

Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute

**Predictable Instability: A Systems Analysis of Shock and
Structural Misalignment in Homelessness Policy**

Deborah J. Hanson, MPA

Founder and Executive Director

April 2026

Published by:

Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute (WRL Institute)

Los Angeles, California

© 2026 Wildfire Resilient Landscapes. All rights reserved.

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). *Predictable Instability: A Systems Analysis of Shock and Structural Misalignment in Homelessness Policy*. Wildfire Resilient Landscapes Institute. Working Paper Series (No. 007). <https://wildfireresilientlandscapes.org>

1. Introduction

This paper examines a central limitation in homelessness response systems: the failure to distinguish between acute shocks and structural conditions as primary drivers of housing instability. While homelessness is often treated as a singular policy problem, the pathways into and through homelessness are heterogeneous and shaped by different types of risk operating across time and context.

Recent research highlights the role of acute events such as eviction, public health emergencies, and climate-related disasters in driving short-term increases in homelessness. At the same time, persistent structural conditions, including housing affordability constraints, income instability, and health-related vulnerabilities, continue to shape baseline levels of housing insecurity. These two forms of risk operate simultaneously but are not equivalent in either cause or required intervention.

Despite this distinction, current homelessness response systems frequently apply similar intervention strategies across both conditions. Programs are often designed around emergency placement and short-term stabilization, emphasizing rapid movement into housing without consistently accounting for long-term sustainability. This approach obscures important differences in risk profiles and contributes to recurring instability in system outcomes.

This paper argues that homelessness response systems require a differentiated framework that aligns intervention strategies with the underlying type of risk. Drawing on systems analysis approaches, this study conceptualizes homelessness as the result of interacting shock and structural drivers and examines how misalignment between these drivers and intervention models produces predictable inefficiencies (Kim et al., 2023; Verboom & Baumann, 2022).

Existing homelessness response systems include mechanisms intended to match individuals to appropriate interventions, most notably through coordinated entry systems and vulnerability assessment tools. These systems prioritize individuals based on level of need and attempt to align them with programs such as rapid rehousing or permanent supportive housing. However, these approaches are primarily classificatory rather than predictive. They assess current vulnerability but do not systematically evaluate the probability of housing retention under specific intervention conditions. In parallel, Homeless Management Information Systems function as the primary data infrastructure for tracking service utilization and housing outcomes but operate retrospectively rather than predictively. Together, these limitations constrain the system's ability to align interventions with long-term stability.

Building on this framework, the paper introduces a forecasting-oriented perspective that emphasizes risk differentiation, system alignment, and long-term stability. The analysis concludes with policy implications for designing more adaptive and effective homelessness response systems.

2. Existing System Design and Limitations

Homelessness response systems in the United States are structured around coordinated service delivery models intended to prioritize need and allocate limited resources efficiently. Central to this approach are coordinated entry systems, vulnerability assessment tools, and centralized data infrastructures, which together form the operational backbone of contemporary homelessness policy implementation. These systems are designed to identify individuals experiencing homelessness, assess their level of need, and match them to appropriate interventions such as emergency shelter, rapid rehousing, or permanent supportive housing.

Coordinated entry systems function as the primary access point for individuals seeking housing assistance. Within these systems, standardized assessment tools are used to evaluate vulnerability and prioritize service allocation. Instruments such as the Vulnerability Index–Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool are widely used to generate scores based on factors including health status, housing history, and exposure to risk. These scores are intended to guide program placement decisions by aligning individuals with interventions that correspond to their level of need. In practice, individuals with higher vulnerability scores are often prioritized for permanent supportive housing, while those with lower scores are directed toward shorter-term interventions such as rapid rehousing (Aubry et al., 2020; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014).

In parallel, Homeless Management Information Systems serve as the primary data infrastructure supporting system coordination and performance monitoring. These systems collect and store information on client characteristics, program enrollment, service utilization, and housing outcomes. HMIS enables local jurisdictions and federal agencies to track key performance indicators, including length of time in homelessness, rates of exit to permanent housing, and returns to homelessness. These data systems are essential for reporting, accountability, and resource allocation across homelessness response systems (City of Los Angeles, 2023; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2024).

Despite their central role, these systems are primarily oriented toward classification and retrospective analysis rather than prediction. Vulnerability assessment tools evaluate conditions at a single point in time and assign priority based on current characteristics, but they do not systematically assess the likelihood that a given intervention will result in sustained housing stability. Similarly, HMIS provides detailed documentation of system activity and outcomes but functions as a retrospective tool that captures what has already occurred rather than forecasting future risk trajectories. As a result, system decision making is largely based on static indicators rather than dynamic assessments of changing conditions (Kim et al., 2023; Verboom & Baumann, 2022).

