitional housing and rapid re-housing short-term rental assistance programs. Families are referred to FHC through the Community Information Line 2-1-1. FHC staff complete an assessment and provide a referral to a program provider based on the family's needs.

City-funded shelter programs and other homeless day services are designed to be low-barrier services. These services are accessible to individuals in need with little to no requirements for eligibility screening. Additional services may be available that provide access to services, connections to community supports, and assistance with seeking more stable housing.

- **Surveys of Shelter Residents and Unsheltered.** The 2013 One Night Count in King County found 1,989 people who were without shelter in the city of Seattle.² Demographic data collected through Safe Harbors does not cover those who are living unsheltered in our communities. As a result, information on unsheltered individuals is limited. In 2009, the City of Seattle, in partnership with the Committee to End Homelessness and United Way of King County, conducted the Homeless Needs Assessment, a survey of 297 unsheltered individuals.

In 2011, HSD completed a survey of 320 individuals at six single adult shelters and one encampment to learn more about service needs of people accessing shelter.

² Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness, 2013 Street Count Results, One Night Count, January 25, 2013.

- **HSD-funded Emergency Services for Families program (“Late Night”).** The Seattle-funded YWCA Emergency Services for Families program is funded to serve homeless families who are on the street or in a place not meant for human habitation. In 2012, the Late Night Program served 101 households. The program was originally designed as a late night referral program for families on the street with nowhere to go after shelters closed. In 2012, program funding was expanded to include day time referrals from community based organizations.

A. Homeless Single Adults

In Seattle/King County, 1,757 year-round shelter beds serve homeless single adults. Analysis of the regional distribution of shelters shows that 92% (1,617) of emergency shelter beds for single adults are located in the City of Seattle.³ Of these beds, 80% are in programs that participate in Safe Harbors HMIS. All emergency shelter programs that receive funding from the City of Seattle are required to participate in Safe Harbors HMIS.

In 2012, Safe Harbors reported that 7,486 single adults were served in Seattle emergency shelters and 911 single adults were served in King County shelters.⁴ Shelters serve a large number of people over the course of a year and the majority of them exit relatively quickly.⁵ Of those served in Seattle shelters, 57% stayed 30 days or less. This is similar to King County shelters, where 53% stayed less than 30 days. HMIS data collected by shelter programs within the City of Seattle shows **the majority of individuals (70%) report a last permanent address from Seattle**⁶. In King County shelters, outside Seattle, 23% reported a last permanent address from Seattle. Regional shelters are primarily serving individuals who are from Seattle and King County.

Table 1: Zip Code of Last Permanent Address for Single Adults

	Safe Harbors - Seattle Shelters	Safe Harbors - King County Shelters
(measured in Individuals)	N=7,485	N=911
Seattle	70%	23%
King County, outside Seattle	5%	53%
Washington, outside King County	5%	8%
Outside Washington State	14%	7%
Missing	6%	8%

Source: 2012 Safe Harbors HMIS

³ 2013 King County Homeless Housing Inventory Chart, as submitted to HUD, January 2013.

⁴ Safe Harbors HMIS, 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR), October 2011 – September 2012

⁵ Committee to End Homelessness, Single Adult Shelter Task Force (SATF) Report, page 20, http://www.cehkc.org/doc_reports/ShelterRole.pdf

⁶ Safe Harbors HMIS, Report on Last Permanent Address, using the 2012 AHAR Data Set

Surveys of homeless individuals indicate the majority of people have been residents of Seattle for an extended period of time. HSD's survey of 320 individuals at six single adult shelters and one encampment showed **70% reported being in Seattle for one year or more**. Two-thirds of these individuals (153 people) reported being in Seattle for six years or more.

The majority of those surveyed during the 2009 Homeless Needs Assessment **were Seattle residents when they became homeless**. When the survey respondents became homeless, 58% reported living in Seattle and 19% elsewhere in Washington. Twenty-one percent (21%) were already homeless when they moved to Seattle from outside Washington State.⁷

Data for single adults served at five winter weather shelters in Seattle and King County showed that of the 3,023 unduplicated individuals served between October 2012 – May 2013, **78% reported a last permanent address from inside the City of Seattle limits**.⁸ Of the five shelters analyzed, three were located in the City of Seattle (representing 90% of the beds) and two were located in King County, outside Seattle (representing 10% of the beds).

