



Metro Denver Stakeholder Input Report

Commissioned by Metro Denver Homeless Initiative
Prepared by Focus Strategies

December 2017



Visit Focus Strategies' website

focusstrategies.net

to find our reports, research, news, and more information about who we are and what we do. Focus Strategies offers analytic services to help communities reduce and end homelessness. Our services include system planning and performance measurement; system and program evaluations; coordinated entry design; supportive housing system development; and point in time counts.

Metro Denver Stakeholder Input Report
Prepared for Metro Denver Homeless Initiative (MDHI)
December 2017

Focus Strategies is providing technical assistance to the Metro Denver Homeless Initiative (MDHI) to assess the performance of the regional homeless system and to begin making strategic shifts that will help reduce homelessness. As part of this effort, Focus Strategies gathered and analyzed community input about the existing homeless response system in Metro Denver. This input process included two components:

1. Stakeholder interviews: Focus Strategies staff conducted a series of about 20 one-on-one phone interviews with key stakeholders identified by MDHI; and
2. Learning Collaboratives: Focus Strategies conducted three systemwide Learning Collaboratives during the months of September and October 2017. Participants included homeless system providers, local government representatives, and other key stakeholders.

The purpose of the stakeholder interviews was to solicit information from those involved with efforts to reduce homelessness in Metro Denver to better understand how the current homeless response system is operating, as well as its key strengths and challenges. Individuals who were interviewed represented a diverse array of community agencies and programs in the seven-county Metro Denver region to elicit a variety of perspectives and opinions. Stakeholders represented included City and County officials, service providers, and CoC board members. A complete list of individuals who were interviewed is provided in Appendix A.

Similarly, the Learning Collaboratives were designed to provide a venue for stakeholder feedback and discussion on three essential elements of a homeless crisis response system: analysis of system performance, shelter diversion/housing problem-solving, and rapid rehousing. These public forums were also an opportunity for Focus Strategies to present information, evidence, and best practices on each of the three topics. Appendix B lists the dates and topics for each session.

The following report provides a summary of the stakeholder interviews, followed by a brief overview of feedback provided during the three Learning Collaboratives.

I. Stakeholder Interviews

The following sections provide an overview of the input we heard during the interviews, including strengths and weaknesses of the Metro Denver homeless response system.

State of Homelessness in Metro Denver

During each interview, stakeholders were asked to describe the state of homelessness in the Metro Denver region. Throughout our conversations, stakeholders described a population steadily expanding in the face of a housing crisis that continues to worsen. Despite this, the 2017 annual Point In Time (PIT) Count published by MDHI shows that homelessness is on the decline in the Metro Denver region, decreasing from 6,204 to 5,116 individuals from 2015 to 2017. However, all the stakeholders who

commented on the PIT said the results are not an accurate representation of the true nature and extent of homelessness throughout the seven-county region and, in fact, homelessness continues to steadily rise.

A drastic influx of new residents seeking career opportunities in the region's booming economy and thriving job market contribute to this increase in homelessness, many stakeholders believe. Many people have migrated to the region in search of economic opportunity, but did not understand how high the cost of living is in Metro Denver, how few units are available, or how expensive available units are. Other low-income households and "blue collar workers" have been pushed out of gentrifying areas and housing situations they can no longer afford and have subsequently fallen into homelessness. Additionally, stakeholders described a homeless population saturated by those who are newly or "first-time" homeless in suburban and urban areas, as well as a large population of people who are chronically homeless concentrated in Downtown Denver and surrounding areas. Across the board, stakeholders agreed that the region's current affordable housing shortage and gentrification were both factors that have significantly contributed to increases in homelessness, as well as huge barriers to reducing homelessness locally. Despite all this, many stakeholders were hopeful that new CoC leadership and systems change efforts being rolled out are crucial steps towards achieving real reductions in homelessness.

Geography and Efforts to End Homelessness

Throughout our interviews, stakeholders spoke to the vast size and geographic diversity of the Metro Denver area, which includes seven counties and a total population of more than three million. The entire metro region encompasses urban, suburban, and rural communities, with a majority of the general population concentrated in the urban and suburban areas of the City and County of Denver, Arapahoe County, and Jefferson County. The 2017 PIT Count reports that a majority of people experiencing homelessness were in Denver County (65.2%), followed by Boulder (11.7%), Arapahoe (11%), and Jefferson (7.7%) Counties.