This limitation has important implications for system performance. Program assignment decisions are typically made without incorporating key external variables that influence housing

stability, including local housing market conditions, rent-to-income ratios, subsidy duration, and the availability of downstream housing options. When these factors are not integrated into decision-making processes, individuals may be placed into interventions that are misaligned with their actual probability of maintaining housing. For example, short-term subsidies may be assigned in contexts where long-term affordability constraints remain unresolved, increasing the likelihood of program exit without sustained stability.

The result is a system that prioritizes efficient placement over durable outcomes. While coordinated entry systems and associated tools improve access and standardize decision-making processes, they do not fully account for the interaction between individual vulnerability and structural constraints. This creates conditions in which housing placements are achieved but not sustained, contributing to repeated system entry and ongoing housing instability. From a systems perspective, this reflects a misalignment between inputs, processes, and intended outcomes, in which interventions are not consistently calibrated to the underlying drivers of risk.

Understanding these limitations is essential for developing more effective homelessness response strategies. While existing systems provide important infrastructure for coordination and data collection, their reliance on static classification and retrospective analysis constrains their ability to anticipate and respond to dynamic risk conditions. This gap highlights the need for a more predictive and differentiated approach that aligns intervention strategies with both the type and trajectory of housing instability.

2.1 Acute Shock Drivers

Acute shocks are sudden, time-bound disruptions that significantly increase the likelihood of housing loss over a short period. These events are often external to the individual and can rapidly destabilize otherwise tenuous housing situations.

Common examples include eviction, changes in tenant protections, public health emergencies such as the COVID-19 pandemic, climate-related disasters including wildfires and extreme heat events, and sudden income loss. Empirical research examining homelessness trends across all 50 states demonstrates that while long-term economic conditions influence baseline levels of homelessness, sharp increases are more strongly associated with acute events, particularly eviction and climate-related displacement (Leifheit et al., 2026).

Acute shocks function as trigger events that produce rapid inflows into homelessness systems. Because these events occur quickly and often at scale, they require immediate system responses designed to stabilize individuals and prevent further harm.

Emergency interventions such as shelter placement, rapid rehousing, and short-term subsidies are generally well suited to these conditions. Evidence from Housing First models supports the effectiveness of rapid placement approaches in improving short-term housing stability,

particularly when access to housing is not delayed by programmatic requirements (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2014; National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

However, the effectiveness of these interventions depends on the availability of downstream housing pathways and sufficient system capacity. When these conditions are limited, emergency responses may delay rather than prevent long-term instability, as evidence indicates that rapid rehousing programs, while effective in facilitating initial exits from homelessness, produce less consistent long-term housing retention outcomes in the absence of sustained affordability and support (Aubry et al., 2020; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2014).

2.2 Structural Drivers

In contrast to acute shocks, structural drivers represent persistent conditions that create ongoing vulnerability to housing instability. These conditions are continuous rather than episodic and shape both the likelihood of entry into homelessness and the probability of returning to homelessness over time.

Structural drivers include long-term housing affordability gaps, income instability, labor market precarity, mental health and substance use challenges, limited access to healthcare and supportive services, and barriers to navigating complex service systems. These factors are embedded within broader economic and institutional systems and are not resolved through short-term intervention.

Research on permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing interventions demonstrates that while short-term assistance can improve immediate housing outcomes, long-term stability is strongly associated with sustained support and alignment with underlying conditions such as income and service needs (Aubry et al., 2020; Henwood et al., 2023).

From a systems perspective, structural drivers represent baseline risk conditions that require continuous intervention. When these conditions are addressed using temporary tools alone, the result is often temporary stabilization followed by renewed instability.

2.3 Interaction Between Shock and Structural Conditions

Although analytically distinct, shock and structural drivers interact in ways that amplify risk and shape system demand. Structural vulnerability increases exposure to and impact from acute shocks, creating a layered risk environment.

Households with high rent-to-income ratios are more likely to experience eviction following even minor income disruption. Similarly, individuals with limited financial reserves or support networks are less able to recover from climate-related displacement or health crises.

