A Demographic Analysis of Rapid Re-Housing Outcomes for Families

February 2020

BUILDING CHANGES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Building Changes gratefully acknowledges our Pierce, King, and Snohomish county partners for providing access to data; Claire Guilmette and Clayton Aldern for conducting the data analyses and writing an initial draft of this report; and Pear Moraras for consulting on data fields and interpretation of results. The findings do not necessarily reflect the views of the counties. Financial support was provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Suggested citation:
Building Changes. (2020). *A Demographic Analysis of Rapid Re-Housing Outcomes for Families*. Building Changes: Seattle, WA. https://buildingchanges.org/images/documents/library/2020_RRHOutcomesforFamilies_Report.pdf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ii
Summary 1
Background 2
Methods 3
Results 5
Discussion 6
Appendix A. Descriptive Statistics A1
Appendix B. Regression Model Outputs B1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Count of families by race/ethnicity of head of household A1
Table 2. Count of families by county A1
Table 3. Count of families by enrollment entry year A1
Table 4. Count of families by veteran status of head of household A1
Table 5. Count of families by gender of head of household A2
Table 6. Count of families by young adult head of household A2
Table 7. Count of families by number of adults in the household A2
Table 8. Summary statistics for number of children in household A2
Table 9. Move-in rate A3
Table 10. Length of time to move in A3
Table 11. Successful exit rate A3
Table 12. Length of time to exit A3
Table 13. Return rate A3
Table 14. Outcomes by family household characteristic variables A4
Table 15. Probability associated with obtaining a move-in date B1
Table 16. Estimated days from project enrollment to move-in B3
Table 17. Probability of exiting to permanent housing B5
Table 18. Estimated days enrolled B7
Table 19. Probability of returns to homeless system after 6 months B9

SUMMARY

For families experiencing homelessness, Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) programs provide housing-search assistance, case management, and financial support to obtain housing in the private rental market. This analysis seeks to answer which families are most likely to benefit from RRH given current service provision practices and who may benefit from alternative services, additional supports, and/or system reform. Here, we focus on demographic variation.

Specifically, we examine Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data from Washington's King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties for families enrolled in and exiting from RRH programs between 2014 and 2018. We seek to answer the following research questions:

1) How well is Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) working for families?
2) Is RRH working better for some groups of families than for others?

This analysis employs linear and logistic regressions with geographic and temporal fixed effects to investigate these research questions. Key findings from our analyses indicate:

- RRH programs work for many, but not nearly all, families experiencing homelessness. Fully 40% of families that enroll in RRH do not move into a rental unit through this program.
- Families headed by veterans tend to have better outcomes. They take less time to search for housing, have an increased likelihood of moving into rental units, and remain in the program for less time, compared to non-veteran-headed families.
- Families headed by a young adult (ages 18 to 24) appear to be served less effectively by RRH programs. They are less likely to remain housed as RRH support ends and are more likely to return to homelessness, compared to families headed by an adult age 25 and older. In addition, they are more likely to stay in the program longer, compared to older adults.
- Families headed by a woman stay in the program longer and are more likely to return to homelessness, compared to families headed by a man.
- Families headed by a single adult have a harder time finding a rental unit (are less likely to move in), compared to families with two or more adults in the family.

BACKGROUND

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) is an intervention that seeks to assist people experiencing homelessness by providing housing-search assistance, short-term rental subsidies, and case management with services.[1] This analysis focuses on families receiving RRH support.

Under RRH, lease agreements are made between private landlords and program participants. As the time-limited rental subsidy expires, leases remain in participants' names and, ideally, families remain housed. As a Housing First program, a unifying goal of RRH is to move families experiencing homelessness as quickly as possible into permanent housing; in particular, through a low-barrier approach that prioritizes getting a roof over one's head before addressing other instabilities in one's life.[2]

The process of administering and participating in an RRH program, however, introduces several opportunities for intervention success or failure (in terms of the ultimate goal of a family securing permanent housing). For example, participating families may be referred to and enroll in RRH, but program staff may not be able to identify a viable housing opportunity, and the family consequently may never move into a rental unit. When families do move into a unit and receive rental assistance under the RRH program, they may not be able to retain the lease upon expiration of the subsidy.