According to stakeholders, characteristics and demographics of the homeless population differ between each county and each city. Traditionally, families experiencing homelessness, as well as people who are doubled up or couch surfing have tended to be concentrated in suburban communities, while single adults have lived in urban areas of the region. However, as some cities have begun adopting and enforcing anti-camping ordinances in recent years, many single adults have moved outside of the City into surrounding communities and counties. Subsequently, many stakeholders reported an uptick in chronic and single adult homelessness in suburban and rural communities. Although some stakeholders mentioned that homelessness has also been an issue in the rural plains and mountainous areas surrounding the Metro area, currently little is known about this population and data is limited.

Many said that efforts to reduce homelessness tend to be siloed between providers and communities throughout the seven-county region. Stakeholders described a landscape where those working on the issue have become "territorial" over their responsibilities and resources. For example, some suburban and rural communities have historically seen homelessness as an urban "Denver problem." As a result, many elected officials and community members from these suburban communities have viewed the City and County of Denver as holding primary accountability for the issue. This dynamic seems to be changing, however, as several counties and cities in the region have created director-level positions and initiatives dedicated to addressing homelessness. Additionally, some expressed that efforts to reduce homelessness

are often disjointed and uncoordinated due to providers and communities “fighting for limited resources and funding,” rather than working in unison. Some expressed believing that funding has been inequitably distributed in favor of urban areas (in particular, the City and County of Denver), leaving suburban communities with a lower-than-needed share of system resources. Throughout the interviews, stakeholders repeatedly said that a more unified, regional approach to addressing homelessness is needed to achieve real results and work as a true system.

System Inventory

During our interviews, we heard from stakeholders that the seven-county Metro Denver region’s existing portfolio of programs for people experiencing homelessness is very diverse and high-quality. However, stakeholders said most of these programs and services are located in urban areas, which has resulted in the perception of a “Denver-centric” CoC. Although many programs seem to be housing-focused (i.e. their service model is organized around helping participants secure housing as quickly as possible), we heard that some programs within the CoC are still strongly “housing readiness” and/or recovery-based, and are not implementing Housing First principles and practices. Many of these programs, particularly emergency shelter and transitional housing programs, impose high barriers to entry, such as income requirements or mandatory participation in curriculum or programming. These programs also require residents to participate in services as a condition of receiving a bed and generally do not help participants secure housing as a first step – focusing first on building life skills and/or addressing substance use.

Additionally, stakeholders said that the region’s inventory of homeless interventions is not right-sized, and there is a “greater homeless population than the services, shelter beds, and housing available.” One stakeholder credited the community’s “hodgepodge of programs” to the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) quick CoC application turnaround, which has ultimately resulted in little time to strategically allocate resources based on community needs at the local level. Further, programs are currently operating at full capacity and need additional resources to bring about significant reductions in homelessness. “The scale of programs needs to be increased,” one stakeholder said. “We have good quality [programs], but capacity just isn’t there.” Some communities, such as Boulder, are considering strategies to ensure programs *only* serve those experiencing homelessness who are from their own jurisdiction(s) as a means to ration resources.

Additionally, some stakeholders noted believing that system inventory and services are lacking for certain subpopulations – including families with children, chronically homeless people (depending on location), youth, women, and those who are elderly (more detail about service gaps for particular subpopulations in the section, “Subpopulations”). In recent years, much of the CoC’s efforts have been focused on providing Veterans and those who meet the chronic homelessness definition with housing and appropriate supportive services. Many feel that as a result, the system lacks “light-touch” interventions, such as rapid re-housing and diversion. Some also said Metro Denver lacks prevention and diversion programs to keep people from becoming homeless, and that momentum around implementing diversion and a strengths-based problem-solving approach has arisen at the systems. Doing so is crucial given how limited system resources are locally, one stakeholder said. The CoC also needs added resources for prevention work, while existing prevention programs must broaden their eligibility criteria to allow households experiencing homelessness to receive prevention assistance and more effectively prevent people from falling into homelessness. “Too many people are falling out of housing who should’ve been helped to stay

in,” one stakeholder said. Other light-touch strategies that have gained community interest include Critical Time Intervention (CTI) and Progressive Engagement.