This interaction produces a compounding effect in which structural conditions increase sensitivity to shocks, shocks accelerate entry into homelessness, and inadequate system response reinforces structural vulnerability. When systems fail to account for this interaction, acute events

may be treated as isolated incidents while the underlying structural conditions remain unaddressed.

2.4 Implications for System Design

The distinction between shock and structural drivers has significant implications for system design and evaluation. Current systems are largely oriented toward throughput-based models that emphasize rapid placement and short-term outputs. While appropriate for shock response, this approach is insufficient for addressing structural conditions.

When structural drivers are treated with emergency interventions, resources are directed toward short-term placement rather than long-term stability. Transitions to permanent housing are delayed or incomplete, and rates of return to homelessness increase.

This misalignment reflects a broader failure to coordinate inputs, processes, and outcomes within a coherent system framework (Kim et al., 2023; Verboom & Baumann, 2022). A systems-based approach that distinguishes between types of risk enables more precise alignment between intervention and need and provides a foundation for integrating forecasting into system design.

Section Takeaway

Homelessness is not driven by a single set of conditions, but by the interaction between acute shocks and structural vulnerabilities. Distinguishing between these drivers is essential for designing systems that are both responsive and sustainable.

Without this distinction, systems will continue to apply short-term solutions to long-term conditions, resulting in predictable instability and limited effectiveness.

3. System Misalignment in Current Response Models

Homelessness response systems are largely structured around emergency intervention and rapid placement models. These approaches are designed to respond to acute disruptions by moving individuals quickly into temporary or subsidized housing. In the context of sudden inflows, such as those triggered by eviction, public health crises, or natural disasters, this model can be effective in stabilizing individuals in the short term.

However, these same approaches are frequently applied to populations experiencing structural vulnerability, where housing instability is not the result of a single event but of persistent and cumulative conditions. This creates a fundamental misalignment between the type of risk individuals face and the type of intervention they receive.

At a systems level, this misalignment can be understood as a breakdown in the coordination between inputs, processes, and intended outcomes. Resources are directed toward immediate placement but are insufficiently supported by mechanisms that enable sustained housing stability. As a result, systems generate short-term outputs that do not consistently translate into long-term outcomes (Kim et al., 2023).

3.1 Misalignment Between Risk Type and Intervention

The current model implicitly assumes that housing instability can be resolved through rapid transition into housing supported by time-limited assistance. While this assumption may hold for individuals experiencing temporary disruption, it does not align with the needs of those facing ongoing structural constraints.

For individuals with structural vulnerabilities, including limited income, health challenges, or barriers to system navigation, short-term interventions often fail to address the underlying conditions that led to housing instability. Placement into housing may occur, but without sustained support, these placements are difficult to maintain.

This produces a recurring pattern in which individuals move through the system without achieving durable stability. From a systems perspective, this reflects an intervention mismatch in which the design of the response does not correspond to the nature of the problem (Kim et al., 2023).

3.2 Consequences of Structural Misalignment

When structural conditions are addressed with short-term tools, several predictable outcomes emerge.

First, systems experience elevated rates of return to homelessness. Individuals who exit into housing without sufficient long-term support remain vulnerable to the same conditions that led to their initial instability. Evidence from housing intervention studies indicates that while short-term

programs improve immediate outcomes, long-term housing retention is strongly influenced by sustained affordability and access to support services (Aubry et al., 2020; Henwood et al., 2023).

Second, delays occur in transitions to permanent housing. Bottlenecks emerge when individuals remain in interim or temporary settings longer than intended due to limited access to stable housing options. These delays reduce system throughput while failing to produce stable exits (City of Los Angeles, 2023; Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, 2024).

Third, systems exhibit inefficient use of resources. Investments are concentrated on initial placement rather than on ensuring that placements are viable over time. When individuals cycle back into homelessness, systems incur repeated costs without achieving corresponding gains in stability (Aubry et al., 2020; National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

These outcomes are not random failures. They are predictable consequences of a system that prioritizes short-term outputs over long-term alignment.

3.3 Throughput Versus Stability

A defining feature of this misalignment is the emphasis on throughput-based performance metrics, such as the number of individuals placed into interim housing or moved through program stages. While these metrics capture activity, they do not adequately measure system effectiveness.

Placement is often treated as a proxy for success, even when placements are not sustained. This creates an incentive structure in which speed is prioritized over stability, reinforcing the use of short-term interventions regardless of underlying conditions.

From a systems perspective, this reflects a failure to align performance measurement with intended outcomes. Effective systems require metrics that capture not only movement through the system but also the durability of outcomes over time (Verboom & Baumann, 2022).

