Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute

# The Structural Gap in Housing Systems II:

# Continuity and Predictable Instability in Homelessness Response Systems

**Deborah J. Hanson, MPA**

Founder and Executive Director

June 2026

**Published by**

Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute (WRL Institute)

Los Angeles, California



This working paper is part of the Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute Working Paper Series. It is intended to support research, policy analysis, and applied systems development in environmental resilience and public sector strategy.

This manuscript may be revised as part of the ongoing development of the Institute's research program. Reproduction, distribution, or commercial use without written permission is prohibited.

**Suggested Citation**
Hanson, D. J. (2026). *The Structural Gap in Housing Systems II*
*Subsidy Duration, Housing Continuity, and Differential Stabilization Outcomes.* Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute Working Paper Series (No. 008).
https://wildfireresilientlandscapes.org

## Introduction

Homelessness response systems throughout the United States have increasingly expanded rapid intervention strategies designed to reduce unsheltered homelessness and move individuals into shelter, interim housing, or permanent housing as quickly as possible (Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009, 2009; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012). Federal homelessness policy, Continuum of Care performance structures, and local implementation systems have increasingly emphasized measurable intervention activity including placements, exits from homelessness, shelter utilization rates, and reductions in unsheltered populations as indicators of system performance (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, n.d.).

These interventions provide important and often lifesaving functions within homelessness response systems. Rapid placement into shelter or housing may significantly reduce exposure to unsheltered conditions, improve short-term safety, increase access to supportive services, and interrupt immediate housing crises. Yet despite substantial intervention activity across many homelessness systems, recurring instability, housing precarity, prolonged interim housing stays, and returns to homelessness continue to persist across many participant populations (Aubry et al., 2020; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026).

This paper argues that one reason for this persistence is that homelessness stabilization is frequently evaluated through visible intervention outputs rather than through the continuity conditions required for durable long-term stabilization. Placement itself may therefore function as a visible operational event without necessarily indicating that the broader systems surrounding stabilization remain sufficiently aligned to sustain housing continuity across time.

The paper introduces the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience as a continuity-oriented systems framework for examining long-duration stabilization processes within complex public systems. Rather than interpreting homelessness stabilization as a singular placement event, the framework conceptualizes stabilization as a continuity-dependent process shaped by the interaction between governance systems, implementation structures, subsidy models, housing markets, operational coordination, institutional capacity, and participant-specific support conditions operating simultaneously across time.

Within the WRL framework, instability is interpreted not solely as episodic program failure or individual participant breakdown, but as a potential manifestation of fragmentation emerging across interconnected systems layers. Systems may therefore continue producing visible intervention activity while underlying continuity capacity gradually weakens beneath the surface of operational performance indicators.

**Several core concepts guide this analysis.**

Continuity of capacity refers to the ability of systems to sustain stabilization conditions across time, disruption, and changing participant circumstances. Fragmentation pathways refer to the gradual breakdown of coordination, timing alignment, operational continuity, and adaptive capacity across interconnected systems environments. Structural time misalignment describes the disconnect that may emerge between subsidy timelines, funding cycles, housing market realities, implementation systems, and the actual duration of support required for long-term stabilization. Throughput versus stabilization refers to the distinction between visible intervention activity and durable continuity outcomes. Predictable instability refers to the proposition that recurring instability patterns may become increasingly foreseeable when continuity systems degrade across multiple systems layers simultaneously.

These concepts draw from several intersecting bodies of literature. Implementation science emphasizes that intervention success depends not solely on policy adoption, but on sustained implementation infrastructure, organizational capacity, leadership systems, and long-term continuity mechanisms (Fixsen et al., 2005). Systems resilience literature similarly argues that resilient systems must maintain adaptive capacity, continuity, and functional stability under conditions of prolonged stress and disruption (Folke et al., 2005; Walker & Salt, 2006; Meerow et al., 2016). Adaptive governance scholarship further emphasizes the importance of coordination across fragmented institutional environments when addressing complex public problems (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Bryson et al., 2014).

The paper applies the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience to homelessness response systems as a case study environment through which broader continuity dynamics can be examined. Homelessness systems provide a particularly relevant case because they operate through highly interconnected governance structures involving housing systems, healthcare systems, subsidy programs, nonprofit implementation networks, labor conditions, and housing markets simultaneously.

The central diagnostic question guiding this analysis is therefore not simply whether homelessness interventions occur, but whether homelessness systems remain structurally aligned to sustain long-term stabilization under conditions of affordability pressure, operational strain, institutional fragmentation, and adaptive systems stress.

From this perspective, recurring instability may not necessarily indicate the absence of intervention. Rather, instability may emerge because the broader continuity conditions required to sustain durable stabilization remain increasingly fragmented across interconnected public systems environments. The paper therefore examines whether homelessness systems may be becoming structurally optimized for throughput and visible intervention activity while simultaneously experiencing weakening continuity capacity beneath the surface of operational performance

## The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience is a continuity-oriented systems framework designed to examine how complex public systems sustain, fragment, or reproduce instability across time under conditions of operational stress, institutional complexity, and environmental uncertainty. The framework draws from implementation science (Fixsen et al., 2005), systems resilience theory (Folke et al., 2005; Walker & Salt, 2006), adaptive governance literature (Ansell & Gash, 2008), and public administration scholarship (Bryson et al., 2014) to evaluate whether systems maintain sufficient continuity capacity to sustain long-duration outcomes rather than merely producing visible intervention activity.

Within this framework, homelessness response systems are interpreted not as isolated intervention programs, but as interconnected continuity systems operating simultaneously across governance, administrative, operational, financial, and social layers. Housing stabilization is therefore conceptualized not as a singular placement event, but as an ongoing continuity process dependent upon sustained alignment across subsidy systems, housing markets, healthcare coordination, implementation structures, staffing systems, administrative operations, and participant-specific support conditions over time (Fixsen et al., 2005; Folke et al., 2005)

The framework emerged from a broader systems observation found across resilience and governance literature: complex public systems may continue demonstrating visible operational activity while underlying continuity capacity gradually weakens beneath the surface of reported performance indicators (Hood, 1991). In these environments, systems may appear operationally functional according to measurable outputs even while fragmentation pathways accumulate internally (Bevan & Hood, 2006).

Continuity capacity functions as one of the framework's central concepts. Continuity capacity refers to the ability of systems to preserve stabilization conditions across time, disruption, operational transitions, and changing participant circumstances. Resilience literature emphasizes that durable systems maintain adaptive functionality even under conditions of prolonged stress or uncertainty (Walker & Salt, 2006). Similarly, adaptive governance research suggests that resilient systems depend upon flexibility, coordination, learning capacity, and institutional adaptability across interconnected environments (Folke et al., 2005).

The framework also introduces the concept of fragmentation pathways. Fragmentation pathways refer to the gradual accumulation of discontinuities emerging across interconnected systems layers. These discontinuities may appear through delayed navigation processes, staffing instability, subsidy interruptions, administrative overload, weakened interagency coordination, housing access barriers, or inconsistent implementation systems. Implementation science literature suggests that interventions frequently deteriorate when organizations lose the operational infrastructure necessary to sustain continuity across time (Fixsen et al., 2005). High reliability organization theory similarly emphasizes that systems degradation often emerges

incrementally through weak signals and recurring small-scale disruptions before major systems failure becomes visible (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015).

Structural time misalignment represents another central diagnostic concept within the WRL framework. Structural time misalignment refers to the disconnect that develops when institutional timelines fail to align with the actual duration of stabilization conditions required within real-world environments. Within homelessness systems, this may include misalignment between subsidy duration and housing affordability conditions, funding cycles and long-term recovery timelines, implementation timelines and participant needs, or emergency intervention periods and durable stabilization requirements. Housing affordability research consistently demonstrates that low-income households frequently face rental conditions substantially exceeding long-term income capacity (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). California housing affordability analyses similarly show that persistent housing cost burdens continue affecting large portions of lower-income populations throughout high-cost metropolitan regions (California Legislative Analyst's Office, 2024).