B. Families with Children

There are 220 shelter units in Seattle/King County serving homeless families with children.⁹ 80% of these beds are in programs that participate in Safe Harbors HMIS.

In 2012, Safe Harbors reported that 1,072 persons in families with children were served in Seattle emergency shelters and 604 families were served in King County shelters.¹⁰ Of those served in Seattle shelters, 48% stayed between one and three months, and 27% stayed between three and six months. This is similar to King County shelters, where 38% stayed between one and three months, and 31% stayed between three and six months.

HMIS data collected by shelter programs within the City of Seattle shows that **half of the families (51%) served by Seattle emergency housing programs reported a last permanent address from Seattle**. In King County shelters, outside Seattle, 15% reported a last permanent address from Seattle. Similar to single adult programs, regional family shelter programs are primarily serving families who are from Seattle and King County.

⁷ 2009 Seattle Homeless Needs Assessment, http://www.seattle.gov/housing/homeless/HNA_report_11-09.pdf

⁸ Safe Harbors HMIS, report on demographics for cohort of winter weather shelter users, October 2012 – May 2013

⁹ 2013 King County Housing Inventory Chart, as submitted to HUD, January 2013.

¹⁰ Safe Harbors HMIS, 2012 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR), October 2011 – September 2012

Table 2: Last Permanent Address for Families with Children¹¹

	Safe Harbors - Seattle Shelters ¹²	Safe Harbors - King County Shelters	Family Housing Connection ¹³	YWCA Late Night Program ¹⁴
(measured in Households)	N=309	N= 183	N=178	N=101
Seattle	51%	15%	31%	31%
King County, outside Seattle	21%	56%	40%	9%
Washington, outside King County	6%	5%	12%	7%
Outside Washington State	10%	19%	7%	49%
Missing	13%	5%	10%	5%

Sources: 2012 Safe Harbors HMIS, King County Family Homelessness Initiative/FHC, and HSD.

Program data collected at different system entry points may provide a different picture of the populations served. In comparison to Safe Harbors data, the YWCA Emergency Services for Families Program reported that of the 101 families served in 2012; 31% reported a last permanent address from Seattle and 49% reported they were from communities outside Washington State, including places outside of the U.S.

Family Housing Connection data mirrors YWCA Late Night data for families from Seattle. In a cohort of 178 homeless households, 31% of families assessed by FHC report a last permanent address from Seattle.

II. Residency Requirements for Emergency Services in Other Jurisdictions

The following jurisdiction’s policies regarding residency requirements were reviewed for this report: Chicago, Illinois; Columbus, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Denver, Colorado; Portland, Maine; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Washington D.C; San Francisco, California; Boston, Massachusetts; and New York City, New York. Many of the jurisdictions HSD surveyed are part of a National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) leadership collaborative. These communities are frequently referenced for their development of best practices in preventing and ending homelessness.

Five of these communities have adopted and implemented residency requirements in order to access one or more emergency services. One community has adopted but not yet implemented a residency requirement. Research found:

¹¹ Note: Data may represent some overlap of households between programs.

¹² Safe Harbors HMIS, Report on Last Permanent Address, using the 2012 AHAR Data Set

¹³ FHC Client Roster, as of 4-22-2013, families who were identified as living on the street or in a place not meant for human habitation without a referral pending.

¹⁴ Data represents clients served by the Late Night Program in Program Year 2012 (1/1/12 – 12/31/2012).

- Columbus, Ohio: 30-day residency requirement for families. Proof of residency includes an eviction notice; notarized letter from a landlord or last person the family stayed with, stating an eviction occurred. All situations are automatically sent to appeals, to ensure the “bigger picture” is taken into account. Residency requirement can be waived due to situations of fleeing domestic violence or other extenuating circumstances.
- Washington, D.C.: Families are required to be a D.C. resident to access shelter. Residency can be proven through a mailing address in the last two years; proof of enrollment in school for children; evidence that the household has applied or is receiving public assistance from the District; or written verification from a verifier.¹⁵
- Denver, Colorado: 90-day residency requirement to access up to 12 nights of emergency motel voucher assistance. Households who do not meet this requirement receive one night of motel voucher assistance only.
- New York: No residency requirement. New York is a right to shelter state. New York shelter workers conduct a two year housing history for families with children, and a one-year housing history for families without children under the age of 18. The housing history must demonstrate that the family has nowhere else to go before they are admitted into shelter. If a family has no other housing alternatives, they are admitted into shelter regardless of last permanent address. Shelter diversion options for families are offered as part of the screening/eligibility process.