3.4 Dependency on External Conditions

The effectiveness of current response models is highly dependent on external factors that are not controlled within the system itself. These include housing market conditions, rental costs, and the availability of units.

Programs such as rapid rehousing and time-limited subsidies assume that housing units are accessible and that individuals will be able to sustain tenancy once assistance ends. In high-cost housing markets, these assumptions often do not hold.

When external conditions are not aligned with program design, the system's capacity to produce stable outcomes is constrained. This creates a situation in which program success becomes contingent on external factors such as local housing affordability, increasing the likelihood of

inconsistent performance in markets where the gap between wages and rental costs remains substantial (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

3.5 Systems Perspective on Misalignment

From a systems analysis perspective, these issues reflect a broader failure of integration across system components. Input, including funding and program design, are not consistently aligned with processes such as service delivery and navigation, nor with the intended outcome of long-term housing stability.

In complex systems, performance is shaped by the interaction between interdependent components, and weaknesses in one area can propagate across the system (Kim et al., 2023). Research on policy implementation similarly emphasizes the importance of aligning design, evidence, and context to achieve effective outcomes (Verboom & Baumann, 2022).

In the context of homelessness, the failure to align risk type, intervention strategy, and external conditions results in a system that is responsive in appearance but limited in effectiveness.

Section Takeaway

The current homelessness response model is not failing due to a lack of effort or resources, but due to a structural misalignment between the problems it seeks to address and the tools it employs.

By applying short-term interventions to long-term structural conditions, the system produces outcomes that are inherently unstable. Correcting this misalignment is essential for improving both system efficiency and housing stability.

4. Case Context: COVID-19 and Emergency Scaling

The COVID-19 pandemic provides a large-scale example of the structural misalignment identified in this study. During this period, homelessness response systems across the United States experienced a substantial influx of funding accompanied by rapid expansion of emergency housing interventions.

In response to immediate public health risks, jurisdictions implemented large-scale efforts to reduce unsheltered homelessness and limit exposure within congregate shelter environments. These efforts included hotel and motel placements, expanded rapid rehousing programs, and increased reliance on short-term subsidies. These interventions were designed to quickly absorb acute demand and reduce risk of transmission.

At an operational level, systems demonstrated a significant capacity to scale. Individuals were placed into temporary housing at a pace and volume not previously observed, and administrative barriers to placement were reduced to facilitate rapid response. This period illustrates that homelessness systems can deploy substantial resources and coordinate large-scale interventions when operating under emergency conditions.

However, while emergency response capacity expanded, the structural conditions underlying housing instability remained largely unchanged.

Housing affordability continued to be constrained by high rental costs and limited supply. Access to permanent housing remained dependent on market conditions that were not directly influenced by emergency funding. Long-term support systems, including sustained subsidy pathways and ongoing service capacity, were not expanded with the same continuity as emergency interventions.

As temporary protections, including eviction moratoria, began to expire and emergency funding streams were reduced, systems faced increasing pressure. The initial success of rapid placement was not consistently matched by the availability of stable exit pathways.

Evidence from this period indicates that while emergency interventions were effective in reducing immediate exposure to homelessness, they were less effective in ensuring long-term housing stability. Individuals placed in temporary or subsidized housing continued to face barriers to maintaining tenancy, particularly in high-cost markets where rent exceeded income capacity (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

From a systems perspective, this reflects the application of shock-response tools to structurally driven conditions. The system addressed the immediate crisis through expanded placement capacity but did not resolve the underlying constraints that determine whether housing can be sustained over time.

Section Takeaway

The COVID-19 response demonstrates that homelessness systems can scale emergency interventions rapidly, but that this capacity alone is insufficient to achieve long-term stability.

Without alignment in housing supply, subsidy continuity, and structural support systems, rapid placement strategies are unlikely to produce sustained outcomes. This case reinforces the central argument that applying emergency interventions to structural conditions produces short-term gains but long-term instability.

5. Forecasting Risk in Housing Systems

A systems-based forecasting approach provides a framework for distinguishing between shock-driven and structural risk and allows homelessness response systems to move beyond reactive intervention toward anticipatory design.

Current system models are largely oriented around measuring activity, particularly the number of individuals placed into interim housing or enrolled in programs. While these metrics capture throughput, they do not provide insight into the likelihood of sustained housing stability. As a result, systems may appear effective in the short term while continuing to produce unstable long-term outcomes.