Furthermore, landlord engagement and retention efforts should be enhanced and expanded, given the community’s high-rent, low-vacancy housing market and subsequent difficulty utilizing housing vouchers within the private market. Stakeholders suggested that the CoC hire dedicated “landlord liaison” staff, who would be responsible for landlord recruitment, engagement, and incentives, as well as monitoring landlords to ensure fair treatment of homeless system clients. Outreach to people living outdoors and in places not meant for human habitation should also be bolstered to ensure those who are not making themselves known to the system are engaged and housed, stakeholders said.

Subpopulations

As mentioned previously, there has been a long-held perception amongst community members and system stakeholders that suburban homelessness is dominated by families and doubled up households, while urban homelessness tends to be more visible and comprised of chronically homeless single adults (mostly male). This population dynamic, however, is said to be shifting as the City of Denver and other surrounding communities have instated anti-camping ordinances. Despite these geographical and demographic changes, stakeholders consistently told us that suburban communities are still best equipped to serve families, while services for single adults are thin within these areas. Similarly, the City of Denver and other more urban communities have focused their resources on serving Veterans, chronically homeless adults, and other single adults, resulting in few resources for families and other subpopulations. “This mismatch has resulted in people being left out,” one stakeholder said.

Other subpopulations that are perceived as underserved and underrepresented within the homeless response system include women, youth, and the elderly. Stakeholders said few shelters serve the region’s women experiencing homelessness, many of whom have children or are elderly. Similarly, there are few emergency shelters, housing programs, and other services available for youth experiencing homelessness. The CoC has been directed by the federal government to adopt an “adult model” of housing and service delivery for youth and transition-aged youth (TAY), however, some providers feel this response is not appropriate given youth and transition-aged youths’ unique developmental needs. Several individuals called for more youth-specific transitional housing programs, as well as “developmentally appropriate” behavioral health services and other supports.

Some stakeholders also described an “ever-growing elderly [homeless] population;” one stakeholder estimated that more than 50 percent of people experiencing homelessness in Denver are over 55 years old, many of whom experience “challenging health issues and other end-of-life challenges.” Stakeholders suggested the need for more age- and health-appropriate supportive services to help these individuals obtain and sustain housing stability.

Despite these gaps, people generally agreed that the system has been particularly effective at housing Veterans and chronically homeless adults. However, some feel that by focusing so narrowly on these populations, the community is leaving many out and inadvertently “cultivating the next generation of [people who are] chronically homeless.”

CoC and System Leadership

Throughout our interviews, stakeholders were asked what they perceive the main role or function of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board to be. Many stakeholders responded that the CoC Board should lead all community collaboration, coordination, and information sharing. Within this role, the Board should work to ensure all geographical areas of the CoC are equitably represented and, when necessary, ensure gaps in resources are addressed. Some believe MDHI is too focused on the urban Denver area and, as a result, some suburban communities have been left out of planning efforts. One stakeholder said, “there is a disconnect between [suburban and rural] communities and MDHI,” and some agencies that are located outside of the City/County of Denver are not aware of regional planning bodies (such as MDHI) and their efforts to reduce homelessness. This has resulted in some very siloed efforts to address homelessness, and some feel the CoC could better engage suburban and rural communities outside of the central, urban core. “A greater unified approach is needed, bringing in all partners, [including] government, funders, and nonprofit providers,” one stakeholder said. MDHI must work to forge and reinforce a more inclusive vision for the system that “all seven counties are engaged in and buying into to make our system a lot more effective,” one person said. “The CoC has been invested in solutions that primarily meets the needs of the urban population,” a separate stakeholder said. “Some rural and suburban counties have wondered whether it’s worth it to be part of CoC if they’re not getting their fair share of resources. My greatest hope is that [the CoC leadership] will fund and find solutions that also fit the suburban and rural components.”

Others said the core function of the CoC Board and MDHI should be to drive all systems planning, ensuring these efforts align with federal policy priorities and proven best practices. The Board is responsible for “lifting the whole region up – and being the body that can raise the level of expertise and push strategies that work.” This involves identifying and thoughtfully addressing key challenges and needs, as well as providing training and support to attain system-level goals and objectives. Several people interviewed applauded MDHI’s recent efforts to more fully step into this role and many are hopeful about such leadership shifts.

