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CSH: Our Mission

Advancing housing solutions that:

- Improve lives of vulnerable people
- Maximize public & private resources
- Build strong, healthy communities
What We Do

- **Lines of Business**
  - Training & Education
  - Policy Reform
  - Lending
  - Consulting & Assistance

- **What We Do**
  - Powerful capital funds, specialty loan products and development expertise
  - Research-backed tools, trainings and knowledge sharing
  - Custom community planning and cutting-edge innovations
  - Systems reform, policy collaboration and advocacy
The Graying of America’s Homeless

Between 2010 and 2020, the elderly homeless population is estimated to increase by

A. 19%, from 44,172 in 2010 to 52,565 in 2020
B. 27%, from 44,172 in 2010 to 56,098 in 2020
C. 33%, from 44,172 in 2010 to 58,772 in 2020
D. 50%, from 44,172 in 2010 to 66,258 in 2020
Old and on the Street: The Graying of America’s Homeless

The emergence of an older homeless population is creating daunting challenges for social service agencies and governments already struggling to fight poverty.

By ADAM NAGOURNEY  MAY 31, 2016
The Aging Population
National Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>65+ POPULATION</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>65%+ SHARE OF TOTAL POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>34,991,753</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>40,229,000</td>
<td>310,233,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>72,092,000</td>
<td>373,504,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>88,547,000</td>
<td>439,010,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S Census Bureau
Aging of the Baby Boomers Swamps Growth Millennial Households Over Next Two Decades

Number of Households (Millions)

Source: Joint Center for Housing Studies.
Severe Cost Burdens Have Risen Sharply Among Younger Renters, But Are Highest Among Seniors

Notes: Severe cost burdens are defined as housing costs more than 50% of household income. JCHS tabulations of US Census Bureau, American Community Surveys.
Elderly Homeless Population
(in shelter)

Growth in % of Homeless Population Over 62

- 2007 – 4.1%
- 2009 – 4.2%
- 2011 – 4.4%
- 2013 – 5.4%
- 2014 – 5.7%

Source: 2014 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress
Homeless Over 50

- Have rates of chronic illnesses similar to general population aged 65+
  - Are 4X more likely to have 1 or more chronic illnesses compared to younger homeless adults
- Have geriatric conditions of those 70+ in general population
  - Those w/ geriatric conditions more likely to frequent ER (4+ times/year) and more likely to be institutionalized
- Have lower rates of mental illness and substance use disorders than younger homeless people, but much higher than general population

*Information originally presented by Dr. Rebecca Brown from University of California, SF, Division of Geriatrics, Dept. of Medicine*
Pathways into Homelessness for Older Adults

- Aging Chronically Homeless
- The Newly Homeless
A Graying City

The Silver Tsunami in NYC
- NYC’s senior population is growing larger, living longer and getting poorer
  - Nearly 20% of the City’s elderly live in poverty
  - Older NYC renters are the most rent burdened. 60% pay more than 1/3 of their income toward rent.

The City’s “Hidden” Homeless
- Over 2,000 seniors per night reside in the shelter system
- Particularly vulnerable due to their physical frailty, age-related health problems and higher risk of memory loss, dementia and vulnerability to predators.
CSH Aging Learning Collaborative

9 NYC Organizational Members
## Medical & Behavioral Health Service Coordination

- Home Health Care/ Visiting Nurses
- Occupational Therapy
- Discharge plan coordination
- Medication Assistance
- Policies that permit stays in hospitals, rehab and convalescent care without losing their housing
- Mobile Dr. Services/ Access to medical care for those who can’t/won’t travel
Building Staff Competencies

• Staff being attentive to fears and concerns of older formerly homeless adults

• Staff possessing knowledge of geriatric health care principles

• Staff feeling that they have the emotional and professional support they need to serve aging tenants
Physical Space Modifications

Most Important:
• Universal design principles
• Accessibility
• Communal spaces
• Dementia-friendly spaces

Retrofit/ Capital Needs
• Grab Bars
• Power Assisted Entranceways
• Entry/Ramps
• Motion Sensitive Burners
• Technology
Housing & Support Service Needs for a Growing Aging Population

- Highest Rent Subsidy & Support Service Need
- Lowest Rent Subsidy & Support Service Need

- Adult Homes/Assisted Living
- Supportive Housing
- NORCs
- Affordable Senior Housing
Describing Supportive Housing

Permanent, affordable, independent, tenant centered, flexible, targeted
Defining Supportive Housing

- Targets households with barriers
- Provides unit with lease
- Is affordable
- Engages tenants in flexible, voluntary services
- Coordinates among key partners
- Supports connecting with community
Breaking Ground’s mission is to strengthen individuals, families and communities by developing and sustaining exceptional supportive and affordable housing as well as programs for homeless and other vulnerable New Yorkers.

