



Governing Board Performance Report

Quarter 2, 2025

Executive Summary	2
Key Takeaways when comparing Quarter 2 2024 to Quarter 2 2025:	2
What Changed in Our System?	3
How to Read the Report	4
How to Interpret the Data	4
Cost per Unit Analysis	6
Interpreting differences	7
1. Emergency Response	7
1.1 Emergency Shelters	7
1.2 Transitional Housing	8
1.3 Outreach	10
2. Housing Services	13
2.1 Permanent Supportive Housing	13
2.2 Rapid Re-Housing	15
3. Future Development of the Report	16

Executive Summary

This report compares how KCRHA's programs performed in spring 2024 and spring 2025, using data from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). We compared last years' time period and this years' time period to see what has changed for people experiencing homelessness in King County. Overall, we didn't see big shifts in outcomes which are expected, but there are important details about how money was spent, who was served, and how well the programs are operating.

Key Takeaways when comparing Quarter 2 2024 to Quarter 2 2025:

- **Fiscal Governance:** KCRHA managed its budget more efficiently in most program areas, even though there was no new funding or major policy changes between these two periods. More of the money that was budgeted for programs was used for their intended purpose, thanks to better contract processing and improved systems for submitting invoices. Most programs kept about the same number of beds, staff, and services compared to last year, but some became better at engaging with clients and improved the way services are provided.
- **Emergency Shelters:** Slightly fewer households used emergency shelters than this time last year, but the shelters filled almost all their beds each evening and people stayed a little longer on average. Less of the emergency shelter budget was spent due to some projects temporarily closing or moving locations, but overall, shelters provided stable and consistent help to those in need. This means emergency shelter continues to be a critical safety net, offering a reliable place to stay for people who need it most.
- **Transitional Housing:** Transitional programs, which help people move out of shelter and toward permanent housing, served a few less households than last year. However, more people who left these programs successfully moved into permanent homes—a sign of stronger service and better outcomes. The system also used more of its transitional housing budget, showing that agencies are providing more consistent and targeted support.
- **Outreach:** Outreach programs connect unsheltered people to housing and services. In early 2025, many outreach contracts shifted from KCRHA back to the City of Seattle, leading to a sharp drop (about 29%) in the number of people served by KCRHA's outreach. However, among the outreach programs that KCRHA kept, there was a small increase in the households served, and a higher percentage of outreach funding was spent, indicating more focused work in those areas.
- **Day and Hygiene Centers:** These centers provide safe places for rest and hygiene needs. In 2025, more people used these centers (about 9% more than last year). The centers consolidated funding and made improvements to buildings and services, resulting in better spending and serving more people at each location.



- **Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH):** This type of program provides people with a permanent home and supportive services. There was a modest increase in households helped, and almost everyone either kept their housing or moved to another permanent housing living situation. The number of available units stayed the same, but the rate at which they were filled went up and more of the housing budget was used. This shows the program is doing a good job helping people stay housed for the long term.
- **Rapid Re-Housing (RRH):** Rapid Re-Housing helps people quickly rent a market-rate home. The number of households served increased, but fewer people were able to transition to permanent housing this year—likely because the program is serving more people who face bigger challenges. Still, the process for spending funds became much more efficient.

What Changed in Our System?

- KCRHA improved the way contracts are renewed, so agencies can bill for their work sooner. This reduces delay and makes the reporting of financials more accurate.
- In January 2025, KCRHA switched from its old grants management system (Fluxx) to a new one (Salesforce), improving how data is collected and reported. This led to a 25% jump in the amount of spending recorded, simply because the records are now more accurate and better reflect the timing of actual services delivered.
- COVID-related funding ended, which shows up as lower total funding in 2025 compared to 2024.
- New projects started and some older ones moved to new locations, causing a bump in spending in late 2024 and early 2025.
- Funding for outreach and prevention programs supported by the City of Seattle was withdrawn in early 2025 and now appears only in City of Seattle funding records. Data for these programs continues to be collected in HMIS but not included in this report.



How to Read the Report

To provide insight into the performance of KCRHA investments, the CEO provides a quarterly report to the Governing Board with key performance measures of the investments. This will be in addition to the System Performance Dashboard that is available on the KCRHA website at all times, which displays performance for all HMIS participating programs in King County including those operating outside of the KCRHA.