Additionally, the CoC Board and system leadership should be data-focused and drive all data activities within the CoC, according to stakeholders. Specifically, the Board should be responsible for holding all CoC-funded agencies accountable for achieving performance targets via performance-based contracting to ensure positive outcomes for people experiencing homelessness. Providers should be encouraged and incentivized to “be outcome driven and not output driven.”

Although the community generally perceives the issue of homelessness to be worsening, due in part to high cost of living and a lack of affordable housing, many are confident in the new system leadership under MDHI and their ability to bring about significant, positive change in Metro Denver. MDHI has been integral in recent shifts towards increased system collaboration and participation amongst agencies throughout the region. “MDHI is on track to be doing what we, as a system, should be doing with system expediency and effectiveness in housing stability being a key outcome,” one person said. Additionally, MDHI has become “much more professional and transparent,” as well as data-driven and performance-oriented recently, several noted. However, some stakeholders perceive a lack of role clarity of system leaders – including the State of Colorado, City of Denver, other cities and counties, MDHI, and Colorado

Coalition for the Homeless (CCH). Many said clarifying and continually communicating the unique roles of each entity would allow for greater transparency, community buy-in, and collaboration.

System Data

Throughout our conversations, stakeholders frequently pointed to data as a key system gap. As previously mentioned, the community shares a widespread belief that the Point in Time (PIT) Count's methodology and results are flawed, reflecting a "severe undercount of homelessness" in Metro Denver; many believe this has negatively affected their competitiveness for federal funding.

Moreover, stakeholders who were interviewed consistently said that the CoC's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) has been one of the greatest system challenges. Complications with the CoC's HMIS vendor have led to inaccurate or incomplete data, and the use of other, inconsistent databases to track client information is common amongst providers. Although most stakeholders are extremely hopeful about the rollout of a new HMIS vendor and software, others questioned whether this change alone will be enough to move the entire system towards becoming more data-driven. Some suggested a more systemic emphasis on the importance of collecting and utilizing data is needed. Further, stakeholders recognized a need to shift providers to focus on outcomes, rather than outputs, and move towards more performance-based contracting. "Frontline service providers need to understand why data is important and understand the difference between outputs and outcomes," one person noted. The CoC must set and communicate clear targets and outcomes to ensure all parties – both on the systems and provider-level – are in alignment. The CoC's NOFA Committee has begun moving in this direction by focusing on outcomes and being "more in line with evidenced-based practices" in completing the 2017 CoC Application, according to one stakeholder.

Coordinated Entry System: OneHome

OneHome, the CoC's newly established coordinated entry system, was frequently pointed to as a key asset of the region's homeless response system. OneHome is designed to provide quick and appropriate access to available system resources and housing interventions for people experiencing homelessness. The system is grounded in being housing-focused, person-centered, and low-barrier, and ensuring that those with the highest needs are prioritized for available resources. Generally, stakeholders feel OneHome has successfully set a framework for a fully-functioning coordinated entry system that thoughtfully incorporates all seven counties and equitably serves people experiencing homelessness. OneHome has also been essential in rallying the community around a common effort and bridging fractured relations within the system; providing access to resources that some providers wouldn't otherwise have had access to; and setting clear, community-wide expectations around client access to the system. According to stakeholders, CoC leadership has truly championed OneHome and "thrown the necessary energy into making sure coordinated entry is fully functioning."

Still, stakeholders mentioned areas for improvement as the OneHome system continues to be developed, including more coordinated outreach and communications efforts to ensure people experiencing homelessness know how to access assistance efficiently. Some also described a coordinated entry system with a "backlog of people being assessed and a lack of units to place these households," calling for more effective strategies for prioritizing extremely limited housing resources and ensuring more seamless

pathways into housing for those with the highest need. Others expressed concerns that the current practice of prioritizing those who are chronically homeless or high-need has “left out” households who could benefit from lighter assistance. There was also an expressed need to incorporate shelter beds into the coordinated entry system or develop an alternative process for assigning bed placements, rather than continuing to use a first-come-first-served model.