• The belief that everyone deserves a home is at the heart of everything we do.

• We provide a variety of homelessness solutions.

• We meet people “where they are” - both literally and figuratively - whether that means conducting a psychiatric evaluation on a street corner or sending an outreach worker who can speak to a client in his or her native language.

• We follow the proven “housing first” philosophy: once a person is stably housed, they are vastly more likely to achieve sobriety and other important needs for healthier living.

• We foster strong, vibrant communities within our buildings by constructing beautiful spaces and offering life-enriching workshops and social events.
About Breaking Ground

New York City’s largest provider of supportive housing & street outreach

Street Outreach

- 24/7 in Brooklyn, Queens, & a third of Manhattan

Transitional Housing

- 19 properties
- 3,500 permanent and transitional units
- 1,000 more in the development pipeline

Permanent Supportive Housing

...paired with supportive services

- Medical care & substance abuse referrals
- Mental health care
- Benefits assistance
- Self-sufficiency skills
ECHO Pilot Overview

1. To implement two complimentary services at three pilot locations that would measurably promote successful aging in place for tenants 62+ years old:
   • Primary medical care
   • Enhanced tenant services

2. To evaluate the benefits of these interventions at the various pilot sites, including the cost-benefits of ECHO

3. To inform other supportive housing providers of the program concept, design, and learnings
We are extremely grateful for the generous support of our ECHO funders:

- Charina Endowment Fund
- The Fan Fox and Leslie R. Samuels Foundation, Inc.
- John H. & Ethel G. Noble Charitable Trust
- MetLife Foundation
- Mizuho USA Foundation, Inc. of Mizuho Financial Group
Launching ECHO

- Hired staff
- Built out medical suite
- Best practices for operating medical services
- Developed tenant services program
- Created communication plan for promoting new services and targeting highest risk tenants

Live Date: June 1, 2013
Targeting the most Vulnerable: Why

- Aging prematurely
  - Higher rates of geriatric syndromes and illnesses earlier

- High co-morbidity
  - Mental illness and substance use disorders
  - Psychosocial struggles and weak external support systems
  - Chronic and acute illness

- Extremely at-risk for serious health conditions and grave outcomes
  - Accelerated onset and progression of chronic illnesses
  - Poor quality of life
  - Excessive and largely preventable hospitalizations and ER visits ($$$)
  - Early admission to nursing homes ($$$)

- Significant obstacles to high quality, integrated care
Targeting the most Vulnerable: How

Guiding Questions tool developed for determining if a tenant is best-suited for on-site care. Considerations include:

- Highest-risk for poor outcomes, including
  - Age 62+
  - Living with severe mental illness and/or substance use disorders
  - Multiple and/or serious chronic medical problems
  - Misusing medical resources

- Unable to successfully engage in adequate care in the community, with some interest in onsite care
  - Maximize independent function in community
  - Minimize fragmentation of care
  - Direct resource-intensive services to those benefitting the most
Intensive, Individualized, Integrated Care

Key Features
- Collaboration and coordination
- Long-term, person-centered medical treatment planning
- Therapeutic alliance
- Time, patience, and more time

Integration
- Primary care
- Behavioral/mental health care
- Social services
- Housing services
ECHO Tenant Services

- **Wellness Promotion Activities**: designed to improve quality of life and complement primary care provider (PCP) lifestyle recommendations

- **Fall Prevention Focus**: awareness-raising kickoff, joint movement and relief, tackling clutter workshop, etc.

- **Event Highlights**: health and nutrition workshops, walking group, cooking class, art workshop, coffee talk, patient empowerment, end of life planning, dance fitness, farmers market trips, etc.

- **Health Groups**: direct collaboration with ECHO PCP
• Senior male with a history of chronic homelessness; coronary artery and peripheral vascular disease, Hepatitis C, Major Depressive Disorder and severe alcohol dependency.

• Prior frequent suicidal ideation closely associated with alcohol use despondency.

• Nine hospitalizations for alcohol-related and cardiac issues in one year before receiving on site primary care.

• Following severe health deterioration (requiring carotid artery and lower extremity stents), individual began accessing onsite primary care services.

• Consistency of medical care enabled greater treatment adherence and, most importantly, a will to abstain from alcohol use, with, so far, excellent commitment to recovery as demonstrated by over two years of sobriety.

• Integration of onsite primary care, onsite psychiatry, and social service staff at the housing site resulted in tenant being able to manage his chronic conditions and have a positive quality of life.