The framework further distinguishes between throughput and stabilization. Throughput refers to visible intervention movement through systems processes, including placements, enrollments, shelter utilization, or exits from homelessness. Stabilization, by contrast, refers to the preservation of long-term continuity conditions necessary to sustain durable housing security over time. Public administration literature increasingly critiques performance systems that prioritize measurable outputs while obscuring longer-term outcome sustainability (Hood, 1991). Performance accountability systems may therefore reward visible intervention activity even when long-term continuity outcomes remain unstable or insufficiently measured (Bevan & Hood, 2006).

Predictable instability represents one of the framework's primary analytical propositions. The framework argues that instability patterns may become increasingly foreseeable when fragmentation pathways accumulate simultaneously across multiple interconnected systems layers. Rather than interpreting recurring instability solely as random failure or isolated participant outcomes, the framework examines whether instability emerges systematically under conditions of continuity degradation, operational overload, affordability pressure, funding instability, and weakened adaptive coordination. Complex adaptive systems research similarly emphasizes that instability often emerges progressively through interacting systems pressures rather than singular collapse events (Talukder et al., 2021).

Implementation science heavily informs the WRL framework's interpretation of systems continuity. Fixsen and colleagues argue that successful implementation depends not solely on policy adoption, but on sustained implementation infrastructure, organizational support systems, leadership coordination, staffing stability, operational fidelity, and long-term sustainability mechanisms (Fixsen et al., 2005). Implementation sustainability research further suggests that interventions may initially demonstrate operational success while gradually losing continuity

capacity through implementation drift, staffing instability, weakened coordination systems, or administrative overload (Kim et al., 2023).

Systems resilience literature also contributes substantially to the framework's continuity-centered orientation. Resilience scholars increasingly argue that systems should be evaluated according to their ability to absorb disruption, maintain functionality, reorganize under stress, and preserve adaptive capacity across changing conditions rather than merely returning to prior operational states (Folke et al., 2005). Urban resilience research similarly emphasizes that interconnected governance capacity and institutional adaptability are central conditions shaping long-term systems stability (Meerow et al., 2016; Cutter et al., 2008).

Adaptive governance and collaborative governance scholarship further shape the framework's interpretation of institutional coordination. Complex public systems increasingly operate through decentralized networks involving multiple agencies, nonprofit organizations, contractors, governance structures, and administrative systems simultaneously (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Under these conditions, long-term stabilization outcomes depend heavily upon sustained coordination capacity across fragmented institutional environments rather than isolated organizational performance alone (Bryson et al., 2014).

The WRL framework additionally incorporates insights from high reliability organization theory. Weick and Sutcliffe argue that resilient systems maintain sensitivity to weak signals, operational inconsistencies, and emerging coordination failures before larger systems breakdowns fully emerge (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). Within the WRL framework, small-scale disruptions therefore function not merely as isolated administrative irregularities, but as potential indicators of deeper continuity degradation occurring beneath visible operational activity.

Applied to homelessness response systems, the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience examines whether systems remain sufficiently aligned to sustain durable stabilization under conditions of affordability pressure, operational strain, institutional fragmentation, and prolonged demand stress. Oversight and evaluation reports increasingly suggest that homelessness systems experience substantial implementation strain associated with staffing instability, navigation delays, administrative fragmentation, subsidy interruptions, and uneven progression through housing pathways (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026; City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee, 2025).

The framework does not reject rapid intervention systems or placement activity itself. Rather, it argues that durable stabilization depends upon whether the surrounding continuity systems remain operationally aligned after placement occurs. From this perspective, homelessness systems function as a case study environment through which broader public systems continuity dynamics can be examined.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience therefore proposes that long-duration systems outcomes depend not solely on intervention activity itself, but on whether continuity

capacity remains sufficiently preserved across interconnected systems conditions over time. The framework ultimately shifts analytical attention away from isolated intervention outputs and toward the broader continuity environments shaping whether systems sustain or reproduce instability across time.

## Homelessness Response Systems as a Case Study Environment

Contemporary homelessness response systems in the United States operate through highly interconnected governance, administrative, financial, and service-delivery structures involving federal agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, housing authorities, healthcare systems, outreach teams, landlords, and supportive service providers simultaneously. These systems are designed to reduce homelessness, increase housing access, coordinate supportive services, and promote long-term stabilization through integrated intervention pathways (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012).

Federal homelessness policy underwent substantial restructuring through the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009, which expanded and formalized the Continuum of Care framework as the primary administrative structure governing homelessness assistance systems throughout the United States (Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009, 2009). The HEARTH Act emphasized coordinated community responses, integrated service delivery systems, measurable performance outcomes, and rapid transitions into permanent housing as central federal policy objectives.

The Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule further operationalized these objectives by establishing formal administrative structures governing coordinated entry systems, participant eligibility, program administration, housing transition pathways, and performance measurement systems (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012). Under the Continuum of Care structure, homelessness systems increasingly function through regional coordination networks intended to align outreach systems, emergency shelter, interim housing, permanent supportive housing, Rapid Re-Housing programs, and supportive service systems across multiple providers and jurisdictions.

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) programs emerged as a major component of this policy structure. HUD guidance defines RRH as a permanent housing intervention combining short-term or medium-term tenant-based rental assistance with housing navigation and supportive services intended to reduce the duration of homelessness episodes and facilitate transitions into housing stability (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d.). RRH systems generally rely upon temporary financial assistance, landlord engagement, housing identification, and case management support to rapidly move participants into market-rate housing environments.

The expansion of RRH reflects a broader policy emphasis on rapid placement strategies intended to reduce unsheltered homelessness and increase exits into permanent housing. HUD homelessness performance systems increasingly evaluate program effectiveness through measurable indicators including placement activity, shelter utilization, exits from homelessness, and reductions in unsheltered populations (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025). Local systems similarly rely upon performance dashboards and

intervention metrics to evaluate operational activity (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, n.d.).

Federal policy structures also increasingly recognize that long-term stabilization depends upon continuity preservation rather than placement alone. One important example appears in HUD's amendment to the Continuum of Care Interim Rule regarding tenant-based rental assistance mobility provisions (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2016). The amendment permits participants receiving tenant-based rental assistance to retain support while relocating outside their original Continuum of Care geographic area under specified conditions. This policy modification reflects institutional recognition that geographic rigidity, administrative boundaries, and relocation barriers may undermine long-term housing continuity.

Mobility amendment is particularly significant within the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework because it demonstrates adaptive flexibility within homelessness policy itself. Rather than treating stabilization as geographically fixed, the amendment acknowledges that participants may require mobility in order to preserve employment opportunities, maintain support networks, avoid unsafe environments, or access more sustainable housing conditions. In this sense, continuity preservation becomes prioritized over rigid administrative boundaries.

At the local level, homelessness response systems in Los Angeles operate through similarly complex governance arrangements involving the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, nonprofit service providers, housing authorities, healthcare systems, outreach organizations, and regional housing initiatives simultaneously. LAHSA functions as a lead regional coordinating agency overseeing many aspects of the homelessness response system including coordinated entry systems, outreach coordination, housing navigation, interim housing programs, and Time-Limited Subsidy systems (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2024; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, n.d.).

Programs such as Inside Safe further expanded the use of interim housing models, including motel and hotel placements intended to transition individuals from unsheltered homelessness into permanent housing pathways (City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee, 2025). Interim housing systems are designed to provide temporary stabilization while participants engage in documentation completion, case management, housing navigation, healthcare coordination, and placement processes.

County and city housing initiatives, including Measure H and Measure HHH investments, have also significantly expanded the regional homelessness response infrastructure through supportive housing development, service funding, outreach systems, and housing assistance programs (City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer, 2023). These investments reflect substantial institutional efforts to expand intervention capacity and improve coordination across homelessness systems environments.