The report will include performance data provided by Research and Data, budget and actuals data provided by Finance, and narrative from the Program Division. These reports will be centered around key project types, including:

Emergency Response

1. Emergency Shelter & Severe Weather (where data is available)
2. Transitional Housing
3. Outreach Programs
4. Day and Hygiene Centers

Housing Services

5. Permanent Supportive Housing
6. Rapid Re-Housing

This scope of the report is key program areas that KCRHA holds contracts for, not performance of the entire homelessness response system. This is a snapshot of how people are served in these programs and is not comprehensive to individuals' episodes of homelessness. Not included in this report is coordinated entry and diversion but may be included in future iterations of this report.

The HMIS data is for the first quarter of 2024 and 2025. 2024 data is from 4/1/2024-6/30/2024 and 2025 data is from 4/1/2025-6/30/2025.

How to Interpret the Data

The report will include similar reporting metrics across all project types. Each project type will have a series of small tables comparing the previous year's reporting period to the current. For example:

Table 1: Emergency Shelter Household Services and Exits provides the HMIS information on the number of households served, how many were active during the period, how many who were



active exited the program, of those, how many exited to a permanent housing situation and what the rate of the exit to permanent housing.

Table 2: Emergency Shelter Utilization Rates and Average Length of Stay, provides the average number of available units, the average utilization rate of those units, and the average length of stay measures.

Table 3: Emergency Shelter Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent, provides financial information for those program types.

Each table contains data that can be compared to each other. Separate tables provide different analyses and are not intended to be compared to each other. Below is a list of the definitions of the terms and calculations used in this report for reference:

- **Actual Financials** – Represents the actual expenditures reported for each period. In FY24, actuals were based on the General Ledger (GL) payment date, which reflects when invoices were processed and paid. In FY25, actuals are aligned with the month services were rendered (i.e., the service month), providing a more accurate representation of when funds were utilized by agencies. This shift improves transparency and supports better financial planning and analysis.
- **Average Length of Stay** – This measure looks at the average amount of time households are enrolled in a program. Specifically, it measures the total number of days that households stay in a program by the end of the timeframe ÷ total number of households who accessed that program during the timeframe. This includes households that exit during the timeframe (movers) and those that remain enrolled at the end of the timeframe (stayers). Best practices aim to reduce the amount of time someone experiences homelessness by moving them to housing as quickly as possible.
- **Budget** – KCRHA's full-year budget allocation. Budget tables include the percentage of year-to-date spending for the identified reporting period, offering insight into how funds are being utilized relative to the annual plan.
- **Exits to PH** – Total number of household exits to a Permanent Housing destination; for PSH, this becomes total households exiting to PH and maintaining enrollment. This includes things like clients renting their own place with or without a subsidy, living with a family or friend, and enrolling in a PSH program.
- **Exit Rate to PH** – divides Exits to PH by Total Exits. This tells us how many program enrollments end in a successful housing situation. Different program types are expected



to have different rates. PSH is intended to be a client's long-term permanent housing, so we include maintaining enrollment in those programs as successful as well.

- **Households Served** – The number of unique households that had an enrollment in that type of program during the reporting period. Households that were enrolled in multiple programs of the same type are only counted once. For the purposes of this report, If they are enrolled in multiple programs of different types, they are counted each time.
- **Period** – Reporting Year or quarter, depending on the report; comparing previous year to current year.
- **Total Exits** – Total number of household exits to any location; for PSH, this becomes total households exiting to any location or maintaining enrollment. Each program exit is counted, so households exiting multiple programs in a year may be counted more than once. Note that clients may leave a program without informing staff of where they are going. This is an unknown exit destination.
- **Units** – This is based on the highest number of units at any point during reporting period. This is for unit-based programs only (e.g. excludes RRH)
- **Utilization Rate** – divides the total number of nights that units were occupied by the total number of nights that units were available in the timeframe. Utilization rates allow us to monitor the use of beds and units in the system. Utilization rates are not calculated for Rapid Re-Housing programs because these programs do not have a fixed number of units.

HMIS holds information about how people interact with the homelessness response system. This reporting uses household enrollments and exit data from HMIS programs. Households may interact with multiple programs throughout their experience of homelessness. When accounting for units, clients may be enrolled into a Emergency Shelters and Transitional programs, clients may be receiving services longer than staying on the program due to program design or may have exited in the following quarter and not reported here.