• Zero hospitalizations in past two years since receiving onsite integrated care!
Recap: ECHO Challenges

- Staffing
- Collaboration with external providers
- Defining the target population
- Evaluation
- Sustainability
ECHO Continuation

- **Medical Services**
  - Ongoing at three pilot locations and four expansion sites, all of which are permanent supportive residences for low-income and chronically homeless individuals.
  - Efforts to become credentialed provider for MCO billing

- **Tenant Services**
  - Best Practices Toolkit now available
  - Key programs incorporated across Breaking Ground locations

- **Final Report and Toolkit Online**
  Found on breakingground.org under “Our Programs”
ECHO Participation

• 155 Tenants received on-site medical care
• Participant age range 62-96
  ✓ Average age 71
• 357 Tenants attended at least one ECHO activity
  ✓ 81% formerly homeless
ECHO Evaluation Overview

**Surveys** to measure care quality and health outcomes

*Administered upon enrollment, then 1 and 2 years post-enrollment (n=13 for baseline and Y1; n=9 for Y2):*

- Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC)
- Health Outcomes Survey (HOS)

*Administered at pilot close (n=40):*

- Patient Care Quality – Homeless (PCQ-H)

**ER and Hospital Utilization Data** to measure impact and cost effectiveness
PACIC Survey Data
Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care

- Measures specific actions or qualities of care that patients have experienced.
- Highlights of % of positive responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asked for my ideas when we made a treatment plan.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Given choices about treatment to think about.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shown how what I did to take care of myself influenced my condition.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asked to talk about my goals in caring for my condition.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Helped to set specific goals to improve my eating or exercise.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Encouraged to go to a specific group or class to help me cope with my chronic condition.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PACIC Survey Data
Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care

Percent Positive Responses

1. Asked for ideas on tx plan
2. Given tx choices to think about
3. Given list of healthy to dos
4. Care well organized
5. Given influence of self-care
6. Helped w eating/exercise goals
7. Encouraged attend group/dess
8. Asked about health habits
9. Doc-considered culture
10. Helped plan useful in daily life
11. Helped plan for hard times
12. Check-in contact post-visit
13. Encouraged to diet/counsel/health ed
14. Told how other specialists help tx
15. Helped to plan for hard times
16. Asked about visits with other docs

Baseline
Year 1 follow-up
Year 2 follow up (n = 9 due to attrition, including deaths and moves)
# Health Outcomes Survey Data

Patient-reported outcomes measure used by Medicare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In general, would you say your health is:</strong> good, very good, excellent</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compared to one year ago, how would you rate your physical health in general now?</strong> slightly better, much better</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, for how many days during the past 30 days was your physical health not good? (average days)</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PCQ-H Survey Data

**Patient Care Quality - Homeless**

---

**Designed for homeless/formerly homeless population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My PCP never doubts my health needs.</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My PCP makes decisions based on what will truly help me.</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel my PCP has spent enough time trying to get to know me.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can get enough of my PCP’s time if I need it.</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If my PCP and I were to disagree about something related to my care, we could work it out.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My PCP makes sure health care decisions fit with other challenges in my life.</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My PCP helps to reduce the hassles when I am referred to other services.</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If I could not get to the medical area, I think the staff would reach out to try to help me get care.</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The medical staff at this place listens to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ER and Hospital Data Summary

### Utilization Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y0 Pre Enrollment</th>
<th>Y1 Post Enrollment</th>
<th>Y2 Post Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Days (ER + Hospital)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes in Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y0 to Y1</th>
<th>Y0 to Y2</th>
<th>Y1 to Y2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER Visits</strong></td>
<td>-10 (-63%)</td>
<td>-12 (-75%)</td>
<td>-2 (-33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital Visits</strong></td>
<td>-9 (-53%)</td>
<td>-11 (-65%)</td>
<td>-2 (-25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Days (ER + Hospital)</strong></td>
<td>-76 (-70%)</td>
<td>-78 (-72%)</td>
<td>-2 (-6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 45 for baseline and Y1  
n = 41 for Y2  

* LEGEND: Change in Utilization is calculated as (Y2 - Y1), with percentage change calculated as ((Y2 - Y1) / Y1) * 100%*
Cost Saving Implications

Projection Based on Cost of Services
- One day/week ECHO medical care serves caseload of 25-35, costs aprx. $67,704; translates into $1,934 cost per tenant per year
- Conservative estimates: $1000 = 1 ER day; $2,500 = 1 hospital day
- 1-2 prevented ER or hospital days per tenant more than offsets expense