At the same time, oversight reports, audits, and implementation evaluations increasingly identify operational challenges associated with navigation delays, staffing instability, subsidy interruptions, prolonged interim housing stays, fragmented administrative coordination, housing shortages, and inconsistent progression through stabilization pathways (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026; City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee, 2025; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General, 2025). These reports suggest that homelessness systems may continue operating at high levels of intervention activity while simultaneously experiencing continuity strain beneath the surface of visible operational performance.

The Los Angeles homelessness response environment therefore provides a particularly relevant case study through which the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience can be applied. The system operates through highly interconnected governance structures while simultaneously confronting affordability pressure, housing scarcity, operational overload, staffing strain, subsidy instability, and implementation fragmentation across multiple institutional layers.

Within the WRL framework, homelessness systems are interpreted not simply as isolated programs, but as interdependent continuity systems whose effectiveness depends upon sustained alignment across governance systems, implementation structures, housing markets, operational coordination, and participant-specific support conditions over time. From this perspective, long-term stabilization outcomes are shaped not solely by intervention availability, but by whether the broader continuity environment remains sufficiently aligned to preserve durable housing stability across changing operational and economic conditions.

## The Structural Gap in Housing Systems

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience proposes that one of the central structural problems within contemporary homelessness response systems is the growing disconnect between intervention activity and durable continuity capacity. While homelessness systems increasingly produce visible placement activity through shelter systems, interim housing, Rapid Re-Housing programs, and Time-Limited Subsidy interventions, long-term stabilization outcomes remain shaped by broader continuity conditions extending beyond placement alone.

Within conventional homelessness policy environments, intervention success is frequently evaluated through measurable outputs including shelter utilization, placements into housing, exits from homelessness, reductions in unsheltered populations, and enrollment activity (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, n.d.). These indicators provide important operational information regarding intervention reach and systems activity. However, they may not fully capture whether the surrounding continuity conditions required to sustain long-term stabilization remain sufficiently aligned after the initial intervention period concludes.

The structural gap identified within the WRL framework therefore extends beyond housing scarcity alone. The framework argues that instability increasingly emerges when systems capable of producing rapid intervention activity are not simultaneously capable of sustaining the continuity conditions required for durable stabilization across time.

One major dimension of this structural gap involves the relationship between subsidy duration and long-term housing continuity. Rapid Re-Housing and Time-Limited Subsidy systems are designed to provide temporary rental assistance intended to interrupt homelessness and facilitate transitions into permanent housing environments (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d.). Federal guidance defines Rapid Re-Housing as a housing intervention combining housing identification, short-term or medium-term rental assistance, and supportive services intended to reduce the duration of homelessness episodes (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014).

Existing housing stability research demonstrates that many participants successfully achieve short-term exits from homelessness through Rapid Re-Housing interventions (Aubry et al., 2020). However, studies also indicate that long-term retention outcomes may vary significantly according to housing affordability conditions, disability status, labor capacity, healthcare continuity, and the duration of available subsidy support (Aubry et al., 2020; Strehlau et al., 2017). These findings suggest that placement itself may not necessarily guarantee durable stabilization once temporary assistance concludes.

Within the WRL framework, this condition is interpreted as structural time misalignment. Structural time misalignment emerges when institutional intervention timelines fail to align with

the actual duration of stabilization conditions required within real-world economic and social environments. In homelessness systems, this may include misalignment between subsidy duration and wage recovery timelines, emergency funding cycles and long-term stabilization needs, or temporary assistance periods and persistent housing affordability pressures.

Housing affordability data increasingly demonstrates the severity of this disconnect. National affordability research consistently shows that many low-income households cannot sustain prevailing market rents without substantial housing assistance (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). California housing affordability analyses similarly indicate that high-cost metropolitan regions continue experiencing persistent affordability pressures driven by limited housing supply, elevated rental demand, and widening rent-to-income disparities (California Legislative Analyst's Office, 2024).

HUD Fair Market Rent data further illustrates the extent of these affordability pressures within many urban housing markets (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025). Participants transitioning from subsidy-supported housing into full rental responsibility may therefore encounter housing costs substantially exceeding available income capacity even when employed or receiving fixed benefits.

Within Los Angeles County, these pressures become particularly significant due to persistent housing shortages and elevated rental costs. Research examining homelessness response systems in Los Angeles increasingly identifies affordability mismatch as a major factor influencing long-term stabilization outcomes (Abraham et al., 2023). Wage-to-rent disparities may leave even employed participants economically vulnerable after subsidy assistance declines or expires.

The WRL framework argues that this affordability mismatch creates a broader continuity problem rather than merely an isolated budgeting challenge. Temporary assistance may successfully interrupt homelessness while simultaneously leaving unresolved structural conditions that continue threatening long-term housing continuity underneath the surface of visible stabilization outcomes.

This structural gap is further intensified by operational timing pressures within homelessness systems themselves. Subsidy systems, housing navigation processes, documentation requirements, coordinated entry systems, and housing availability often operate according to different timelines simultaneously. Delays occurring within one portion of the system may therefore destabilize surrounding continuity pathways across multiple interconnected systems layers.

Oversight reports and implementation evaluations increasingly identify prolonged interim housing stays, navigation delays, administrative bottlenecks, staffing instability, and uneven progression through housing pathways within homelessness systems environments (City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee, 2025; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026). Within the WRL framework, these operational conditions are interpreted not solely as isolated

administrative inefficiencies, but as indicators of broader continuity strain emerging across interconnected stabilization systems.

The structural gap therefore reflects more than the absence of housing resources alone. Rather, the WRL framework proposes that instability increasingly emerges when systems remain operationally capable of producing intervention activity while simultaneously lacking sufficient continuity alignment across housing affordability conditions, subsidy duration, implementation systems, staffing capacity, administrative coordination, and participant-specific stabilization requirements.

From this perspective, homelessness systems may continue generating substantial placement activity while long-term continuity capacity gradually weakens beneath the surface of operational performance indicators. Participants may therefore move successfully through visible intervention stages while remaining structurally vulnerable to recurring instability after temporary stabilization periods conclude.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience interprets this condition as a core systems gap within contemporary homelessness response environments. Durable stabilization depends not solely on whether placements occur, but on whether the broader continuity systems surrounding placement remain sufficiently aligned to preserve housing stability across time, disruption, and changing participant conditions.

## Differential Continuity Conditions

Existing homelessness and housing stability research increasingly demonstrates that stabilization outcomes vary significantly across participant populations, health conditions, labor capacity, disability status, aging-related vulnerability, and economic precarity (Aubry et al., 2020). While homelessness systems are frequently evaluated through aggregate placement metrics and overall exits from homelessness, these measures may obscure important differences in how various populations experience continuity, retention, and long-term stabilization across time.

Within the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience, these differences are interpreted as variations in continuity dependency. Different populations may require different levels of subsidy duration, healthcare continuity, labor flexibility, mobility accommodation, supportive capacity, and adaptive coordination in order to sustain housing stability successfully. Stabilization outcomes therefore emerge not solely from participant characteristics themselves, but from whether surrounding systems conditions remain sufficiently aligned with participant-specific continuity requirements over time.

One major example involves disability-related housing vulnerability. Research examining homelessness among individuals with disabilities consistently demonstrates that long-term housing retention often depends upon ongoing subsidy support, healthcare continuity, supportive services, and stable administrative coordination (Aubry et al., 2020). Permanent Supportive Housing models were developed largely because many individuals experiencing chronic disability, behavioral health conditions, or severe medical vulnerability face significant difficulty sustaining housing without continuous support structures (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2014).

Permanent Supportive Housing outcome studies frequently demonstrate stronger long-term retention outcomes when continuous subsidies and integrated supportive services remain available (Aubry et al., 2020). At the same time, SSI and SSDI affordability research consistently shows that disability income levels often remain substantially below prevailing market rents throughout many regions of the United States (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). These affordability conditions create heightened continuity vulnerability for individuals dependent upon fixed-income systems.