Cost per Unit Analysis

Cost per unit analysis is out of scope of this report, as the following only includes financials that are within KCRHA's portfolio, and not the full cost of the program (i.e. agency philanthropy or other funding source). Further analysis would be needed to accurately account for the true cost. We are evaluating the feasibility of this in our research plan for Q1 and Q2 of 2026.



Interpreting differences

All programs in this analysis depend on KCRHA receiving funding to continue a program, discontinue a program, or start a program. Therefore, it is expected that program enrollment and exit levels remain relatively stable throughout the year, given there are no major changes to funding levels during this analysis period. There are normal fluctuations in data points that will occur during normal business operations of a program and are expected and may not necessarily demonstrate a trend. For example, a program may be experiencing staff turnover lowering the number of intake slots, a remodel may be completed allowing for extra units, or an incident may have occurred the reduced occupancy for a period. Usually, when there are smaller number changes, this is the reasoning. Even so, these differences are reviewed with programs team and/or providers to confirm. KCRHA then includes in this report any noteworthy changes that may affect the numbers.

1. Emergency Response

1.1 Emergency Shelters

Highlighted trends:

- *Slightly lower total households served, and lower total exits between the two periods*
- *Consistently high utilization rate and slightly higher “currently enrolled” and average length of stay in 2025*
- *Improved budget expenditure*

Emergency Shelters (ES) primarily provide temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness. This includes all shelter types for all populations, (2) Safe Haven programs, and (2) Safe Lot programs, but not seasonal shelters.

Table 1: Emergency Shelter Household Services and Exits

Period	Total Households Served	Households Currently Enrolled as of 6/30/25	Total Exits	Exit to PH	Percent Exits to PH
Q2 2024	5,512	3,674	1,869	561	30%
Q2 2025	5,474	3,957	1,556	487	31%

Table 2: Emergency Shelter Utilization Rates and Average Length of Stay

Period	ES Units	Utilization	Average Length of Stay (Days)
--------	----------	-------------	-------------------------------



Q2 2024	3,275	87%	185
Q2 2025	3,222	84%	201

Table 3: Emergency Shelter Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Emergency Shelter	2024	\$86,696,498	\$15,331,441	\$20,798,560	\$36,130,001	42%
	2025	\$124,351,804	\$21,274,725	\$24,706,975	\$45,981,701	37%

Shelter capacity in the system generally remains stable, as it is uncommon for new shelters to open without significant funding and community support. Changes in available units usually reflect smaller adjustments, such as repurposing shelter space for offices or expanding capacity to add beds. Shelters are a cornerstone of the homelessness response system and serve diverse populations. For this reason, the data provided should be understood as a high-level snapshot of current conditions.

Between the two reporting periods, the number of households served was largely unchanged. Total exits decreased slightly, while exits to permanent housing (PH) remained steady. This outcome is expected, given there have been no major system changes between quarters. Increases in households served typically reflect the addition of new shelter beds. The lower overall number of emergency shelter (ES) units in 2025 is the result of both gains and losses across programs—for example, STAR Center added 85 beds, while COLEAD lost 55, and several others reduced capacity or did not report data.

The number of currently enrolled households (Table 1, column 3) is higher than the number of ES units (Table 2, column 2). This occurs because some individuals remain enrolled in programs even if they are not actively using services at the time the data is pulled. For instance, night-by-night programs may keep people enrolled, and some programs delay recording exits until the following quarter. For these reasons, enrollment counts are higher than bed counts. Development of the Live Bed Inventory, piloted this fall with possible implementation by the end of Q1 2026, will address these discrepancies by providing more real-time bed availability data.

Table 3 shows that the expenditures rate for ES decreased in 2025 compared to 2024 due to several projects being temporarily offline or undergoing relocation to new sites, resulting in delayed or paused services delivery during the reporting period. Despite this, KCRHA has seen improvements in expenditure efficiency due to enhanced partner training and upgraded Salesforce functions, which have streamlined invoicing.

1.2 Transitional Housing



Highlighted trends:

- *Small decrease in households served*
- *Slight increase in exits, particularly to permanent housing*
- *Highly improved budget expenditure*

Temporary housing offers voluntary supportive services intended to serve as a bridge between emergency shelter and permanent housing. Transitional Housing (TH) programs provide up to 24 months of housing with integrated case management and service coordination, with performance measures focused on exits to permanent housing and housing stability, rather than the speed of exits regardless of destination. These programs are primarily targeted toward youth, young adults, and survivors of domestic violence, supporting underserved and vulnerable populations identified in HUD strategic priorities.