Projection Based on Actual Reduced Hospital Use during ECHO
- Comparing pre-enrollment Y0 to Y2 post-enrollment, ECHO data shows 12 fewer ER days and 66 fewer hospital days
- Translates into $177,000 savings, which covers more than twice the annual cost of a day of service per week

Note: Projected caseload and expenses do not 100% mirror those from pilot period
Outliers: Looking Beyond ECHO

• Small number of data set outliers had significant hospital usage before and during the pilot

• Takeaways
  • Broader timeframe for analysis is warranted
  • Promoting aging in place requires early intervention
  • Though difficult to quantify with certainty, potential net cost savings by delaying costly, undesirable moves to nursing homes, estimated at $101,184 to $144,4082 per year in NYS
Medicaid Redesign Team’s Supportive Housing Workgroup

Charged with making recommendations to Governor for allocating Medicaid savings into SH

- Multi-Agency Collaboration:
  - NYS OASAS, OTDA, OMH, AIDS Institute, and OPWDD; NYC DOHMH and HPD
- SH Providers and intermediaries
- Supportive Housing Developers
- Advocacy/member organizations including aging, persons with disabilities
- Collective decisions made on how to allocate monies
- Financing across agencies

### Medicaid Redesign Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>$75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>$86 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>$127 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MRT Initiatives for Aging Supportive Housing Tenants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENTAL SUBSIDIES / SUPPORTIVE SERVICES</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Subsidy Program (Olmstead)</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>This program would provide rental subsidies to eligible participants enrolled in MLTC or FIDA, or individuals transitioning out of nursing homes or could be diverted from nursing homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Home Transition and Diversion Funding</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Funding will support individuals currently accessing rental subsidies through the State’s Nursing Home Transition and Diversion (NHTD) Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Home to Independent Living Rapid Transition</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>Funding will support rent and service subsidies to offer individuals with mobility impairments or other severe physical disabilities an alternative pathway to community living. (DOH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Supportive Housing Pilot Project</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>Funding will support capital and supportive services to enable low-income seniors to remain in the community. (DOH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Senior and Disabled Placement Pilot Project</td>
<td>5,076,000</td>
<td>5,076,000</td>
<td>Funding will support rent and service subsidies to seniors, the disabled, and/or any other high-cost Medicaid user currently residing within the shelter system and/or another setting. Funding will transition this population into the community. (OTDA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Studies: First Completed MRT Supportive Housing Project Boston Road

Boston Road Apartment Complex, developed by Breaking Ground, has a total of 154 residential units; 94 of those are MRT Supportive Housing units. The amount invested in this project was $6,930,000.

**Below:** The rear yard of Boston Road Complex.

**At right:** Front of the Boston Road Complex from street.
35,000 Supportive Housing Units for the Most Vulnerable New Yorkers

A Tale of Two Plans:

Promoting Healthy Aging in Place as Core Principles to City’s Supportive Housing Plan

- Recognize that the City’s aging homeless population experiences “accelerated aging” as a result of years of hard living on the street or in shelters and unmet health needs. Ensure that affordable housing with comprehensive support services are available for formerly homeless adults age 55 and older.
What Foundations Can Do: Increase Accessibility

John H. and Ethel G. Noble Charitable Trust, administered by Deutsche Bank Trust Company New York

**Project FIND’s Woodstock Hotel**
- Used grant funds to convert an SRO unit into a fully-handicap accessible shower room for the use by any of the roughly 280 formerly homeless tenants with mobility constraints

**Goddard Riverside’s The Senate**
- Utilized Noble Trust funds to complete several environmental projects at the Senate Residences including a new CCTV system and replacing heavy metal doors in communal spaces
What Foundations Can Do: Bolster Enhanced On-site Support Services

Brooklyn Community Housing & Services Aging Program @ Oak Hall

How the Program Worked

- Geriatric Case Manager:
  - Caseload of 18-22; on-going training in and focus on wellness and aging; case management “by nudging”

- Weekly Wellness Groups:
  - Often peer led, topics include nutrition, exercise, coping with loss, reconciling familial relationships, aging and sobriety

- Weekly Game and Movie Night

- Wednesday is Nurse Day, no appointments necessary

- “Morning Action” – coffee and newspapers

Reduction in Inpatient Hospital Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96% Decrease over 9 yrs
What Foundations Can Do (BG)

- Make funding available to:
  - bring additional healthcare to the street;
  - enhance safety of tenant apartments via grab bars and motion sensor safety monitoring;
  - transport elder residents via an ADA accessible van;
  - train staff to serve the unique needs of older adults in supportive housing; and
  - provide seniors-focused tenant services staff, activities, and events.