Furthermore, each system touchpoint presents opportunity for the introduction of individual and systemic biases to act on RRH program access and delivery. Generations of structural racism and systemic disenfranchisement from housing opportunities are reflected in the disproportionate representation of people of color in the homeless system,[3] which in turn presents the opportunity for the introduction of further systemic bias. Recent research on racial disparities in a homeless-housing prioritization tool reveals that people of color are, on average, more likely to receive lower prioritization scores for housing interventions (including RRH) than their white counterparts.[4] Given this context, it is conceivable that disparities associated with family characteristics like race and ethnicity—along with others like gender, household composition, veteran status, and age—may affect the probability that a given family will secure permanent housing through RRH.

In this analysis, we examine administrative HMIS data from King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties—the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett metropolitan area—to assess aggregate RRH effectiveness and identify whether certain household characteristics are associated with program success or failure (and at which point in the RRH process). Specifically, we seek answers to the questions:

1) How well is Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) working for families?
2) Is RRH working better for some groups of families than for others?

[1] Rapid Re-Housing. (n.d.) National Alliance to End Homelessness. Retrieved from www.endhomelessness.org
[2] Rapid Re-Housing Fact Sheet: Housing First. (April, 2016). National Alliance to End Homelessness. Retrieved from www.endhomelessness.org
[3] Olivet, J., et al. (March, 2018). Phase One Study Findings. Supporting Partnerships for Anti-Racist Communities (SPARC). Retrieved from www.center4si.com
[4] Wilkey, C., et al. (October, 2019). Coordinated Entry Systems Racial Equity Analysis of Assessment Data. C4 Innovations. Study funded by Building Changes. Retrieved from www.c4innovates.com

METHODS

For this analysis, we accessed HMIS data from three Continua of Care (CoC): King County, Pierce County, and Snohomish County.[5] We focus on heads of families that enrolled and exited an RRH program between 2014 and 2018. Data were combined across the three CoCs. Families are defined as a household with at least one member under the age of 18 and at least one member over the age of 18.[6]

We estimate baseline program performance to understand how well RRH is working for families overall. We focus our analysis on five metrics and examine program performance by subgroup—namely, do race/ethnicity, gender, veteran status, household composition, or age predict the following measures:

1. Probability associated with obtaining a move-in date while enrolled in RRH
2. Length of time from RRH project enrollment date to move-in date
3. Probability that a family moves into an RRH rental unit and exits to permanent housing
4. Length of time enrolled in RRH
5. Probability that a family will return to homelessness after six months of successfully exiting an RRH program

Independent and explanatory variables include HUD-specified Universal Data Elements (UDEs) in HMIS.[7] Data fields used to calculate program performance metrics include: Enrollment Entry Date, Housing Move-In Date, Enrollment Exit Date, and Exit Destination. With respect to the first measure, receipt of a move-in date is represented as a binary variable based on the presence or absence of a move-in-date in a given enrollment record. We investigate our second and fourth measures by calculating the difference in days between Enrollment Entry Date and Move-In Date, as well as the difference in days between Enrollment Entry Date and Enrollment Exit Date, respectively. With respect to our third measure, we consider a "successful exit" to correspond to Exit Destinations coded as units owned or rented by clients, with or without ongoing housing subsidy, as well as destinations corresponding to staying/living with family or friends for a permanent tenure.[8] We consider a family as having returned to homelessness by assessing whether a family returns to the homeless system within six months of successful program exit (as measured by the presence of a subsequent HMIS enrollment—not necessarily in RRH). This understanding of returns, however, applies only to heads of household that consent to having their identity tracked in HMIS and, for this analysis, is limited to two of the three counties that provided data for this report.[9]

Outcomes are analyzed against demographic characteristics of family heads of household including gender, age, race/ethnicity, and veteran status. We also examine household composition, focusing on family size, including the number of adults in the household and number of children in the household.

For this analysis, we treat HUD-delineated race and ethnicity status as a single, combined variable. Heads of household who identify as Hispanic/Latino are coded accordingly in the combined variable, regardless

[5] Data are available through a Building Changes partnership with Pierce, King, and Snohomish counties, made possible through funding support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
[6] Each county determines household type using different criteria, but these are the criteria used to standardize classifications across the three CoCs studied.
[7] HUD UDE standards
[8] HUD System Performance Measure 7: Housing Destination Summary
[9] Due to data limitations, we were unable to calculate return rates for Snohomish County.

of their recorded racial identity. “Client refused,” “other,” and “unknown” entries for veteran status and gender status are removed from our multivariate analyses due to small sample size and to mitigate co-linearity and erroneous correlations.