Table 4: Transitional Housing Served and Exits

Period	Households Served	Total Exits	Exit to PH	Percent Exits to PH
Q2 2024	654	135	111	82%
Q2 2025	573	148	124	84%

Table 5: Transitional Housing Utilization

Period	Units	Utilization	Average Length of Stay (Days)
Q2 2024	345	73%	279
Q2 2025	345	84%	293

Table 6: Transitional Housing Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Transitional Housing	2024	\$5,661,259	\$1,027,933	\$887,435	\$1,915,367	34%
	2025	\$5,880,403	\$1,438,134	\$2,158,610	\$3,596,744	61%

Table 4 indicates a modest reduction in total households served in transitional housing, from 654 in Q2 2024 to 573 in Q2 2025, while the percentage of exits to permanent housing increased from 82% to 84%. This improvement suggests deeper client engagement and strengthened service delivery, supporting successful placements in permanent housing. The observed variations in households served are largely attributable to the Coming Home program, which is categorized as a service-only initiative under Transitional Housing. This program tends to display



greater enrollment fluctuations throughout the year than more traditional transitional housing models.

Table 5 shows a significant rise in utilization, increasing from 73% in Q2 2024 to 84% in Q2 2025, with average length of stay also rising from 279 to 293 days (NOTE: utilization refers to the amount of time a person is assigned to a unit and not how many nights a unit is occupied). These improvements indicate greater system efficiency, reduced turnover outside of the Coming Home program, and lower vacancy rates. As of Q2 2025, KCRHA is responsible for 345 transitional housing units out of a total system capacity of 710. Transitional housing programs generally offer longer stays and case management services, which contribute to higher rates of exit to permanent housing compared to emergency shelter. While there is no universally standardized set of supportive services across all transitional housing programs, many provide on-site resources such as behavioral health, food, and hygiene supports.

Table 6 demonstrates a substantial increase in year-to-date expenditures: 61% of the transitional housing budget was spent through Q2 2025, up from 34% for the same period in 2024. This upward trend in spending is consistently observed across programs and reflects operational improvements, including more efficient invoicing, expanded training for contracted partners, and enhanced Salesforce system functions. The Housing Stability team is preparing to launch the Transitional Housing Base Building Space in Q1 2026, which is intended to improve overall program performance and increase provider resource navigation capacities. Additionally, KCRHA is currently auditing the supplementary services offered by each provider, including in-house supports and community partnerships such as behavioral health, chemical dependency treatment, and workforce development. The findings from this audit will inform the development of robust performance baselines and strengthen understanding of effective service interventions

1.3 Outreach

Highlighted trends:

- The City of Seattle transitioned over all but one City of Seattle funded Outreach Program contracts at the end of 2024 to align the City's outreach with operational needs
- 7 programs saw a small increase in the number of households served

KCRHA currently operates seven outreach programs that build relationships with unsheltered individuals, providing support and referrals to shelter and housing. These programs do not operate within the City of Seattle, which directly funds its own outreach initiatives and those of some suburban cities; thus, those programs are not included in this report.

Since last year, eight outreach programs transitioned from KCRHA back to the City of Seattle, with contracts ending December 31, 2024. According to the data, there was a 29% decrease in



households served from Q2 2024 to Q2 2025 across all 15 Seattle and KCRHA outreach programs. Seattle had initially transferred outreach contracts to KCRHA in 2022 to regionalize services but resumed direct oversight in late 2024 to better coordinate with city departments managing encampment response and public spaces. KCRHA continues to manage county, state, and federal outreach investments and regional system planning. This realignment allows the City to align outreach with its operational needs while KCRHA focuses on broader regional housing stability and system coordination. The tables below show the number of households served by KCRHA and the City of Seattle across different scenarios. The purpose of showing these various scenarios is to help understand the total population that was served by outreach programs. However, there are concerns about these counts as (1) Seattle data may be in the process of improvement and incomplete at the moment and (2) true outreach program counts within KCRHA requires a deeper assessment of expenditure and participation, which is out of scope for this report and will be addressed in future reports.