Within the WRL framework, this suggests that stabilization requirements for disabled populations may differ substantially from those of participants possessing stronger labor flexibility or higher income recovery potential. Under these conditions, subsidy expiration may create disproportionate instability risks because the underlying affordability gap remains structurally unresolved after temporary assistance concludes.

Aging-related vulnerability further illustrates differential continuity conditions within homelessness systems. Research increasingly identifies older adults as one of the fastest-growing populations experiencing homelessness in the United States (U.S. Department of Housing and

Urban Development, 2025). Older adults may experience declining labor capacity, chronic illness, mobility limitations, cognitive vulnerability, fixed-income dependency, and heightened healthcare coordination needs simultaneously.

Chronic illness and ongoing medical vulnerability may further complicate housing retention by increasing dependency on healthcare continuity, transportation systems, social support networks, and stable case management relationships. Research examining medically vulnerable populations suggests that housing instability frequently interacts with healthcare fragmentation, administrative disruptions, and mobility constraints in ways that increase long-term stabilization vulnerability (Strehlau et al., 2017).

Within the WRL framework, these populations demonstrate how continuity requirements extend beyond housing placement itself. Long-term stabilization may depend upon preserving continuity simultaneously across housing assistance, healthcare systems, transportation access, administrative coordination, and social support environments. Housing systems that fail to maintain continuity across these interconnected systems conditions may inadvertently increase long-term instability risk even when initial placements occur successfully.

Labor capacity and economic precarity also significantly influence stabilization outcomes within homelessness systems. Existing research increasingly documents the growth of working homelessness and severe housing burden among employed populations throughout high-cost housing markets (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). Wage-to-rent ratio studies consistently demonstrate that many low-wage occupations fail to generate sufficient income to sustain prevailing rental costs without substantial housing burden or ongoing subsidy assistance (California Legislative Analyst's Office, 2024).

These affordability pressures create conditions of structural economic fragility in which participants may demonstrate employment capacity while simultaneously remaining vulnerable to recurring instability because available wages remain structurally disconnected from long-term housing affordability conditions. Temporary subsidy systems may therefore produce only conditional stabilization if participant income remains insufficient to absorb market-rate housing costs after assistance declines or expires.

Research examining living wages within homelessness response sectors similarly suggests that even service-sector employment connected to homelessness systems may remain economically insufficient relative to regional housing markets (Abraham et al., 2023). Participants may therefore successfully secure employment during subsidy periods while still remaining unable to independently sustain long-term housing costs after temporary assistance concludes.

Within the WRL framework, these conditions are interpreted as forms of differential continuity dependency rather than merely individual participant variation. Different populations experience stabilization pathways differently because systems conditions interact unevenly with disability

status, labor capacity, aging-related vulnerability, fixed-income dependence, healthcare needs, and broader economic conditions.

This interpretation challenges simplified assumptions within homelessness policy environments regarding uniform recovery timelines or standardized stabilization pathways. Temporary subsidy systems frequently operate according to fixed administrative timelines, yet participants may require substantially different continuity conditions depending upon medical vulnerability, labor capacity, affordability pressures, or support system dependency.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience therefore argues that homelessness stabilization cannot be fully evaluated through aggregate placement metrics alone. Durable stabilization depends upon whether continuity systems remain sufficiently aligned with the long-term realities experienced by different participant populations over time.

From this perspective, recurring instability may not necessarily indicate isolated participant failure. Rather, instability may emerge when participant-specific continuity requirements become structurally misaligned with the stabilization capacity of the surrounding systems environment itself.

## Fragmentation Pathways and Operational Strain

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience proposes that instability within homelessness response systems frequently emerges not through singular systems collapse, but through the gradual accumulation of fragmentation pathways across interconnected administrative, operational, financial, and governance systems. Under these conditions, homelessness systems may continue demonstrating substantial intervention activity while continuity capacity progressively weakens beneath the surface of visible operational performance indicators.

Within the framework, fragmentation pathways refer to the gradual erosion of coordination, timing alignment, implementation continuity, adaptive flexibility, and operational synchronization across interconnected systems environments. These fragmentation processes may emerge incrementally through staffing instability, administrative overload, navigation delays, subsidy interruptions, funding volatility, waitlist congestion, documentation barriers, or weakened interagency coordination systems.

Implementation science literature suggests that interventions frequently deteriorate when organizational systems lose the infrastructure necessary to sustain implementation continuity over time (Fixsen et al., 2005). Organizational strain may emerge through staffing shortages, weakened leadership coordination, inconsistent implementation fidelity, administrative overload, or declining sustainability capacity (Kim et al., 2023). Importantly, implementation systems may continue operating formally even while underlying continuity structures become progressively strained.

Within homelessness systems, fragmentation pathways often emerge through operational timing pressures. Housing navigation systems, subsidy administration processes, coordinated entry systems, documentation requirements, landlord engagement, healthcare coordination, and placement timelines frequently operate simultaneously across multiple institutional environments. Delays or instability occurring within one portion of the system may therefore destabilize surrounding continuity pathways across interconnected systems layers.

Oversight reports and implementation evaluations increasingly identify these operational conditions within homelessness response environments. Administrative audits examining homelessness systems have documented recurring concerns involving prolonged interim housing stays, delays in housing navigation, fragmented participant progression pathways, inconsistent case coordination, and operational bottlenecks affecting transitions into permanent housing (City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee, 2025; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026).

Within the WRL framework, these conditions are interpreted not simply as isolated administrative inefficiencies, but as indicators of broader continuity strain emerging underneath

visible intervention activity. Systems may continue producing placements and enrollments while simultaneously experiencing weakened synchronization across stabilization pathways.

Funding instability represents one major fragmentation pathway identified within the framework. Homelessness systems frequently operate through layered federal, state, county, and local funding structures dependent upon appropriations cycles, grant renewals, emergency allocations, temporary funding expansions, and shifting political priorities (City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer, 2023). Under these conditions, operational continuity may become dependent upon unstable or temporary funding environments rather than durable long-term stabilization infrastructure.

Time-Limited Subsidy systems illustrate this vulnerability particularly clearly. Subsidy programs may expand rapidly during emergency funding periods while subsequently experiencing enrollment pauses, capacity reductions, or operational contraction once temporary funding streams decline (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2025). These disruptions may destabilize the timing relationship between interim housing, subsidy availability, and participant transition pathways.

Within the WRL framework, these disruptions represent forms of continuity degradation rather than isolated administrative events. Stabilization pathways depend heavily upon synchronized timing between subsidy systems, housing availability, participant readiness, and operational coordination structures. When funding instability interrupts this synchronization, participants may remain operationally active within homelessness systems while simultaneously losing access to the continuity mechanisms necessary for durable stabilization.

Waitlist instability and systems congestion further contribute to fragmentation accumulation. Coordinated entry systems, voucher queues, supportive housing waitlists, and housing navigation pipelines increasingly operate under conditions of high demand and constrained housing supply (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2024). Participants may therefore spend prolonged periods within interim housing systems or temporary placements while awaiting access to permanent housing opportunities.

These prolonged transitional conditions may themselves become destabilizing. Delays in housing progression may disrupt healthcare continuity, employment stability, transportation access, administrative coordination, and participant trust in stabilization systems. From the WRL perspective, instability may therefore emerge not solely from the absence of intervention, but from prolonged exposure to fragmented continuity conditions within overloaded systems environments.

Operational overload further intensifies these fragmentation pressures. Homelessness systems increasingly function through dense networks of agencies, nonprofit providers, contractors, outreach systems, reporting requirements, healthcare systems, and housing coordination structures operating under sustained demand pressure (Bryson et al., 2014). Under overloaded

conditions, systems may continue functioning operationally while gradually losing adaptive flexibility, implementation consistency, responsiveness, and coordination capacity over time.