System Strengths

In addition to the various strengths detailed in the previous sections, stakeholders identified several areas that are key assets of the homeless response system in Metro Denver. These strengths include:

- *Strong leadership and community momentum.* In addition to a newfound communitywide sense of confidence in CoC leadership, several stakeholders pointed to a recent upsurge in community buy-in and motivation around ending homelessness. In addition, local elected officials and the public have elevated the issue of homelessness, while cities and counties in the metropolitan region have created positions dedicated to addressing homelessness. “The capacity for addressing homelessness across Metro Denver has grown and a lot of people working on the issue now,” said one stakeholder. “It’s difficult to systematically address [homelessness] without the right level of support staff at the CoC level, and MDHI continues to grow and increase their capacity. As a result, we’ve seen a shift away from the cynicism that once existed in communities [towards] much greater momentum.” The Close to Home campaign, which was designed to raise awareness and increase public engagement around homelessness, has also been seen as a success in changing public opinion about homelessness. However, the campaign’s organizers, The Denver Foundation, are still refining the campaign to focus on building public will amongst “neighborhoods and not as much with providers.”
- *Support from the State of Colorado.* During our interviews, several discussed promising State-level initiatives and as well strong leadership from the State’s Department of Housing to address homelessness. Several are hopeful about new “marijuana money” – tax revenue collected from the sale of legalized recreational marijuana – that will be used in part to fund housing programs for people experiencing homelessness. The State has also developed some innovative programs, incentives, and supports to encourage the development of permanent supportive housing (PSH) and other affordable housing.
- *Community initiatives.* Stakeholders mentioned several recent, local initiatives that have been seen locally as important steps towards solving homelessness. Amongst these are the IBM Smarter Cities Challenge program, which was aimed at determining methods to use data and technology to reduce homelessness; trainings and workshops by MDHI and the consulting firm OrgCode; the Metro Mayors Caucus’ focus on homelessness and hunger; and some local public housing authorities’ commitment to Housing First and prioritizing people who are chronically homeless for available units and/or vouchers.

System Gaps and Challenges

While many expressed feeling that Metro Denver is on a promising path forward, some gaps and challenges of the homeless response system in Metro Denver that were discussed during the interviews include:

- *Serving the hardest to serve.* While the CoC has committed to prioritizing Veterans and chronically homeless individuals, some questioned whether the CoC is effectively targeting and engaging those who are truly the hardest to serve. “People are languishing outside,” one stakeholder said. “We have to figure out how to end homelessness for people who have been homeless longest: those who have the highest barriers, struggling with substance abuse or mental illness, who have pets or a partner. These people are not accessing the system and its resources – we need to get creative and reallocate some resources. [We need to] look at working with people in encampments and use data to understand this population.” Stakeholders also mentioned a continued need to focus on and improve upon serving high utilizers of the homeless system and other systems of care.
- *Urgency.* Stakeholders said that a greater sense of urgency amongst local leadership and the community is needed to truly turn the tide on homelessness in Metro Denver. This involves determining ways to utilize limited resources more effectively and efficiently, and “getting more done with less, despite a challenging housing market and other local factors.”
- *Affordable housing and cost of living.* Throughout our interviews, the region’s lack of affordable housing, low vacancy rates, and high cost of living were identified as major contributing factors to the region’s growing homeless populations. Stakeholders said the community and its leaders must continue to push for the development of more affordable housing to ensure those experiencing homelessness may be housed and other households are prevented from ever entering homelessness.

II. Learning Collaboratives

During September and October of 2017, Focus Strategies and MDHI hosted a series of three Learning Collaborative meetings on the topics of system performance, diversion, and rapid re-housing for stakeholders in Metro Denver. The following sections provide a brief overview of stakeholder input collected during each of the three sessions.

System Performance: During the first Learning Collaborative regarding system performance on September 13th, Focus Strategies presented on essential elements of a homeless crisis response system, the importance of performance analysis, key system and program-level performance measures, and ways to implement systemwide performance analysis. Stakeholders in attendance expressed a general desire to become more data-driven and performance-oriented with a focus on housing outcomes and effectiveness of the overall system. As a first step, stakeholders expressed the need to ensure that *all* projects serving people experiencing homelessness participate in the community’s HMIS, not just projects funded by the CoC. Participants expressed wanting more accessible data, greater collaboration and

participation around data sharing and performance measurement, and increased data “integrity,” accuracy, and completeness. Some also wondered how to “get everyone on the same page” given differing political views and opinions on how to best address homelessness.

