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Overview

- NED-2 voucher program background
- Study questions
- Process analysis—methods and findings
- Impact analysis—methods and descriptive statistics
People with disabilities are entitled to a choice of receiving services in “the most integrated setting appropriate”

Federal and state efforts attempt to transition people with disabilities out of institutions and into the community

Lack of affordable, accessible housing cited as one of the biggest barriers to community placement
NED-2 Program Design: April 2010

- Rental assistance for non-elderly disabled (NED) individuals living in an institution (NED-2)

- Public housing authorities (PHAs) required to partner with Money Follows the Person (MFP) program or Health and Human Services (HHS) agency to arrange community support services for voucher recipients
Awarded 948 vouchers to 28 PHAs in 15 states

Expected vouchers to be used within one year

Technical assistance by New Editions and the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC)
Study Questions (1)

- Process and implementation
  1. What were the voucher issue and lease rates over time and across sites?
  2. How did key design and implementation processes vary across sites?
  3. Are there specific procedures associated with faster or higher rates of voucher issue and lease?
Study Questions (2)

- Impact

4. Do NED-2 vouchers affect the rate of transitions from nursing facilities to community residences overall or by site?
NED-2 Process and Implementation
Process Analysis: Selected PHAs

13 PHAs (8 states) that received at least 35 vouchers

Washington:
- Tacoma
- Snohomish Co.
- Longview

California:
- Pasadena
- Orange Co.

Texas:
- Austin

Georgia:
- Decatur

Maryland:
- Baltimore City
- Baltimore Co.

Ohio:
- Cincinnati
- Lucas Co.

Mass:
- Lynn

New Jersey

Ohio:
- Cincinnati
- Lucas Co.

Maryland:
- Baltimore City
- Baltimore Co.

Georgia:
- Decatur
Process Analysis: Data Sources

- Distribution data collected by TAC in June 2011, September 2011, and December 2011
- Phone discussions with PHA and partners in summer of 2012
Process Analysis: Topics in Discussions

- Collaboration between PHA and HHS/MFP staff
- Process for identifying and referring participants
- Level and type of assistance provided to applicants
- Modification of PHA policies for NED-2 program
Variation in Progress

- Most vouchers issued and leased within first year
  - NJ, Baltimore City, and Snohomish County

- Few vouchers issued and leased within first year, but all by summer 2012
  - Baltimore County, Lynn, Cincinnati, Lucas County, Tacoma, and Longview

- Fewest vouchers issued and leased
  - Orange County, Pasadena, Decatur, and Austin
HUD granted flexibility to PHAs and their partners, resulting in variation in several areas, including:

- Length and nature of prior relationships and involvement of HHS/MFP staff in the application process
- Outreach to and recruitment of NED-2 eligible individuals
Variation in Implementation (2)

- How referrals were tracked
- Amount of assistance offered to applicants on forms and housing searches
- PHA policies to accommodate the special needs of NED-2 voucher recipients
  - For example, portability, voucher expiration, applicant briefings
Factors that Lead to Higher Voucher Use

- Communication between PHA and HHS/MFP staff during application and after award
- Centralized, coordinated referral and tracking
- Involvement of HHS/MFP housing specialist
- Relaxed PHA rules governing portability
Common Implementation Challenges

- Challenges in leasing issued vouchers
  - Lack of affordable and accessible housing
  - Landlords sometimes unwilling to hold unit
  - PHA rules restricting portability

- Challenges for eligible population
  - Criminal background
  - Missing documentation
  - Poor credit history
Conclusions and Lessons (1)

- Significant coordination between housing and health agencies helps NED-2 eligible individuals navigate the complex application processes.

- In communities with a shortage of affordable, accessible housing, flexible portability policies are important.
Conclusions and Lessons (2)

- Program expansion would likely be more effective if the vouchers were targeted to communities that show evidence of staff capacity and strong PHA—MFP/HHS partnerships.
Impact Analysis Plan
Impact Analysis: Methodology

- Identify comparison regions
- Identify people residing in nursing facilities in NED-2 and comparison areas
- Narrow the sample to only those eligible and likely to use vouchers
- Generate a difference-in-difference estimate of probability of transition
Impact Analysis: Data

- HUD administrative data: identify NED-2 participants
- Minimum Data Set (MDS): individual characteristics and institutional information
- National Provider Identifier (NPI) registry: zip codes for providers in the MDS
### NED-2 and Comparison Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NED-2 Region</th>
<th>Comparison Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City and Baltimore County, MD</td>
<td>Prince George's, Montgomery, and Anne Arundel Counties, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>Akron and Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County, WA</td>
<td>Spokane County, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma, WA</td>
<td>Vancouver and Bellingham, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See supplementary slides for more details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of NED-2 Vouchers Used by Dec 11</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Eligibles to be Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City and County</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish Co.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptive Statistics: Untrimmed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NED-2 Voucher Users</th>
<th>Treatment Area Subjects</th>
<th>Comparison Area Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6,389</td>
<td>6,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty walking (%)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty dressing (%)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty eating (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Narrow the sample and conduct difference-in-difference analysis

- Future research
  - Extend the analysis to include 2012 voucher users
  - Compare nursing facility readmission rates
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### NED-2 and Potential Comparison Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Transition Rate</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Fair Market Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>619,000</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>$1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G. Co.</td>
<td>841,000</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>$1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Co.</td>
<td>787,000</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>$1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Co.</td>
<td>932,000</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>$1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Arundel Co.</td>
<td>538,000</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>$752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>$714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>$745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MATHEMATICA Policy Research
### NED-2 and Potential Comparison Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Transition Rate</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Fair Market Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish Co.</td>
<td>722,000</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Co.</td>
<td>471,000</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>