Workforce instability represents an especially important dimension of this operational strain. Research examining workforce burnout and turnover suggests that high-demand service environments frequently experience elevated staffing instability, emotional exhaustion, and declining organizational retention capacity (Willard-Grace et al., 2019). Within homelessness systems, staffing instability may weaken case management continuity, increase administrative delays, disrupt participant relationships, and reduce implementation consistency across stabilization pathways.

The WRL framework interprets these staffing pressures not merely as workforce management issues, but as continuity vulnerabilities capable of affecting broader stabilization systems. Case management continuity, housing navigation consistency, documentation processing, healthcare coordination, and participant trust may all become increasingly fragile under conditions of sustained workforce instability.

Navigation breakdown evidence further illustrates how fragmentation pathways accumulate operationally. Oversight reports increasingly identify inconsistent referrals, delayed documentation processing, interrupted communication systems, fragmented case coordination, and unclear participant progression pathways across homelessness systems environments (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General, 2025). These conditions may appear individually administrative while collectively contributing to broader continuity instability across stabilization systems.

Within the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience, fragmentation pathways function as weak signals of deeper systems misalignment. High reliability organization theory emphasizes that recurring operational inconsistencies and small-scale disruptions frequently indicate underlying continuity degradation before major systems breakdown becomes fully visible (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015).

The framework therefore proposes that homelessness systems may continue demonstrating substantial operational activity while simultaneously accumulating hidden stabilization vulnerabilities beneath the surface of visible intervention outputs. Placement systems may remain active even while coordination systems, subsidy structures, staffing environments, administrative operations, and long-term continuity pathways become progressively strained.

From this perspective, recurring instability patterns may emerge not because intervention systems are absent, but because fragmentation pathways increasingly weaken the continuity conditions required to sustain durable stabilization across time. The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience therefore shifts analytical attention away from isolated intervention outputs and toward the broader operational environments shaping whether systems preserve or reproduce instability under prolonged strain conditions.

## Throughput Versus Durable Stabilization

Contemporary homelessness response systems increasingly operate within performance environments shaped by measurable outputs, administrative reporting structures, and visible intervention activity. Placement counts, shelter utilization rates, reductions in unsheltered homelessness, exits from homelessness, subsidy enrollments, and housing navigation outcomes frequently function as central indicators of operational performance within federal and local homelessness systems (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, n.d.).

These metrics provide important information regarding intervention reach and systems activity. However, the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience argues that visible throughput activity may not fully capture whether long-term continuity conditions remain sufficiently preserved to sustain durable stabilization over time.

Within the WRL framework, throughput refers to the system's capacity to process participants through intervention stages including outreach, interim housing, coordinated entry, subsidy enrollment, placement activity, and exits from homelessness. Durable stabilization, by contrast, refers to the preservation of long-term continuity conditions required to sustain housing security after the initial intervention period concludes.

This distinction is central because systems may continue demonstrating high levels of throughput activity while simultaneously experiencing weakening long-term stabilization capacity beneath the surface of operational performance indicators. Placement itself may therefore represent a visible intervention output without necessarily indicating durable continuity across time.

Public administration literature increasingly critiques the limitations of output-centered performance systems within complex public sector environments. Hood (1991) argues that modern public management systems frequently prioritize measurable administrative outputs because they are more visible, reportable, and politically actionable than long-duration outcomes. Bevan and Hood (2006) similarly argue that performance measurement systems may distort institutional behavior by incentivizing measurable activity over deeper outcome quality.

Within homelessness systems, placements, enrollments, and exits from homelessness therefore become highly visible indicators of intervention activity, while long-term retention, recurring instability, continuity preservation, and post-placement vulnerability remain more difficult to observe administratively. The WRL framework proposes that this visibility imbalance may contribute to structural emphasis on throughput rather than durable stabilization capacity.

New Public Management critiques further support this interpretation. Greve (2010) argues that output-oriented governance systems increasingly emphasize measurable operational efficiency and performance reporting within public administration environments. Under these conditions, systems may become structurally incentivized toward rapid movement through intervention stages because throughput metrics remain institutionally visible and politically defensible.

Within homelessness systems, this may produce operational pressure toward rapid placements, accelerated exits, or increased enrollment activity even when long-term continuity conditions remain unstable. Throughput performance may therefore continue improving while long-term stabilization vulnerability simultaneously accumulates beneath the surface of reported outcomes.

The WRL framework does not argue that placement activity lacks value. Rapid intervention may significantly reduce exposure to unsheltered homelessness, improve immediate safety conditions, and provide important short-term stabilization benefits. Rather, the framework argues that placement alone should not be treated as synonymous with durable stabilization.

Implementation science literature similarly emphasizes that intervention success depends upon long-term sustainability and continuity across implementation systems rather than initial intervention activity alone. Fixsen and colleagues (2005) argue that programs frequently experience deterioration when implementation infrastructure, organizational support systems, staffing continuity, and operational fidelity weaken over time. Sustainability research further suggests that interventions may initially demonstrate successful outputs while gradually losing continuity capacity through operational overload, staffing instability, implementation drift, or fragmented coordination systems (Kim et al., 2023).

Within homelessness systems, this distinction becomes particularly significant because stabilization outcomes frequently unfold across extended periods shaped by housing affordability pressures, labor instability, disability conditions, healthcare continuity, subsidy alignment, and broader economic environments. Durable stabilization therefore requires more than successful initial placement. It depends upon whether continuity systems remain sufficiently aligned after intervention timelines conclude.

The WRL framework proposes that throughput and stabilization are therefore related but fundamentally distinct systems conditions. A system optimized primarily for rapid exits and visible placement activity may not simultaneously preserve the slower, more resource-intensive continuity structures necessary for durable stabilization. Long-term housing retention frequently depends upon ongoing case coordination, landlord participation, healthcare continuity, subsidy alignment, administrative flexibility, and sustained housing affordability conditions.

Housing affordability research further reinforces this distinction. National affordability analyses consistently demonstrate that many low-income households remain unable to sustain prevailing rental costs independently without ongoing housing assistance (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). California housing affordability reports similarly identify persistent rent burden and widening wage-to-housing disparities across high-cost metropolitan regions (California Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2024). Under these conditions, participants may successfully complete formal intervention stages while simultaneously remaining economically vulnerable after subsidy support declines or expires.

The WRL framework interprets this condition as a form of hidden stabilization fragility. Systems may continue generating visible throughput outputs while simultaneously reproducing future instability risk beneath the surface of operational performance indicators. Participants may therefore move successfully through placement systems while remaining structurally vulnerable to recurring instability because continuity conditions remain insufficiently sustained across time.

Systems sustainability literature similarly argues that durable systems performance depends upon adaptive continuity rather than short-term operational activity alone. Resilient systems preserve coordination capacity, absorb disruption, maintain flexibility, and sustain functionality across changing conditions (Folke et al., 2005; Walker & Salt, 2006). Within homelessness systems, durable stabilization therefore depends upon whether continuity systems remain sufficiently aligned to preserve housing retention after the initial intervention period concludes.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience extends these critiques by proposing that homelessness systems may become structurally optimized for throughput visibility while continuity instability gradually accumulates underneath ongoing operational activity. Placement systems may therefore appear operationally successful according to visible output measures while simultaneously struggling to preserve the long-term continuity conditions necessary for durable housing stabilization.

From this perspective, recurring instability patterns should not necessarily be interpreted solely as isolated participant failure or insufficient intervention effort. Rather, instability may emerge when throughput capacity exceeds stabilization capacity across interconnected systems environments.

The framework therefore shifts analytical attention away from intervention visibility alone and toward whether systems maintain sufficient continuity capacity to sustain long-duration stabilization outcomes over time. Durable stabilization depends not simply on how rapidly participants move through intervention systems, but on whether the surrounding continuity environments remain sufficiently aligned to preserve stability after visible intervention activity concludes.

## Predictable Instability and Systems Misalignment

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience proposes that instability within homelessness response systems is not solely episodic or random, but increasingly predictable under conditions of structural systems misalignment. From this perspective, recurring housing instability emerges when the continuity conditions required for durable stabilization become progressively fragmented across interconnected administrative, operational, financial, and housing systems simultaneously.