Table 7: All 15 Outreach Programs Served by KCRHA and the City of Seattle: 2024 - 2025

Period	Households Served
Q2 2024	3,394
Q2 2025	2,416

Table 7 shows that among all 15 outreach programs that were served by both KCRHA and Seattle, regardless of who held the contract, there was a significant drop in households served between Q2 2024 and Q2 2025. KCRHA is supporting City of Seattle and contracted outreach programs with their data quality, most likely the displayed decrease here is a result of the transition.

Table 8: Households Served in Only KCRHA's 7 Outreach Programs

Period	Households Served
Q2 2024	1,485
Q2 2025	1,588

Table 8 compares changes in only the 7 outreach programs that ended up as KCRHA contracts by 2025. Between the two periods there was a slight increase in the number of households served. This count consists mostly of programs that are outside the City of Seattle.



Table 9: Households served in KCRHA's 15 Outreach Programs in 2024 and 7 Outreach Programs in 2025.

Period	Households Served
Q2 2024	3,394
Q2 2025	1,588

Table 9 shows the number of households served by KCRHA (not the City of Seattle) across the 15 programs in 2024 and the 7 programs in 2025. In 2025, half of the number of households were served due to the drop-in contracted programs for KCRHA.

Table 10: Outreach Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Outreach	2024	\$7,924,023	\$1,042,323	\$1,421,603	\$2,463,926	31%
	2025	\$2,244,681	\$479,316	\$1,059,816	\$1,539,133	69%

Table 10 shows that KCRHA's Outreach budget and expenditure were reduced due to contract reductions in 2025. However, in FY25 the percentage of budget spent on Outreach and Vehicle Outreach is on track to be fully expended by year-end, reflecting improved efficiency in invoicing and system enhancements that support timely financial reporting.

Day and Hygiene Centers

Highlighted trends:

- In FY25, several Day Centers were consolidated to optimize funding while maintaining participant services.
- City of Seattle Participatory Budget funding provided resources to address critical project needs, including repairs, maintenance, and infrastructure improvements.

Day and Hygiene Centers provide safe, accessible spaces for people experiencing homelessness to rest and access essential hygiene services such as showers and laundry. These centers also offer case management and connections to resources and referrals. They serve individuals based on need and can support those recently housed who are transitioning to stable living situations. Day and Hygiene Centers record enrollments and exits from the program while someone is regularly using the program.

Table 11: Day and Hygiene Center

Period	Households Served
--------	-------------------



Q2 2024	3,466
Q2 2025	3,791

Table 12: Day and Hygiene Centers Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Day Center	2024	\$4,854,774	\$1,037,760	\$590,448	\$1,628,208	34%
	2025	\$4,539,881	\$1,396,012	\$1,372,687	\$2,768,699	61%

Table 11 shows a 9% increase in households served from Q2 2024 to Q2 2025. The added funding to existing outreach centers increased the ability to serve more households. No additional Day and Hygiene Centers were added; existing centers have limited capacity to serve clients based on current funding and can only expense a certain degree. The increase between FY2024 and FY2025 is attributed to improved Salesforce implementation and more timely submissions from agencies; the increase is from one agency and their monthly expenses remained steady between \$160K–\$200K year over year.

2. Housing Services

These program types are designed to stabilize people into long-term housing options.

2.1 Permanent Supportive Housing

Highlighted trends:

- Modest increase in households served
- 98% of participants maintain their housing or exit to permanent housing
- Unit inventory steady year over year with 97% utilization rate in '25 and low turnover
- Improved budget expenditures

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) combines permanent housing with supportive services. Permanent housing usually includes long-term leases or rental assistance. Supportive services can include things like case management, food, childcare, education services, employment assistance and job training, legal services, mental health services, behavioral health services, substance use disorder services, and transportation.



Table 13: Permanent Supportive Housing Households Served

Period	Households Served	Maintain or exit the program	Maintain or Exit to PH	Percent Maintains or Exits to PH
Q2 2024	2,115	1,963	1,928	98%
Q2 2025	2,214	2,175	2,141	98%

Table 14: Permanent Supportive Housing Utilization Rate

Period	Units	Utilization
Q2 2024	2,188	91%
Q2 2025	2,188	97%

Table 15: Permanent Supportive Housing Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Permanent Supportive Housing	2024	\$22,053,234	\$2,704,487	\$1,337,705	\$4,042,192	18%
	2025	\$22,227,388	\$3,877,349	\$4,358,977	\$8,236,325	37%

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units continue to fall short of meeting demand, underscoring the need for expansion to ensure appropriate households are matched to available resources. Table 13 shows a modest increase in households served, with 2,115 in Q2 2024 rising to 2,214 in Q2 2025, and consistently high success rates—98% of participants either maintain their housing or exit to permanent housing, signaling strong program efficacy and stable placements. However, the inventory of units remains steady year over year, at 2,188 units for both periods, with new units added only occasionally as buildings come online. Because PSH is intended as a long-term solution, turnover remains low and open units are filled exclusively through the Coordinated Entry process, which helps ensure targeted matches for those in greatest need.