See Attachment A for more information on residency requirements in other jurisdictions.

III. Shelter Diversion and Out-of City Relocation Assistance

In the SLI, Council indicated concerns for people who may have come to Seattle seeking opportunities and employment, but have become stranded, homeless and/or disconnected from existing support systems. Council specifically expressed interest in learning more about programs in other communities that provide individuals and families assistance to return “home.”

Providing this type of assistance is not a new idea. Since the mid-1800’s, Travelers Aid programs have assisted individuals and families in transition, crisis or disconnected from support systems. Many of these programs are currently assisting homeless individuals and families.

Cities such as San Francisco and New York have created programs that offer transportation assistance to return to communities where people have employment and housing opportunities, and support. Assistance is typically in the form of a one-way bus/train/airline ticket “home.” Clients must meet specific requirements to access transportation assistance.

¹⁵ Washington D.C. Law 18-0367

- San Francisco’s Homeward Bound program, for example, requires verification that the individual has a family/friend willing and able to provide support; additionally, the individual cannot have behavioral health issues which would prevent safe travel (e.g., must remain clean/sober for the duration of the trip).
- In New York City, Project Reconnect provides eligible, interested families with a one-way bus, train, or airline ticket (domestic and international) and can also assist with passports, visas, and in rare cases rental assistance and move-in costs. Project Reconnect is offered to interested individuals or families seeking shelter, regardless of last permanent address.

Project Reconnect is one of multiple service opportunities provided to individuals and families when they apply for shelter. New York Department of Human Services believes that families are best served in their communities through prevention efforts, and that they should only utilize temporary emergency shelter as a last resort when they are experiencing an immediate housing crisis.¹⁶

Eligibility criteria for Project Reconnect requires that an individual or family have:

- A strong connection to a location outside of New York City
- A viable, identified place to live, and
- A means of support through employment, or a family member or individual.

Social worker verifies these arrangements are in place before assistance is provided. The social worker follows up to verify safe arrival after relocation has occurred, and check in again after a few weeks.

Since 2007, Project Reconnect has encouraged 2,443 single adults and 2,024 families from out of town to return to home communities. Average transportation costs were \$269 for single adults and \$192 per person in families. In comparison, the cost for providing shelter is roughly \$76.24 a day for single adults and \$103 a day for families with children.¹⁷

- Williston, North Dakota, has seen had an influx of people in search of employment opportunities in the oil boom. With limited housing available, it’s reported that hundreds of people in search of jobs ended up becoming homeless. In response, a Salvation Army program is assisting people who are interested in relocating, through gas vouchers and one-way bus or train tickets. In 2012, the program helped more than 200 people relocate.

In New York City, a right-to-shelter city, the cost of providing shelter averages \$36,000 a year per family. Programs such as Homeward Bound and Project Reconnect are seen as cost

¹⁶ New York City, Department Of Homeless Services, Applying for Temporary Housing Assistance, <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dhs/html/housing/families.shtml>

¹⁷ New York Times, *City’s Sheltering of Out-of-Town Homeless, and Mayor’s Remark, Stir Debate*, March 17, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/18/nyregion/new-york-as-safety-net-for-out-of-town-homeless.html>

avoidance programs, in that they can “save” communities from more expensive interventions or divert them from costly shelter stays.

In Seattle, there are some agencies and faith-based organizations that provide bus or other transportation assistance to connect with family or friends in other communities, as funds are available.

IV. Standards for Determining Residency in Washington State

City of Seattle and the State of Washington funding sources do not require proof of residency in order to access shelter services.

The Washington State Legislature established residency requirements (WAC 388-468-0005) to be eligible for cash benefits, the Basic Food program, and medical programs through the Washington State Department of Social Health and Services (DSHS). A person is considered a resident of Washington if they meet one of the following requirements:

- (1) Currently live in Washington and intend to continue living here permanently or for an indefinite period of time;
- (2) Entered the state looking for a job; or
- (3) Entered the state with a job commitment.¹⁸

A person does not need to live in the state for a specific period of time to be considered a resident.