To understand potential differences in outcomes between families headed by a single-adult and households with more than one adult, we transformed the continuous “household adult count” variable into a categorical dichotomous variable. Similarly, to account for young-adult experiences, we examined outcomes by age of the head of household dichotomously, separating those 18 to 24 years old (“young adults”) from adults age 25 and older.

This analysis employs linear and logistic regression to examine the effect of key demographic variables on our outcomes of interest. To control for heterogeneity in unobserved factors specific to each Continuum of Care and sample year that may bias the modeled effects—including unique policies and housing and labor markets—we add both geographic and time fixed-effect terms to our original model specifications and then estimate within-group effects. Specifically, we leverage the lfe and alpaca packages from the R programming language to implement linear and logistic fixed-effects models, respectively. (Fixed-effects models are compared to naive linear and logistic models implemented in base R.)

We also estimate cluster-robust standard errors by county and year to account for regional and temporal heterogeneity of variance across clusters (i.e. heteroskedasticity). Final model specifications also include interaction terms for household adult count and head of household gender.

Our data source is limited to families enrolling in publicly funded Rapid Re-Housing programs that participate in HMIS. This excludes families in privately funded programs, other publicly funded housing programs, or those otherwise not participating in HMIS. Furthermore, independent variables included in this analysis are limited to those for which we had equal access across the three Continua of Care studied. Excluded variables (i.e., those for which we did not have equal access) include income and income sources, employment status, experience of domestic violence, as well as physical and mental health conditions.[10]

Our models describe the estimated effects of observed variation among a subset of variables coding for some aspects of families’ backgrounds and experiences with RRH programs in the sample area. Given omitted variables, we do not claim to present a fully comprehensive or causal explanation of variation in RRH effectiveness. For example, because income may be correlated with race, statistically significant effects concerning race may partially describe relationships between income and RRH efficacy. Modeled effects must be understood as descriptive. Additionally, in deciding to pursue fixed-effects modeling, we forego the possibility of partial pooling across groups in estimating our coefficients (i.e., in the case of random effects). By definition, we seek to determine average within-group regression effects as opposed to pooling across all groups, estimating separate models for each county or time period, or including these variables as dummies in our models. It was outside the scope of this study to conduct county-specific analyses.

[10] Complete list of HUD Program Specific UDEs

RESULTS

A total of 4,387 families enrolled and exited an RRH program between 2014 and 2018 in King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties. The largest racial/ethnic group represented among these families was Black/African-American (40.4%). Most heads of household identify as female (80.1%). Among the families, (13.2%) are headed by veterans. Our basic descriptive analysis reveals that gender and veteran status are highly correlated—46% of male heads of household are veterans. In contrast, only 5% of female heads of household are veterans. In a majority of families, there is only one adult in the household (67.2%), with a median of two members who are children under age 18. Of one-adult households, most (89.5%) are headed by a female. Young-adult headed households represent 9.7% of families in the sample.

Of the 4,387 RRH-enrolled families, 59.6% moved into housing through RRH. For these families, the median length of time to move into a unit was 40 days. The median length of total time enrolled in RRH for those who moved into a unit was 217 days. Of those families that moved into an RRH-supported unit, 93.4% had a successful exit. Among records of families that exited RRH successfully after moving into a unit, 11.6% returned to the homeless system within six months of exit. For detailed summary statistics of household characteristic variables and outcomes, see *Appendix A*.

The following results articulate findings from logistic and linear regressions, which we use to analyze the outcomes of interest against our key demographic variables (race/ethnicity, age, veteran status, gender, and household composition). Our models control for unobserved effects that are unique to each county and year of program enrollment. The models report the relative, remaining effects shared across all counties and years. For complete outputs of results, see *Appendix B*.

Findings from this analysis indicate that race/ethnicity of the head of household for families is generally not predictive of RRH program outcomes,[11] and neither is the number of children in a household.

Our results further indicate that veteran status is correlated with positive RRH program outcomes. Specifically, veteran heads of household are more likely to move into an RRH housing unit, spend less time searching for a unit, as well as fewer days enrolled in RRH, compared to non-veteran families. Additionally, veteran-headed families who moved into an RRH housing unit may be more likely to exit successfully and less likely to return to the homelessness within six months, although not at a rate of statistical significance.