Diversion: The second Learning Collaborative, which was hosted on September 26th, provided an overview of the concepts, purpose, and benefits of implementing diversion or “problem-solving” activities, as well as how to implement and measure the success of a diversion program. Focus Strategies discussed two different system-level approaches: shelter diversion (diverting people from entering shelter specifically) and housing problem solving, which focuses on diverting people from entering the homeless system more generally. As an introduction to the Learning Collaborative, stakeholders were asked to name words or phrases they associate with diversion; their responses included: options, avoidance, respect, empowerment, unfamiliar, resiliency, prevention, creativity, innovative, and stabilization.

Participants were also invited to share diversion activities that are currently being conducted or will be implemented in the future in Metro Denver. Diversion efforts mentioned by stakeholders during the session included:

- *Volunteers of America (VOA).* VOA has initiated some informal problem-solving work including helping clients pay arrears, reunify youth with family, and provide bus passes for those with connections in other communities. Currently, VOA has no way of measuring the success of these programs and the extent to which the activities are conducted largely depends on resources available (primarily from in-kind donations).
- *Family Motel Program – Denver Department of Human Services and VOA.* The Family Motel program utilizes problem-solving as a first step in assisting clients – providing clients with motel vouchers is intended to be a last resort strategy. The program, however, reported that a very small percentage of families who enter the program are successfully diverted.
- *Family Promise.* Family Promise of Greater Denver, which operates emergency shelter for families experiencing homelessness, reported conducting some diversion activities, such as landlord mediation. The program is currently working to strengthen its family reunification strategies, as well. Family Promise reported some success, as six families are now housed utilizing problem-solving strategies.
- *Denver’s Road Home.* Denver’s Road Home, a joint effort to address homelessness by coordinating housing and other resources within the seven-county Metro Denver area, recently issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a diversion pilot program. The funded program must assist households in shelter or seeking shelter *and* who are literally homeless or at imminent risk of becoming homeless; provide mediation and/or cover one-time expenses to solve a household’s housing crisis; and work in coordination with the greater system.
- *City and County of Boulder.* Boulder is currently undergoing a “radical change” for its single adult emergency shelter system in part by implementing diversion at program entry, as well as restructuring how people enter and access emergency shelter and other system resources.

Diversion activities and resources currently do not exist in some communities including Adams and Aurora County, according to participants.

Following an activity and small group discussion concerning possible diversion scenarios, the entire group discussed potential ways to create a systemwide diversion strategy for the Metro Denver region that

would be consistent across its various geographies and program types. Participants said necessary diversion elements may include dedicated “problem-solvers,” or diversion staff; flexible dollars available solely for diversion-related expenses (i.e. arrears, security deposits and other move-in costs); data sharing that avoids clients repeating their situation to multiple people and tracks outcomes of clients who are diverted; and systemwide buy-in and fidelity to a common approach, including consistent messaging and language amongst all providers. Stakeholders also said it would be important to define when and where diversion activities would take place (i.e. before or after entering shelter).

Generally, stakeholders seemed to be optimistic about implementing diversion and housing problem-solving in Metro Denver, however some concerns were raised during the session including: how to adopt a consistent problem-solving approach and messaging across all programs; how to get all seven Counties to work in unison; and how to integrate diversion into HMIS and the coordinated entry system, OneHome.

Rapid Re-Housing: The final Learning Collaborative, which took place on October 10th and 11th, was focused on rapid re-housing (RRH), including its core components, best practices, and shifting system culture through RRH. This Learning Collaborative was part of a two-day “RRH Summit” that also included presentations by ICF Consulting on developing RRH written standards for CoC and ESG funded programs.

In general, stakeholders were open to and hopeful about implementing more expansive RRH efforts throughout the community. Currently, many of the region’s RRH programs are restricted to serving families or Veterans, and stakeholders asked how best to target and serve high-need individuals and other single adults experiencing homelessness with RRH.