Increases in the number of households served reflect improved program efficiency, allowing for timely turnover and minimal vacancies, as indicated by the jump in utilization rate from 91% in Q2 2024 to 97% in Q2 2025 (Table 14). Low turnover and sustained exits from programs demonstrate that placements are well-matched and the supportive housing model is delivering its intended outcomes. Budget tables (Table 15) reveal a substantial increase in year-to-date expenditures—from 18% spent in Q2 2024 to 37% in Q2 2025—as the system responds to



demand and sustains service quality. Nonetheless, ongoing investment and unit growth remain key priorities to address the persistent gap between PSH availability and community needs.

2.2 Rapid Re-Housing

Highlighted trends:

- Households served grew due to increased case manager capacity and the assignment of additional RRH slots via Coordinated Entry Case Conferencing
- Exits to PH did not change as anticipated due to households facing barriers and challenges to achieving/sustaining PH after RRH subsidies ended.
- Percentage exits to PH declined due to higher enrollment and little change in exit to PH
- Improved percent spent due to better invoicing and improved fiscal operations

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) provides short-term rental assistance and supportive services tailored to the household's needs, enabling individuals and families to quickly secure and maintain permanent housing. RRH operates without preconditions such as employment, income, sobriety, or absence of a criminal record.

Table 16: Rapid Re-Housing Households Served and Exits

Period	Households Served	Total Exits	Exit to PH	Percent Exits to PH	Average Length of Stay (Days)
Q2 2024	871	184	160	87%	266
Q2 2025	1040	203	157	77%	267

Table 17: Rapid Re-Housing Budget, Quarterly Actuals, and Percentage Spent

Program	Period	Budget	Q1	Q2	Total Actuals thru 6/30	% Spent
Rapid Re-Housing	2024	\$34,532,883	\$3,490,546	\$3,173,945	\$6,664,491	19%
	2025	\$26,179,815	\$5,479,867	\$5,113,018	\$10,592,886	40%

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) is a voucher-based program, meaning households receive rental assistance for market-rate units rather than program-specific housing. The number of households served in Table 16 reflects those actively receiving rental subsidies, which can be allocated to a range of households regardless of acuity level. RRH slots are filled through the Coordinated Entry system to ensure prioritization based on client needs. The expectation is that recipients will assume full rent payments when their subsidies end, supporting a transition to long-term housing stability.



In Q2 2025, the number of households served grew from 871 to 1,040 compared to the previous year, while the average length of stay in RRH remained steady (266 to 267 days). This growth may be attributed to increased case manager capacity and the assignment of additional RRH slots via Coordinated Entry Case Conferencing, allowing programs to support more households efficiently. Notably, while RRH usually shows high rates of positive exits and retention, the percent of exits to permanent housing (PH) declined from 87% in Q2 2024 to 77% in Q2 2025, likely reflecting higher overall enrollment and changing household composition—including more households with complex barriers who may require extended assistance or experience greater challenges achieving or sustaining permanent housing after their RRH subsidy ends.

Table 17 reveals a significant decrease in the RRH budget paired with a sizable increase in RRH expenditures, with 40% of the annual budget spent by Q2 2025 as compared to 19% in Q2 2024. This higher spending proportion reflects KCRHA's improvements in invoice processing, contractor training, and Salesforce functionality, strengthening fiscal operations, and enabling faster, more effective service delivery.

3. Future Development of the Report

KCRHA Research and Data team are continually working to improve the data available to the Governing board. Future developments for these reports will include:

- Total number of households enrollments divided by project type as a percentage of total portfolio
- Analysis on Diversion Program performance
- Deeper assessment of outreach programs
- Returns to Homelessness after 6 months and 12 months from program exit
- Cost per unit analysis
- Number of resources by subregion
- Inclusion of Coordinated Entry Specific Metrics along with Racial Equity Analysis
- Other suggestions by Governing Board or supporting staff