In contrast, we find that female-headed households are more likely to experience negative RRH program outcomes compared to male-headed households. Female-headed households experience longer enrollments in RRH and appear at greater risk of returning to homelessness after a successful exit.

Families headed by one adult are less likely to move into an RRH rental unit than those with two or more adults. For other outcomes of interest, the number of adults in a household does not appear to be

[11] Race/ethnicity category "other" may be predictive of greater likelihood of a move-in date. Additionally, families with heads of household who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native may have greater likelihood of a successful exit if they moved into a unit.

predictive. Furthermore, the interaction of gender and number of adults in households did not yield any statistically significant differences in outcomes.

Our results further suggest that families headed by young adults have higher probabilities of negative RRH program outcomes compared to heads of household age 25 or older. Young adult heads of household who moved into an RRH housing unit are less likely to exit to permanent housing, and for those who do, are more likely to return to homelessness. Young adult heads of household also may be more likely to stay enrolled in an RRH program longer than heads of household age 25 or older.

DISCUSSION

Our findings should be understood as assessing the extent to which Rapid Re-Housing works for families that gain access to the program. Based on our analysis of move-in rates, RRH programs work for many, but not nearly all, enrolled families. Fully 40% of families that enrolled in RRH never moved into a rental unit through this program. Among families that moved into RRH units, the intervention had a 93% success rate in terms of a given family maintaining permanent housing at program exit.

It is worth noting that veteran-headed families tended to have better outcomes. All else equal, heads of household identifying as veterans were more likely to move into an RRH unit, moved in more quickly, and required shorter subsidy periods. Given the ample investment in and federal prioritization of veteran homelessness—as exemplified by the Supportive Services for Veterans Families program—it may be of no surprise that veterans experiencing homelessness have better outcomes.

Our analysis further suggests the RRH approach as implemented works better for families headed by older adults. Families headed by young adults are less likely to retain their housing as the program ends, despite spending more time in RRH programs, and they are more likely to return to homelessness within six months of the subsidy ending. Female-headed households also are more likely to return. Additionally, relative to multi-adult families, single-adult families are less likely to move into an RRH unit. Deeper investigations into how RRH programs can better support these sub-populations are warranted.

Our modeling results offer insights but have limitations. Generally, model fits were poor to modest and left much outcome variance unexplained. Without richer data—including predictors related to housing barriers, medical acuity, income, and other correlates of housing instability—we wouldn't expect to achieve better model fits.

This analysis does not account for variation in access to RRH programs. Families often have many interactions with the homeless system. Our study sample includes only families that received a vulnerability assessment, received a referral to an RRH program, and subsequently had their referral accepted by a service provider. Questions related to these other homeless system interactions—include those addressing potentially disparate access, referral rates, and system flow—require further research. Interpretation of our findings also is limited by the nature of data collection across the CoCs studied. While high-quality HMIS data exist in all cases, the absence of robust follow-up data limits our ability to make definite statements about housing stability post-RRH.

APPENDIX A. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Summary Statistics for Family Household Characteristic Variables

Table 1. Count of families by race/ethnicity of head of household

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Families	Percent of Total
American Indian/Alaska Native	93	2.1%
Asian	99	2.3%
Black/African American	1,771	40.4%
Hispanic/Latino	556	12.7%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	188	4.3%
Other	320	7.3%
White	1,360	31.0%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 2. Count of families by county

County	Number of Families	Percent of Total
King	2,436	55.5%
Pierce	1,419	32.3%
Snohomish	532	12.1%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 3. Count of families by enrollment entry year

Enrollment Entry Year	Number of Families	Percent of Total
2014	871	19.9%
2015	1,163	26.5%
2016	916	20.9%
2017	962	21.9%
2018	475	10.8%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 4. Count of families by veteran status of head of household

Veteran Status	Number of Families	Percent of Total
No	3,808	86.8%
Yes	579	13.2%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 5. Count of families by gender of head of household

Gender	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Female	3,512	80.1%
Male	871	19.9%
Other	4	0.1%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 6. Count of families by young adult head of household

Young Adult	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Yes	427	9.7%
No	3,960	90.3%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 7. Count of families by number of adults in the household