Forecasting shifts the focus from outputs to probabilities. Rather than asking how many individuals have been placed, a forecasting approach evaluates the probability that a placement will be sustained, the likelihood that an individual will exit the system without achieving stability, and the conditions that increase the risk of return to homelessness.

This approach aligns with systems analysis methods that emphasize the interaction between conditions, processes, and outcomes rather than isolated performance measures (Kim et al., 2023).

5.1 Key Risk Indicators

Forecasting relies on identifying measurable indicators that signal increased risk of housing instability. These indicators operate at both individual and system levels and can be used to anticipate where breakdowns are most likely to occur.

Key indicators include eviction trends, subsidy program continuity, rent-to-income ratios, and housing availability. Eviction patterns and changes in tenant protections serve as leading indicators of inflow into homelessness systems. Program interruptions, including funding reductions or enrollment pauses, directly affect transition pathways. Rent-to-income ratios reflect the affordability gap and the likelihood that housing can be sustained. Housing supply constrains the system's ability to achieve permanent placement.

These indicators interact to shape system performance. High rent burdens combined with limited housing supply increase the probability that subsidy-based placements will not be sustained once assistance ends, particularly in markets where renter households face severe cost burdens and limited access to affordable units (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023; National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

5.2 Differentiating Risk Profiles

A forecasting framework enables systems to distinguish between different risk profiles.

Individuals experiencing acute shock may have a high likelihood of stabilization if provided with short-term assistance, particularly when underlying conditions such as income and health remain stable. In contrast, individuals experiencing structural vulnerability face ongoing risks that is not resolved through temporary intervention. For this population, housing retention is closely tied to long-term affordability and sustained support.

Without this differentiation, systems apply uniform interventions to populations with fundamentally different needs. Forecasting provides a mechanism for aligning intervention strategies with risk type by identifying which individuals are likely to benefit from temporary assistance and which require long-term support.

5.3 From Reactive to Predictive Systems

The integration of forecasting represents a shift from reactive to predictive models of governance. Reactive systems respond to crises after they occur, whereas predictive systems use data to anticipate where instability is likely to emerge.

In the context of homelessness, predictive approaches enable earlier intervention, more efficient resource allocation, and improved coordination across system components. Systems can identify populations at high risk of system exit or return to homelessness, anticipate the effects of policy changes such as subsidy expiration, and allocate resources based on projected demand rather than observed backlog.

Research on policy implementation highlights the importance of aligning decision-making with contextual evidence and system conditions (Verboom & Baumann, 2022). Forecasting extends this approach by incorporating forward-looking analysis into system design.

5.4 Implications for System Alignment

By incorporating forecasting, homelessness response systems can better align inputs, processes, and outcomes. Funding and program design can be directed toward areas of highest projected need. Service delivery processes can be adapted to reflect different risk profiles. Outcomes can be evaluated based on housing retention and stability rather than placement alone.

This alignment reduces the likelihood of applying emergency interventions to structural conditions and supports the development of differentiated response models.

Section Takeaway

Forecasting introduces a critical dimension to homelessness system design by shifting the focus from past activity to future risk.

By identifying patterns of instability and differentiating between types of vulnerability, systems can move beyond reactive placement models and toward interventions that support long-term housing stability.

6. Policy Implications: Toward a Dual-Track System

The findings of this study suggest that improving homelessness response systems requires more than expanding existing programs. It requires structural reorientation of how interventions are designed, categorized, and deployed. Specifically, systems must move toward a dual-track model that distinguishes between shock-driven and structural risk and aligns intervention strategies with the underlying conditions of housing instability.

Current models often rely on a single continuum of care in which individuals are expected to progress through standardized stages regardless of the nature of their risk. This approach obscures important differences between temporary disruption and persistent vulnerability and contributes to the misalignment identified in earlier sections.

A dual-track system addresses this limitation by establishing two coordinated but distinct response pathways: shock response systems and structural stability systems.

6.1 Shock Response Systems

Shock response systems are designed to address acute, time-bound disruptions that create immediate risk of housing loss. These systems prioritize speed, accessibility, and short-term stabilization.

Within this framework, interventions include emergency shelter, non-congregate housing options, rapid rehousing programs, and short-term rental assistance. These approaches are essential for absorbing sudden increases in demand and preventing immediate harm. Evidence from Housing First and rapid rehousing models supports the effectiveness of rapid placement in stabilizing individuals experiencing short-term disruption (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2014; National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023).