This interpretation differs from conventional program evaluation approaches that primarily assess homelessness systems through visible intervention activity or aggregate placement outcomes. Instead, the WRL framework evaluates whether the surrounding stabilization infrastructure remains sufficiently aligned to sustain continuity across time under conditions of affordability pressure, operational overload, institutional fragmentation, housing scarcity, and prolonged demand stress.

A central proposition of the framework is that systems may continue demonstrating substantial operational activity while underlying continuity capacity gradually deteriorates beneath the surface of visible performance indicators. Placements, enrollments, interim housing activity, and exits from homelessness may therefore continue occurring even while long-term stabilization pathways become increasingly fragmented across interconnected systems environments.

Within the WRL framework, this gradual deterioration process is interpreted as predictable instability. Predictable instability refers to the accumulation of continuity degradation across multiple systems layers simultaneously until recurring instability outcomes become structurally foreseeable rather than isolated or unexpected events.

One major source of systems misalignment involves funding continuity itself. Homelessness systems frequently operate through layered federal, state, county, and local funding structures dependent upon appropriations cycles, temporary grants, emergency allocations, renewal processes, and shifting political priorities (City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer, 2023). Under these conditions, long-term stabilization systems may become dependent upon unstable or temporary funding environments rather than durable continuity infrastructure.

The expansion and contraction of Time-Limited Subsidy systems illustrates this condition particularly clearly. Subsidy programs may expand rapidly during emergency funding periods while subsequently experiencing enrollment pauses, funding reductions, or program contraction after temporary funding streams decline (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2025). Participants may therefore enter stabilization pathways expecting continuity while the surrounding funding environment simultaneously becomes increasingly unstable.

Within the WRL framework, these conditions represent forms of continuity degradation rather than isolated administrative events. Stabilization pathways depend heavily upon synchronized timing between subsidy availability, housing access, participant readiness, interim housing

progression, and case management continuity. When funding instability interrupts this synchronization, participants may remain operationally active within homelessness systems while simultaneously losing access to the continuity conditions required for durable stabilization.

Waitlist instability further contributes to predictable fragmentation patterns. Coordinated entry systems, supportive housing queues, voucher pipelines, and housing navigation systems increasingly operate under conditions of constrained housing supply and sustained demand pressure (Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2024). Participants may therefore spend prolonged periods within interim housing systems or temporary placements while awaiting access to permanent housing opportunities that remain delayed, uncertain, or operationally inaccessible.

The WRL framework argues that these prolonged transition conditions may themselves become destabilizing. Delays in progression through housing systems may disrupt employment continuity, healthcare coordination, transportation access, social support systems, administrative stability, and participant trust in stabilization pathways. From this perspective, instability may emerge not solely through the absence of intervention, but through prolonged exposure to fragmented transition environments operating under sustained systems congestion.

Housing market volatility intensifies these continuity pressures further. Affordable housing shortages, rising rents, landlord withdrawal from subsidy programs, limited housing pipeline expansion, and construction delays all reduce the availability of sustainable placement opportunities (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024; California Legislative Analyst's Office, 2024). Even when subsidies remain operationally available, participants may increasingly struggle to locate units compatible with program requirements, affordability conditions, geographic needs, or long-term sustainability capacity.

Within the WRL framework, the interaction between volatile housing markets and time-limited subsidy systems represents a major form of structural time misalignment. Subsidy timelines may remain administratively fixed while housing costs continue increasing beyond participant income capacity. Under these conditions, stabilization pathways may become structurally disconnected from the economic realities participants are expected to navigate after assistance concludes.

Operational strain within homelessness systems further contributes to predictable instability patterns. Homelessness systems increasingly function through dense coordination networks involving agencies, nonprofit providers, outreach systems, healthcare systems, contractors, reporting structures, and housing navigation systems operating under sustained demand pressure (Bryson et al., 2014). Under overloaded conditions, systems may continue functioning operationally while gradually losing adaptive flexibility, responsiveness, coordination capacity, and implementation consistency across time.

Workforce instability intensifies these fragmentation pressures further. Research examining workforce burnout and turnover demonstrates that high-demand service environments frequently

experience elevated staffing instability, emotional exhaustion, and declining organizational retention capacity (Willard-Grace et al., 2019). Within homelessness systems, staffing instability may weaken case management continuity, delay navigation processes, disrupt participant relationships, and reduce implementation consistency throughout stabilization pathways.

Implementation science literature similarly suggests that overloaded systems may continue functioning operationally while gradually losing implementation fidelity, sustainability capacity, and long-term continuity infrastructure (Fixsen et al., 2005). Interventions may therefore remain formally active even while underlying stabilization systems become progressively strained beneath the surface of operational activity.

Navigation breakdown evidence further illustrates how predictable instability accumulates operationally. Oversight reports increasingly identify delays in documentation processing, fragmented referral systems, interrupted communication pathways, inconsistent case coordination, and unclear participant progression systems within homelessness response environments (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2026; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General, 2025). Individually, these conditions may appear administrative in nature. Collectively, however, they contribute to broader continuity instability across stabilization systems.

Within the WRL framework, these recurring disruptions function as weak signals of deeper systems misalignment. High reliability organization theory argues that recurring operational inconsistencies and small-scale disruptions frequently indicate underlying instability conditions before large-scale systems failure becomes fully visible (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). Homelessness systems may therefore continue demonstrating substantial intervention activity while simultaneously accumulating hidden stabilization vulnerabilities beneath the surface of operational performance indicators.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience interprets these conditions as forms of structural predictability rather than isolated program failure. Recurring instability patterns become increasingly foreseeable when fragmentation pathways simultaneously emerge across funding systems, staffing environments, housing markets, subsidy timelines, administrative coordination structures, and implementation systems.

From this perspective, homelessness systems may not be failing because interventions are absent. Rather, instability may emerge because the broader continuity environment required to sustain stabilization remains increasingly misaligned with the operational realities participants and institutions must navigate over time.

The framework therefore shifts analytical attention away from isolated intervention outcomes and toward the broader systems conditions shaping long-term stabilization capacity. Under conditions of sustained fragmentation, systems may continue generating placements,

enrollments, and visible intervention activity while simultaneously reproducing predictable instability beneath the surface of operational performance indicators.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience ultimately proposes that durable stabilization depends not simply on intervention availability, but on whether continuity systems remain sufficiently aligned to sustain long-term housing stability across time, disruption, and changing operational conditions. When continuity degradation accumulates across interconnected systems layers simultaneously, instability may become not merely possible, but structurally foreseeable.

## Toward Continuity-Oriented Housing Systems

The findings of this analysis suggest that durable homelessness stabilization depends not solely on the availability of interventions, but on whether homelessness response systems maintain sufficient continuity capacity across time, changing participant conditions, operational transitions, and fluctuating economic environments. Within the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience, long-term stabilization requires alignment across governance systems, implementation structures, subsidy pathways, housing markets, healthcare coordination systems, and adaptive support capacity rather than isolated placement activity alone.

A continuity-oriented housing system would therefore differ from placement-centered systems by prioritizing long-duration stabilization pathways rather than primarily emphasizing rapid throughput and short-term exits from homelessness. This distinction does not imply that rapid intervention lacks importance. Immediate placement may significantly reduce exposure to unsheltered homelessness, improve safety conditions, and provide critical short-term stabilization benefits. However, the WRL framework argues that systems should ultimately evaluate success according to whether continuity conditions remain sustainable after the initial intervention period concludes.

Resilience governance literature provides important guidance for this transition. Adaptive systems research increasingly emphasizes that resilient institutions must maintain flexibility, learning capacity, redundancy, adaptive coordination, and continuity preservation in order to remain functional under prolonged stress and changing environmental conditions (Folke et al., 2005). Systems resilience scholarship similarly argues that durable systems maintain functionality not through rigidity, but through adaptive capacity capable of responding to disruption without destabilizing core continuity structures (Walker & Salt, 2006).