Adults in households	Number of Families	Percent of Total
One adult	2,946	67.2%
More than one adult	1,441	32.8%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 8. Summary statistics for number of children in household

Households with Minors Count	Min	Median	Mean	Max	Standard Deviation
4,387	1	2	1.993	9	1.15

Summary Statistics – Outcomes

Table 9. Move-in rate

Move-In Date Receipt	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Moved into RRH unit	2,614	59.6%
Did not move into an RRH unit	1,773	40.4%
Total	4,387	100%

Table 10. Length of time to move in

	N	Min	Median	Mean	Max	Standard Deviation
Days from Enrollment to Move-In-Date*	2,614	0	40	64.56	360	69.8

*For those who moved into an RRH unit

Table 11. Successful exit rate

Exit Destination Type*	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Permanent housing destination	2,441	93.4%
Other	173	6.6%
Total	2,614	100%

*For those who moved into an RRH unit

Table 12. Length of time to exit

	N	Min	Median	Mean	Max	Standard Deviation
Days Enrolled in RRH*	2,614	2	217	236.1	1083	141.1

*For those who moved into an RRH unit

Table 13. Return rate

Returns to system within 6 months of exit*	Number of Families	Percent of Total
Did not return within 6 months	1,954	88.4%
Returned within 6 months	257	11.6%
Total	2,211	100%

*For those who moved into an RRH unit and exited to a permanent housing destination (data exclude Snohomish County)

Table 14. Outcomes by family household characteristic variables

	Move-in rate	Length of time to move in (median days)	Successful exit rate	Length of time to exit (median days)	Return rate
Female head of household	58.5%	42	92.8%	227	12.8%
Male head of household	64.1%	35	95.5%	181.5	7.8%
One-adult household	57.7%	39	92.7%	222	12.5%
More than one adult in household	63.4%	41	94.7%	209	10.3%
Young adult head of household	58.8%	40	90.0%	252	16.9%
Not young adult head of household	59.7%	38	93.8%	214	11.0%
American Indian/ Alaska Native	54.8%	57	98.0%	216	2.3%
Asian	54.5%	34.5	96.3%	180	11.1%
Black/African-American	59.5%	41.5	94.3%	215.5	13.4%
Hispanic/Latino	58.5%	31	94.4%	234	9.9%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	61.7%	40.5	94.0%	237.5	6.4%
Other race/ethnicity	63.8%	49.5	90.2%	206	14.8%
White	59.6%	38	92.1%	213	10.3%
Veteran head of household	70.6%	30	96.1%	152	7.5%
Not a veteran head of household	57.9%	43	92.9%	229	12.4%
Single female adult household	57.6%	39	92.3%	224.5	12.8%
Not single female adult household	62.6%	40	95.0%	206	10.3%
1 child in household	58.1%	39	94.0%	221.5	11.4%
2-3 children household	60.8%	40	92.6%	213.5	11.8%
4+ children household	60.0%	42.5	94.6%	213	12.0%
Total population	59.6%	40	93.4%	217	11.6%

APPENDIX B. REGRESSION MODEL OUTPUTS

Table 15. Probability associated with obtaining a move-in date

	Dependent variable:		
	Probability of moving in		
	logistic	*fixed effects*	*fixed effects & clustered SE*
Controls	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female	-0.032 (0.123)	-0.038 (0.124)	-0.038 (0.166)
One Adult Household	-0.277* (0.150)	-0.309** (0.152)	-0.309* (0.173)
Young Adult	0.037 (0.106)	0.059 (0.107)	0.059 (0.126)
American Indian/Alaska Native	-0.158 (0.217)	-0.090 (0.218)	-0.090 (0.328)
Asian	-0.151 (0.210)	-0.053 (0.208)	-0.053 (0.207)
Black/African American	0.029 (0.075)	0.137* (0.080)	0.137 (0.121)
Hispanic/Latino	0.008 (0.103)	0.102 (0.107)	0.102 (0.146)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.028 (0.163)	0.076 (0.168)	0.076 (0.168)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.214* (0.130)	0.229* (0.133)	0.229** (0.101)
Veteran	0.537*** (0.111)	0.532*** (0.112)	0.532*** (0.146)
Count of Children in Household	0.032 (0.028)	0.027 (0.028)	0.027 (0.032)
Single Female Adult Household (Interaction)	0.148 (0.169)	0.156 (0.171)	0.156 (0.187)
N	4383	4383	4383
Null deviance	5914.5	5914.5	5914.5
Residual deviance	5866.9	5791.9	5791.9
Pseudo-R-squared	0.008	0.021	0.021