V. Challenges

Several challenges have been identified surrounding the use of any residency requirement to access services:

- (1) Definitions – Use of a residency requirement requires a clear definition of “residency” and at this time there is no local definition of what it means to be a “resident” of Seattle. Other jurisdictions have used 30 days (New York), 90 days (Denver), or at any time in the last two years (Washington, D.C.). The State Legislature as referenced above established state-wide residency criteria for certain benefit programs.
- (2) Verification and Data Collection – Documentation and verification of residency would require additional time and resources, including training for providers on the definition of residency, proper verification, and data collection to ensure consistency. An additional layer of verification for shelter programs to collect and maintain would be required. This is complex, and would prove costly, particularly at high-volume shelters.

¹⁸ Washington State Legislature, *WAC 388-468-0005 Residency*, <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=388-468-0005> (Accessed June 13, 2013).

- (3) Burden on Clients – Requiring proof of residency creates an impact on people experiencing homelessness, including those who would be considered residents of Seattle. People experiencing homelessness, fleeing domestic violence situations, or experiencing mental health issues, may have difficulty maintaining ID and other documents, which are often lost, stolen, or destroyed.

The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (NLCHP) provided testimony in opposition to a 2010 bill regarding the use of residency requirements for individuals and families to access emergency shelter and other services in Washington D.C.

NLCHP cited difficulty in obtaining and maintaining documentation while experiencing homelessness, as a person may have been homeless in an area for an extended period of time but without a mailing address. A requirement to prove residency may appear an effective way to prevent non-residents from accessing precious local resources and services, the actual impact will be significantly against local residents.¹⁹ The bill passed nonetheless.

VI. Policy Recommendations

The following policy recommendations related to serving individuals who are coming from outside the City of Seattle should be considered in developing any next steps. HSD is not proposing changes to shelter intake/eligibility requirements.

- (1) Continue to Focus on a Regional Approach: Continued efforts should focus on a regional approach in partnership with King County and other major funders. The City of Seattle is a partner in the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), and has been actively involved at all levels, including participation on the Governing Board, the Funders Group, and the Inter-Agency Council. Local data indicates that a high percentage of individuals and families served in our emergency shelter system report being from Seattle or King County.

City of Seattle is one of many public and private funders of shelter programs that are located within the city. It is critical to consider how the current inventory is geographically distributed and funded, and continue to include all stakeholders in regional discussions about access to these services.

For single adult programs, the CEH Single Adult Shelter Task Force (SATF) recommended increasing shelter capacity outside of Seattle. Within Seattle, additional resources should be focused on assisting individuals with long-term shelter stays (more than 180 days) to transition to housing, thereby freeing up shelter capacity.²⁰ The Office of

¹⁹ National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, “Testimony of Tulin Ozdefer, Civil Rights Director, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty on Bill 18-1059, November 8, 2010.

²⁰ CEH 2012 SATF Report, page 22.

Housing is working with partners and housing providers to move up to 100 long-term shelter residents to permanent housing in 2013.

The SATF identified 17 action items to strengthen the homeless crisis response system; one of these is the creation of a fund pool to assist clients who have low-barrier/minimal needs, such as gas/transportation, utility payments, and minor debt.²¹ These costs are typically not allowable under current funding sources.

For family programs, the King County Family Homelessness Initiative is leading regional efforts to implement changes within existing emergency/transitional housing programs with a focus on resources to provide more rapid re-housing and tailored services to help families reduce length of shelter stays.

- (2) New Sources for Data Collection: In 2013, HSD-funded Day and Hygiene Center services are scheduled to begin data entry into Safe Harbors. Data collected from day services will provide a clearer picture of service needs and desires of people experiencing homelessness, both sheltered and unsheltered. It will include data on people who use day centers or hygiene services for showers or laundry facilities, but who may be unable to access shelter due to capacity, or not interested in shelter.

Expanded outreach and engagement efforts will support data collection on individuals who are on the street in our communities. Improved data on the service needs and backgrounds of this population will inform future policy decisions.

²¹ CEH 2012 SATF Report, page 24.