Applied to homelessness systems, this suggests that stabilization pathways should not function as rigid linear intervention sequences alone. Instead, continuity-oriented systems would operate as adaptive stabilization environments capable of responding to changing participant conditions, housing affordability pressures, labor instability, healthcare disruptions, and operational strain across time.

One major implication of the WRL framework involves reconsidering subsidy structures themselves. Time-limited assistance models may provide important stabilization benefits, yet continuity-oriented systems would recognize that participants experience substantially different continuity requirements depending upon disability status, aging-related vulnerability, labor capacity, healthcare dependency, family structure, and local housing affordability conditions.

The framework therefore suggests that stabilization systems may require greater adaptive flexibility capable of responding to participant-specific continuity conditions rather than relying exclusively on standardized intervention timelines. Housing continuity may require variable

subsidy durations, stronger healthcare coordination, mobility flexibility, or extended supportive systems depending upon the continuity dependencies shaping different stabilization pathways.

Continuity planning literature further supports this interpretation by emphasizing the importance of preserving operational functionality during periods of transition, disruption, or systems strain. Continuity-oriented systems seek to maintain coordination, preserve adaptive functionality, reduce fragmentation risk, and sustain critical support pathways even during unstable operational environments (Ahern, 2011).

Within homelessness systems, continuity planning may involve preserving subsidy continuity during administrative transitions, reducing documentation fragmentation, maintaining healthcare coordination across housing transitions, strengthening long-term landlord participation systems, minimizing navigation interruptions, and protecting participants from abrupt continuity breakdown during periods of operational instability.

Longitudinal care coordination research similarly suggests that stabilization outcomes improve when support systems remain continuous across organizational and administrative boundaries. Participants navigating homelessness systems frequently interact simultaneously with housing systems, healthcare systems, mental health providers, transportation systems, disability programs, workforce systems, and nonprofit service environments. Fragmentation across these interconnected systems may weaken stabilization capacity even when initial placements occur successfully.

The WRL framework therefore emphasizes that continuity-oriented housing systems require stronger cross-sector governance coordination rather than isolated program administration alone. Adaptive governance literature increasingly argues that complex public problems cannot be effectively managed through fragmented institutional silos operating independently from one another (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Collaborative governance systems instead depend upon sustained coordination capacity across agencies, organizations, funding systems, and implementation environments operating within shared continuity structures (Bryson et al., 2014).

The framework also proposes that homelessness systems should increasingly monitor weak signals of continuity degradation before fragmentation escalates into larger stabilization failures. High reliability organization theory emphasizes that resilient systems maintain sensitivity to operational inconsistencies, coordination breakdowns, and emerging fragmentation conditions before full systems disruption becomes visible (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015).

Within homelessness systems, these weak signals may include prolonged interim housing durations, subsidy enrollment interruptions, rising exits to unknown destinations, landlord withdrawal from subsidy systems, staffing turnover acceleration, documentation delays, navigation bottlenecks, declining implementation consistency, or recurring cycling between temporary placements and renewed instability.

Rather than treating these indicators as isolated administrative concerns, continuity-oriented systems would interpret them as early manifestations of broader continuity strain requiring adaptive intervention before fragmentation becomes structurally entrenched.

The WRL framework further argues that homelessness systems should increasingly evaluate long-term retention, continuity preservation, and stabilization durability alongside placement activity itself. Output-oriented performance systems may obscure deeper instability conditions when visible intervention metrics remain active despite weakening long-term continuity capacity (Hood, 1991; Bevan & Hood, 2006).

Continuity-oriented systems would therefore prioritize longitudinal stabilization outcomes including housing retention duration, recurring instability reduction, healthcare continuity, long-term affordability alignment, participant resilience, and continuity preservation across time rather than evaluating performance primarily through throughput metrics alone.

Importantly, the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience does not argue for the elimination of rapid placement systems. Rather, the framework proposes that rapid intervention should function within broader continuity infrastructures capable of sustaining stabilization after placement occurs. Housing systems should therefore be evaluated not only according to how rapidly participants move into housing, but according to whether the surrounding continuity systems remain sufficiently aligned to preserve durable stabilization under changing economic and operational conditions.

Ultimately, the WRL framework proposes that durable homelessness reduction depends upon systems capable of maintaining adaptive continuity rather than merely producing temporary interruption of instability. Long-term stabilization requires governance systems that remain flexible, coordinated, resilient, and continuity-oriented across time.

Without sufficient continuity capacity, homelessness systems may continue generating substantial intervention activity while simultaneously reproducing recurring instability beneath the surface of visible operational success indicators. The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience therefore argues that durable stabilization depends not simply on expanding interventions, but on strengthening the continuity systems surrounding stabilization pathways themselves.

## Conclusion

This paper examined homelessness response systems through the WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience, with particular attention to the relationship between intervention systems, continuity capacity, fragmentation pathways, and long-term housing stabilization. The analysis suggests that homelessness systems increasingly operate within environments characterized by affordability pressure, operational strain, institutional fragmentation, housing scarcity, and unstable continuity conditions across interconnected governance and implementation systems.

The paper argues that homelessness stabilization cannot be fully understood as a singular placement event. Rather, stabilization functions as a long-duration continuity process shaped by the interaction between subsidy systems, housing markets, implementation structures, healthcare coordination, staffing environments, administrative systems, and participant-specific support conditions across time. From this perspective, placement alone does not necessarily indicate durable systems resilience.

The analysis further demonstrates that homelessness systems may increasingly exhibit structural tension between throughput-oriented intervention models and the continuity conditions required for long-term stabilization. Placement metrics, rapid exits from homelessness, shelter utilization rates, and visible intervention activity remain institutionally important within homelessness governance systems (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2025). However, these outputs may not consistently capture whether housing continuity is ultimately sustained after temporary intervention periods conclude.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience proposes that recurring instability patterns may emerge predictably when continuity systems become progressively fragmented across funding structures, subsidy timelines, housing affordability conditions, staffing systems, administrative coordination environments, and implementation pathways simultaneously. Under these conditions, systems may continue producing substantial intervention activity while underlying continuity capacity gradually weakens beneath the surface of operational performance indicators.

A central contribution of this paper is the proposition that recurring instability should not always be interpreted solely as individual failure or isolated program inefficiency. Instead, instability may reflect broader systems misalignment in which the continuity conditions necessary for durable stabilization remain structurally disconnected from the operational and economic environments participants must navigate over time.

The paper also demonstrates that populations experience stabilization pathways differently according to disability status, aging-related vulnerability, chronic illness, labor capacity, fixed-income dependence, healthcare continuity needs, and housing affordability pressures. Existing research consistently shows that housing stability outcomes vary significantly across these

conditions (Aubry et al., 2020; National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2024). Within the WRL framework, these differences are interpreted as variations in continuity dependency rather than merely differences in participant characteristics alone.

The framework therefore shifts analytical attention away from placement-centered evaluation alone and toward broader continuity-oriented systems analysis. Homelessness systems should be evaluated not solely according to intervention visibility or throughput activity, but according to whether the surrounding governance systems, implementation structures, subsidy pathways, operational environments, and adaptive support systems remain sufficiently aligned to preserve long-term stabilization across time.

This interpretation does not reject rapid intervention models or placement systems themselves. Rapid placement may provide substantial short-term stabilization benefits and significantly reduce exposure to unsheltered homelessness. Rather, the WRL framework argues that placement must function within broader continuity systems capable of sustaining housing stability after the initial intervention period concludes.

Without sufficient continuity capacity, homelessness systems may continue generating visible operational success while simultaneously reproducing recurring instability beneath the surface of reported performance indicators. Placement systems may therefore remain highly active even while underlying stabilization pathways become increasingly fragmented across interconnected systems environments.