However, the effectiveness of shock response systems depends on appropriate targeting and limited duration. These interventions are most effective when applied to individuals whose underlying conditions support stabilization within a defined timeframe. When extended beyond this scope, particularly to populations experiencing structural vulnerability, their effectiveness declines and system inefficiencies increase.

6.2 Structural Stability Systems

Structural stability systems are designed to address persistent conditions that create ongoing risk of housing instability. These systems prioritize continuity, alignment with economic conditions, and long-term support.

Such systems include continuous or renewable subsidy pathways that reflect actual housing costs, policies that address long-term affordability constraints, and integrated support services such as case management, healthcare access, and employment support. Unlike shock response

systems, these interventions are not time-limited by design but are structured to provide support for as long as underlying conditions require.

This approach recognizes that for many individuals, housing instability reflects a sustained mismatch between income, housing costs, and access to services. Research demonstrates that long-term housing stability is strongly associated with ongoing affordability and support rather than short-term intervention alone (Aubry et al., 2020; Henwood et al., 2023).

By aligning interventions with these conditions, structural stability systems increase the likelihood of durable housing outcomes and reduce repeated system entry.

6.3 Coordination Between System Tracks

Although analytically distinct, shock response and structural stability systems must operate in coordination. Effective system design requires mechanisms that allow individuals to move between these pathways based on changing conditions and evolving risk profiles.

This coordination depends on assessment frameworks capable of distinguishing between shock-driven and structural risk, flexible program design that allows for transition from short-term to long-term support when necessary, and data systems that track housing retention and risk over time.

Without this coordination, dual-track systems risk fragmentation and may replicate the same navigation challenges that exist within current models.

6.4 Implications for Resource Allocation and Performance Measurement

A dual-track approach also requires changes in how resources are allocated and how system performance is measured. Resource allocation must reflect the distribution of risk within the population, ensuring that funding supports both immediate crisis response and long-term housing stability.

Performance measurements must move beyond throughput-based metrics to include indicators of housing retention, reductions in returns to homelessness, and alignment between intervention type and risk profile. This shift supports a more accurate assessment of system effectiveness and reinforces the objective of sustained housing stability (Verboom & Baumann, 2022).

Section Takeaway

A dual-track system provides a framework for aligning homelessness response with the realities of housing instability. By distinguishing between acute shocks and structural conditions, systems can deploy interventions that are more appropriately matched to need.

This approach moves beyond a uniform model and toward a coordinated system capable of producing both immediate stabilization and long-term housing outcomes.

7. Conclusion

Homelessness is not driven by a single set of conditions but by the interaction between acute shocks and structural vulnerabilities operating across economic, policy, and social systems.

When response systems fail to distinguish between these drivers, they apply short-term interventions to long-term conditions. This misalignment produces predictable patterns of instability, including repeated system entry, unsuccessful transitions to permanent housing, and inefficient use of public resources.

The analysis presented in this paper demonstrates that these outcomes are not random failures but the result of system design that does not adequately align risk, intervention, and expected outcomes. A systems-based approach that incorporates risk classification and forecasting offers a pathway toward more effective responses.

By differentiating between shock-driven and structural risk, systems can better align intervention strategies with underlying conditions. Forecasting further strengthens this approach by enabling systems to anticipate instability, allocate resources more strategically, and evaluate success based on long-term housing retention rather than short-term placement.

Improving homelessness response systems will require a shift from reactive models toward coordinated and predictive frameworks that prioritize stability, continuity, and alignment across system components. Without this shift, efforts to reduce homelessness will remain constrained by recurring gaps between program design and real-world conditions. With it, there is potential to develop systems that not only respond to crisis but support sustained housing stability over time.

References

- 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>
- 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>
- City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer. (2023, July 28). *Homelessness emergency account – General City purposes fund fifth status report* (C.F. 22-1545). https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2022/22-1545_misc_07-28-23.pdf
- City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer. (2025). *Homeless services system: Time-limited subsidy program analysis and funding overview*.
- City of Los Angeles, Office of the City Administrative Officer. (2025). *Time-limited subsidy program: Funding reductions and program impacts*.
- 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>

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. (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). *TLS landlord notice of program ending*.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. (2026, March 23). *Time-limited subsidy (TLS) programs*.

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-time-limited-subsidy-tls-programs>

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

United States District Court, Central District of California. (2025). *Alliance for Human Rights v. City of Los Angeles, Dkt. 905: Final Administrative Monitoring Report*.

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

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

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>