Several individuals, however, expressed concerns about the region’s high-cost and low-vacancy housing market, and how RRH could be successfully executed given these barriers. More suburban communities, such as Aurora, were also interested in using rapid re-housing as a prevention strategy and asked whether RRH programs can serve people outside of the literally homeless definition. Several stakeholders expressed interest around linking prevention and diversion more closely to housing intervention. Other expressed interest in operationalizing the Progressive Engagement model, which involves providing small amounts of assistance upfront to help a household stabilize and reassessing client need over time to determine whether more or less assistance is needed. This approach ensures that RRH resources are maximized and households do not receive more assistance than they need to end their homelessness.

From our observation, it seems that the community has a solid grasp of RRH’s key concepts, such as the value of landlord recruitment and engagement in building a successful RRH program. However, it was unclear whether the community has a strong understanding of how well its existing RRH programs are performing or even how to set performance standards for housing interventions such as RRH. Whether or not existing RRH programs are coordinated across the system was also unclear.

Appendix A
Stakeholder Interview Participants

The following is a list of stakeholders who participated in one-on-one phone interviews with Focus Strategies during the months of September and October 2017.

Stakeholder Name	Organization and Role	Date of Interview
Abel Montoya*	Director, Adams County Department of Regional Affairs	October 17
Adam Burg*	Legislative Affairs Coordinator, Adams County Department of Regional Affairs	October 17
Alix Midgley*	Homelessness Liaison, Adams County Department of Regional Affairs	October 17
Claire Clurman	Executive Director, Attention Homes	September 21
Dave Riggs	Director of Community Service, Adams County Housing Authority	September 14
Ethan Hemming	President and CEO, Warren Village	September 21
Greg Harms	Executive Director, Boulder Shelter for the Homeless	September 14
Josh Geppelt	Senior Director of Emergency Services, Denver Rescue Mission	September 20
Kate Skarbek	Analyst, City of Westminster	October 17
Kathryn Otten	Director of Housing, Homelessness, and Integration, Jefferson County	September 20
Kendall Rames	Deputy Director/Director of Programs, Urban Peak	September 20
Kristin Toombs	Homeless Programs Manager, Colorado Department of Local Affairs, Division of Housing	September 21
Lindi Sinton	Vice President of Program Operations, Volunteers of America Colorado	September 15

Mandy May	Vice President of Quality Assurance, Colorado Coalition for the Homeless	September 20
Michael Sinnett	Vice President of Shelters and Community Outreach, Catholic Charities of Denver	October 6
Michelle Lapidow	Deputy Chief, Homeless and Vocational Programs, Eastern Colorado Veterans Affairs	September 15
Rand Clark	Community of Care Navigator, Douglas County	September 21
Rebecca Zamora*	Neighborhood and Constituent Services Liaison, Adams County Department of Regional Affairs	October 17
Scott Shields	CEO, Family Tree	September 21
Shelley McKittrick	Homelessness Program Director, City of Aurora	September 22
Stevi Gray	Housing Program Manager, Colorado Coalition Against Domestic Violence	September 15
Tom Luehrs	Executive Director, St. Francis Center	September 14

*Abel Montoya, Rebecca Zamora, Adam Burg, and Alix Midgley participated in the only group interview on October 17, 2017, in order to fully represent the Adams County Department of Regional Affairs work on homelessness.

Appendix B
Metro Denver Learning Collaboratives

The following is a list of the dates and topics for each of the three Learning Collaborative hosted by Focus Strategies and Metro Denver Homeless Initiative (MDHI) in September and October 2017.

Learning Collaborative Topic	Presenters	Date of Session
Analysis of System Performance	Will Connelly, Executive Director, MDHI Megan Kurteff Schatz, Principal, Focus Strategies	September 13
Diversion/Housing Problem-Solving	Will Connelly, Executive Director, MDHI Megan Kurteff Schatz, Principal, Focus Strategies Kate Bristol, Director of Consulting, Focus Strategies	September 26
Rapid Re-Housing	Will Connelly, Executive Director, MDHI Rebecca Mayer, Deputy Director, MDHI Katharine Gale, Principal Associate, Focus Strategies Marcy Wheeler, ICF Consulting Chris Pitcher, ICF Consulting	October 10 & 11