The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience ultimately contributes a broader systems interpretation of homelessness stabilization by emphasizing continuity capacity, fragmentation pathways, structural time misalignment, throughput versus stabilization dynamics, adaptive systems strain, and predictable instability as central conditions shaping long-term housing outcomes.

From this perspective, durable homelessness reduction depends not simply on expanding interventions, but on strengthening the continuity systems surrounding stabilization pathways themselves. Long-term resilience within homelessness systems therefore requires governance systems capable of sustaining adaptive continuity across time, disruption, and changing participant conditions rather than merely producing temporary interruption of instability.

The framework further suggests that the dynamics identified within homelessness systems may extend beyond housing policy environments alone. Complex public systems operating under prolonged strain may similarly experience fragmentation pathways, continuity degradation, operational overload, and predictable instability beneath visible intervention activity. The WRL Systems Diagnostic Framework for Resilience therefore offers broader diagnostic potential for examining long-duration stabilization processes across interconnected public systems environments more generally.

References

Abraham, L., Hunter, S. B., Matthews, S., & Sizemore, A. (2023). *Living wages in Los Angeles County's homeless response sector*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA1890-1.html

Ahern, J. (2011). From fail-safe to safe-to-fail: Sustainability and resilience in the new urban world. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 100*(4), 341–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.02.021

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Aubry, T., Bloch, G., Brcic, V., Saad, A., Magwood, O., Abdalla, T., Alkhateeb, Q., Xie, E., Mathew, C., Hannigan, T., Costello, C., Thavorn, K., & Pottie, K. (2020). Effectiveness of permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing interventions for homeless populations: A systematic review. *American Journal of Public Health, 110*(5), 693–702. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.305613

Bevan, G., & Hood, C. (2006). What's measured is what matters: Targets and gaming in the English public health care system. *Public Administration, 84*(3), 517–538. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2006.00600.x

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review, 74*(4), 445–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238

California Legislative Analyst's Office. (2024). *California's housing affordability challenges and trends*. https://lao.ca.gov/LAOEconTax/Article/Detail/793

City of Los Angeles Homeless Strategy Committee. (2025, March 6). *City performance management: Accurately understanding the impact of the City's investment into the region's homelessness response*. https://homelessdashboard.lacontroller.app/InsideSafe

Collins, S. E., Malone, D. K., & Clifasefi, S. L. (2013). Housing retention in single-site Housing First for chronically homeless individuals with severe alcohol problems. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(S2), S269–S274. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301312

Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E., & Webb, J. (2008). A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Global Environmental Change, 18*(4), 598–606. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. University of South Florida.

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 30*, 441–473. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511

Greve, C. (2010). Whatever happened to New Public Management? *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 76*(1), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852309359042

Henwood, B. F., Kuhn, R., Padwa, H., Ijadi-Maghsoodi, R., Corletto, G., Lawton, A., Chien, J., Bluthenthal, R., Cousineau, M. R., Chinchilla, M., Tran Smith, B., Vickery, K. D., Harris, T., Patanwala, M., Akabike, W., & Gelberg, L. (2023). Investigating the comparative effectiveness of place-based and scatter-site permanent supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness during the COVID-19 pandemic: Protocols for a mixed

methods, prospective longitudinal study. *JMIR Research Protocols, 12*, e46782. https://doi.org/10.2196/46782

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-22, 123 Stat. 1632 (2009). https://www.congress.gov/111/statute/STATUTE-123/STATUTE-123-Pg1632.pdf

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration, 69*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x

Hung, C., & Hager, M. A. (2019). The impact of revenue diversification on nonprofit financial health. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 48*(1), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764018807080

Kim, B., Cruden, G., Crable, E. L., Quanbeck, A., Mittman, B. S., & Wagner, A. D. (2023). A structured approach to applying systems analysis methods for examining implementation mechanisms. *Implementation Science Communications, 4*(1), 127. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-023-00504-5

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. (n.d.). *LAHSA data and performance metrics*. https://www.lahsa.org/data-refresh

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. (2024, March 12). *Report on coordinated entry system improvements and permanent supportive housing tenant selection* (Council File No. 23-0281). City of Los Angeles. https://cityclerk.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2023/23-0281_rpt_lahsa_03-12-2024.pdf

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. (2025, April 11). *Memo to TLS and prevention service providers: Enrollment pause (FY 2025–2026).*

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. (2026, March 23). *Time-limited subsidy (TLS) programs update (FY 2025–2026)*. https://www.lahsa.org/news?article=896-lahsa-timelimited-subsidy-tls-programs

Meerow, S., Newell, J. P., & Stults, M. (2016). Defining urban resilience: A review. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 147*, 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011

National Low Income Housing Coalition. (2023). *The evidence is clear: Housing First works*. https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/Housing-First-Evidence.pdf

National Low Income Housing Coalition. (2024). *Out of reach: The high cost of housing*. https://nlihc.org/oor

Searing, E. A. M., Wiley, K. K., & Young, D. R. (2021). Resilience and mission tension in nonprofit revenue diversification. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 31*(4), 705–722. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21459

Strehlau, V., Torchalla, I., Patterson, M., Moniruzzaman, A., Laing, A., Addorisio, S., Frankish, J., Krausz, M., & Somers, J. (2017). Recruitment and retention of homeless individuals with mental illness in a Housing First intervention study. *Contemporary Clinical Trials Communications, 7*, 48–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conctc.2017.05.001

Talukder, B., Schubert, J. E., Tofighi, M., Likongwe, P. J., Choi, E. Y., Mphepo, G. Y., Asgary, A., Bunch, M. J., Chiotha, S. S., Matthew, R., Sanders, B. F., Hipel, K. W., vanLoon, G. W., & Orbinski, J. (2021). Complex adaptive systems-based framework for modeling the health impacts of climate change. *Urban Climate, 38*, 100885. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2021.100885

Tyler, S., & Moench, M. (2012). A framework for urban climate resilience. *Climate and Development, 4*(4), 311–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2012.745389

United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2014). *Implementing Housing First in permanent supportive housing*. https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Housing_First_PSH.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2012). *HEARTH Continuum of Care (CoC) Program interim rule*. HUD Exchange. https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/2033/hearth-coc-program-interim-rule/

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2014). *Rapid re-housing brief*. https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Rapid-Re-Housing-Brief.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2016). *CoC Program Interim Rule Amendment to § 578.51(c): Increasing mobility options for homeless individuals and families with tenant-based rental assistance*. HUD Exchange. https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/4871/coc-program-interim-rule-amendment-to-57851c/

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2025). *2025 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress: Part 1—Point-in-time estimates of homelessness in the U.S.* HUD USER. https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/ahar/2025-ahar-part-1-pit-estimates-of-homelessness-in-the-us.html

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2025). *FY2026 Fair Market Rent documentation system*. HUD USER. https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr.html

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (n.d.). *Homelessness assistance data and reports*. HUD Exchange. https://www.hudexchange.info/homelessness-assistance/data/

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (n.d.). *Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)*. HUD Exchange. https://www.hudexchange.info/homelessness-assistance/coc-esg-virtual-binders/coc-program-components/permanent-housing/rapid-re-housing/

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2026). *Homelessness assistance: Opportunities exist to strengthen coordination and program oversight* (GAO-26-107517). https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-26-107517

Verboom, B., & Baumann, A. (2022). Mapping the qualitative evidence base on the use of research evidence in health policy-making: A systematic review. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 11*(7), 883–898. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2020.201

Walker, B., & Salt, D. (2006). *Resilience thinking: Sustaining ecosystems and people in a changing world*. Island Press.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). *Managing the unexpected: Sustained performance in a complex world* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Willard-Grace, R., Knox, M., Huang, B., Hammer, H., Kivlahan, C., & Grumbach, K. (2019). Burnout and health care workforce turnover. *The Annals of Family Medicine, 17*(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2338

Young, D. R. (2022). *Financing nonprofits and other social enterprises: A benefits approach*. Edward Elgar Publishing.