*Significance Level: ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10*

This model estimates families' probabilities of moving into a unit after enrolling in RRH. In our selected specification (column 3), families headed by one adult were at most 8% less likely to move into a unit, relative to families with more than one adult, all else equal (OR = 0.73). However, this effect was only weakly statistically significant ($p < 0.1$). Relative to families with non-veteran heads of household, families with veteran heads of household were at most 13% more likely to move in, all else equal (OR = 1.70).[12]

[12] In this summary paragraph (and all proceeding), to convert logit coefficients to probabilities, we estimated upper bounds for marginal effects using Gelman and Hill's (2007) divide-by-four rule.

Table 16. Estimated days from project enrollment to move-in

	Dependent variable:		
	Days from project enrollment to move-in		
	linear	*fixed effects*	*fixed effects & clustered SE*
Controls	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female	4.159 (5.111)	3.703 (4.907)	3.703 (4.934)
One Adult Household	-2.204 (6.367)	-0.539 (6.115)	-0.539 (7.101)
Young Adult	-5.825 (4.731)	-4.283 (4.545)	-4.283 (7.498)
American Indian/Alaska Native	20.101** (10.006)	9.262 (9.634)	9.262 (9.505)
Asian	-3.152 (9.746)	-12.483 (9.393)	-12.483 (11.258)
Black/African American	9.958*** (3.268)	-3.630 (3.356)	-3.630 (3.680)
Hispanic/Latino	-1.660 (4.601)	-12.226*** (4.496)	-12.226 (10.273)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1.796 (6.981)	-5.343 (6.723)	-5.343 (5.558)
Other Race/Ethnicity	13.552** (5.439)	6.710 (5.292)	6.710 (5.418)
Veteran	-20.625*** (4.363)	-15.426*** (4.218)	-15.426*** (3.433)
Count of Children in Household	1.520 (1.214)	1.402 (1.166)	1.402 (1.042)
Single Female Adult Household (Interaction)	0.482 (7.195)	-0.229 (6.908)	-0.229 (6.612)
N	2607	2607	2607
R-squared	0.022	0.103	0.103
Adjusted R-squared	0.017	0.097	0.097

*Significance Level: ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10*

This model estimates the number of days it takes for families to move into a unit after enrolling in RRH. Relative to families with non-veteran heads of household, families with veteran heads of household moved into a unit in approximately 15 fewer days, all else equal.

Table 17. Probability of exiting to permanent housing

	Dependent variable:		
	Probability of exiting to permanent housing		
	logistic	*fixed effects*	*fixed effects & clustered SE*
Controls	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female	0.119 (0.333)	0.137 (0.332)	0.137 (0.343)
One Adult Household	0.268 (0.463)	0.314 (0.459)	0.314 (0.481)
Young Adult	-0.427* (0.237)	-0.407* (0.238)	-0.407** (0.200)
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.481 (1.019)	1.349 (1.022)	1.349* (0.748)
Asian	0.875 (0.734)	0.745 (0.730)	0.745 (0.936)
Black/African American	0.406** (0.188)	0.223 (0.205)	0.223 (0.207)
Hispanic/Latino	0.486* (0.278)	0.326 (0.283)	0.326 (0.355)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.223 (0.419)	0.123 (0.420)	0.123 (0.394)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.167 (0.271)	-0.257 (0.278)	-0.257 (0.308)
Veteran	0.483 (0.306)	0.547* (0.301)	0.547 (0.336)
Count of Children in Household	-0.035 (0.070)	-0.034 (0.064)	-0.034 (0.073)
Single Female Adult Household (Interaction)	-0.644 (0.506)	-0.686 (0.505)	-0.686 (0.481)
N	2607	2607	2607
Null deviance	1267.5	1267.5	1267.5
Residual deviance	1241.7	1227.1	1227.1
Pseudo-R-squared	0.020	0.032	0.032

*Significance Level: ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10*

This model estimates families' probabilities of successfully exiting a RRH program after moving into a unit. In our selected specification (column 3), families with heads of household ages 18 to 24 were at most 10% less likely to exit the program successfully, relative to families with heads of household age 25 and older, all else equal (OR = 0.67). Relative to families with white heads of household, families with American Indian/Alaska Native heads of household were at most 34% more likely to exit successfully, all else equal (OR = 3.85). However, the latter effect was only weakly statistically significant ($p < 0.1$).