Attachment A – Residency Requirements for Emergency Services in Other Jurisdictions

SLI 104-2-A-1

City	Right to Shelter?	Residency Requirements/ Documentation	Notes
New York, New York	Yes	No.	<p>“Right to shelter” state since 1981; Bill A02028 allows municipalities to require residency to access social services.</p> <p>Families allowed up to ten days in shelter while an investigation is conducted to determine eligibility. This includes a housing history for families with children (2 years) and families without children under 18 (1 year). If a family is deemed ineligible, they have 60 days to appeal if they choose. Families are found ineligible if they have an alternative housing option.</p>
Washington D.C.	No	Yes; for families.	Families required to prove DC residency to be eligible for shelter. Residency proven through mailing address; proving children are enrolled in city schools; or having a “verifier” (commonly a nonprofit). Families have three days after shelter entry to prove residency. There is no minimum time length requirement to establish residency.
Columbus, Ohio	No	Yes; 30 days for families.	Residency requirement can be waived based on individual family situation. All cases undergo an automatic appeal.
Denver, Colorado	No	Motel vouchers only.	<p>Approximately 60% of emergency motel vouchers go to families from other counties. All families given 1 night stay; Families with 3+ months residency can access a maximum of 12 nights of motel vouchers per calendar year.</p>
Boston, Massachusetts	Yes, for families	Yes, for families.	Families must prove they are a resident of Massachusetts. Most commonly proven through proof of enrollment in school. Can also be proven through copy of a lease, utility bill, pay stub, etc. Small system of private non-profits provide few “community loan beds”, for families who have not proven residency.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	No	Yes, 30 days.	Shelter intake workers meet with families seeking shelter to see if other arrangements can be made, and provide assistance to return to a home city. Residency is proven by having a Philadelphia ID.
Minneapolis, Minnesota	Yes, for Families	None.	If a family has an open public assistance case in another Minnesota county, shelter providers contact that county and make arrangements for the family to return. If a family relocates out of state, they are immediately considered a resident.

Attachment A – Residency Requirements for Emergency Services in Other Jurisdictions

SLI 104-2-A-1

City	Right to Shelter?	Residency Requirements/ Documentation	Notes
Portland, Maine	No	None	Was discussed and voted down. Uses a “market-based approach”, with a strong focus on accountability and rapid transition from shelter to housing. An individual may be denied access to shelter if there is on-going refusal to participate in stabilization plan.
Chicago, Illinois	No	None	Anecdotal evidence indicates there is a lot of fluidity in/out of the city, and people in need from surrounding communities might seek services in Chicago when they are available.
San Francisco, California	No	None currently.	<p>Plan to require families to provide proof of residency or intent to reside within City limits to access longer term shelter (3-6 months). Residency can be proven through proof of employment, school enrollment, or a previous address. Plan to implement one for families beginning August 1, 2013, although the implementation timeline may be delayed due to concern from homeless advocates.</p> <p>Some California communities (Long Beach, Santa Monica, and Pasadena) have residency requirements to access shelter; most of California does not.</p>

2013 - 2014 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
104	2	A	1

Budget Action Title: Services for Out of City Homeless

Councilmembers: Bagshaw; Clark; Rasmussen

Staff Analyst: Traci Ratzliff

Budget Committee Vote:

Date	Result	SB	BH	TR	RC	TB	NL	JG	SC	MO
11/07/2012	Pass 8- 1-Absent	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Like many major cities, it is anecdotally reported that Seattle attracts people searching for better employment opportunities or better quality support services than they can find in other parts of the state or country. Unfortunately, sometimes the better job opportunities don't materialize and support services in the city maintain waiting lists. This problem is particularly acute when it comes to homeless individuals and families. In September, the Human Services Department (HSD) reported that to date in 2012, 47% of the families served by the Emergency Services Program reported a most recent permanent address out of state. This is compared to 2011, when 37% of the families served were from out of state. In addition, 2011 Safe Harbors annual data showed that at least 14% of individuals accessing single- adult shelter, and at least 28% of individuals accessing transitional housing, gave a last permanent address outside of the city.

Some cities, such as New York City, have developed policies regarding the types of services that are provided to homeless individuals and families who are residents of New York City versus those who are not. The goal of this differentiation is not to deny survival services to anyone, rather to match people to services that will get them into stable housing as effectively as possible in or out of the NYC region.

The Council requests the Human Services Department obtain further information regarding policy and program options concerning the provision of services for homeless individuals and families who have come from outside the city. HSD shall collect information from other jurisdictions that have implemented policies or programs to serve out of city residents.

In addition, HSD is requested to provide additional data on where individuals and families in Seattle's shelter system are coming from, as provided by Family Housing Connection, Safe Harbors data system, and social service providers. This includes information on individuals and families coming from out of state, or cities or counties within Washington State. The Council requests HSD to provide this information to the Council by July 1, 2013, with potential recommended policy or program changes ready for implementation in 2014.

Responsible Council Committee(s): Housing, Human Services, Health, & Culture

Date Due to Council: July 1, 2013