Table 18. Estimated days enrolled

	Dependent variable:		
	Days enrolled		
	linear	*fixed effects*	*fixed effects & clustered SE*
Controls	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female	17.880* (10.279)	13.139 (9.736)	13.139** (6.548)
One Adult Household	2.592 (12.806)	-0.037 (12.131)	-0.037 (13.507)
Young Adult	21.206** (9.515)	15.190* (9.018)	15.190* (9.006)
American Indian/Alaska Native	11.345 (20.125)	5.777 (19.114)	5.777 (19.037)
Asian	-6.879 (19.603)	1.679 (18.635)	1.679 (34.638)
Black/African American	0.356 (6.573)	3.741 (6.658)	3.741 (6.499)
Hispanic/Latino	5.817 (9.253)	3.715 (8.920)	3.715 (9.453)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.780 (14.040)	4.429 (13.339)	4.429 (10.225)
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.844 (10.940)	7.185 (10.500)	7.185 (12.471)
Veteran	-65.629*** (8.774)	-71.591*** (8.368)	-71.591*** (13.185)
Count of Children in Household	-2.176 (8.774)	-1.773 (2.313)	-1.773 (2.134)
Single Female Adult Household (Interaction)	-7.845 (14.472)	0.770 (13.704)	0.770 (12.559)
N	2607	2607	2607
R-squared	0.041	0.145	0.145
Adjusted R-squared	0.037	0.139	0.139

*Significance Level: ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10*

This model estimates the number of days a family spent in a RRH program (post-enrollment). Relative to families with male heads of household, families with female heads of household spent approximately 13 more days in RRH programs, all else equal. Additionally, families with heads of household ages 18 to 24 spent approximately 15 more days in RRH programs than families with heads of household age 25 and older, all else equal. However, the latter effect was only weakly statistically significant ($p < 0.1$). Relative to families with non-veteran heads of household, families with veteran heads of household spent approximately 72 fewer days enrolled in RRH programs, all else equal.

Table 19. Probability of returns to homeless system after 6 months

	Dependent variable:		
	Probability of returning to system after 6 mo.		
	logistic	*fixed effects*	*fixed effects & clustered SE*
Controls	(1)	(2)	(3)
Female	0.606**	0.609**	0.609**
	(0.269)	(0.279)	(0.253)
One Adult Household	0.390	0.397	0.397
	(0.341)	(0.351)	(0.337)
Young Adult	0.386*	0.382*	0.382*
	(0.199)	(0.201)	(0.230)
American Indian/Alaska Native	-1.579	-1.625	-1.625
	(1.022)	(1.041)	(1.064)
Asian	0.075	0.051	0.051
	(0.496)	(0.500)	(0.493)
Black/African American	0.278*	0.242	0.242
	(0.168)	(0.172)	(0.178)
Hispanic/Latino	-0.152	-0.189	-0.189
	(0.247)	(0.252)	(0.352)
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-0.530	-0.553	-0.553
	(0.420)	(0.428)	(0.371)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.373	0.374	0.374
	(0.258)	(0.260)	(0.297)
Veteran	-0.320	-0.294	-0.294
	(0.234)	(0.236)	(0.340)
Count of Children in Household	0.070	0.073	0.073
	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.060)
Single Female Adult Household (Interaction)	-0.447	-0.431	-0.431
	(0.374)	(0.384)	(0.356)
N	2208	2208	2208
Null deviance	1588.3	1588.3	1588.3
Residual deviance	1554.2	1548.1	1548.1
Pseudo-R-squared	0.021	0.025	0.025

*Significance Level: ***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10*

This model estimates families' probabilities of returning to the homeless system within six months of successfully exiting a RRH program (and, as such, is a proxy for returning to homelessness). In our selected specification (column 3), families with female heads of household were at most 15% more likely to return to homelessness, relative to families with male heads of household, all else equal (OR = 1.84). Relative to families with heads of household age 25 and older, families with heads of household ages 18 to 24 were at most 10% more likely to return to homelessness, all else equal (OR = 1.47). However, the latter effect was only weakly statistically significant ($p < 0.1$).