STEVEN R. NIVIN PH.D., LLC
Economic Research & Consulting

Cost-Benefit Analysis of Haven for Hope

Study conducted by:

Steve Nivin, Ph.D.

November 7, 2025

Study conducted for:

Haven for Hope

Abstract

Haven for Hope began operations in 2010 with the mission "to offer a place of hope and new beginnings by providing, coordinating, and delivering an efficient system of care for people experiencing homelessness in San Antonio" (Haven for Hope(a), n.d.). With its 75 partners[1] and numerous volunteers, Haven for Hope has provided care for 52,108 people who have experienced homelessness.[2] The purpose of this study was to measure the net benefits of the services provided by Haven for Hope to the community from 2007 through 2024. The benefits measured in the study included the economic and fiscal impacts of Haven for Hope operations, the economic and fiscal impacts of the volunteers at Haven for Hope, benefits of reduced crime, benefits of providing school stability to children, and the benefits of medical care, housing, and other care services. Haven for Hope has provided net benefits to the community in the range of $6.5 billion to $18.7 billion with an average of about $12.7 billion. Measured by the benefit-cost ratio, the benefits to the community generated by Haven for Hope per dollar spent (measured as the organization's total expenses) ranged from $21.83 to $60.79 with an average of $41.51. Throughout its history, Haven for Hope has been a leader in successfully providing services to those experiencing homelessness that has greatly improved the quality of life these individuals and yielded huge benefits to the larger community.

[1] Source: https://www.havenforhope.org/our-partners/
[2] Data provided by Haven for Hope.

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

Haven for Hope began operations in 2010 with the mission "to offer a place of hope and new beginnings by providing, coordinating, and delivering an efficient system of care for people experiencing homelessness in San Antonio." Haven for Hope has become a model of excellence for how to establish and operate a facility to effectively and efficiently serve those who are experiencing homelessness. With its 75 partners and numerous volunteers,[3] Haven for Hope has provided care for 52,108[4] people who have experienced homelessness. The purpose of this study was to measure the net benefits of the services provided by Haven for Hope to the community from 2007 through 2024.[5] The value of the benefits and total expenses measured in the study are provided in the following table. Haven for Hope has provided net benefits to the community of $12.7 billion. In other words, for each dollar spent to create and operate Haven for Hope, the community has received $42 in benefits.

Table 1. Net Benefits of Haven for Hope: 2007-2024

Economic Impacts of Haven for Hope Operations	$648,800,789
Economic Impacts of Volunteers	$6,043,578
Benefits from Reduced Crime	$164,975,535
Benefits from School Stability	$583,201,982
Benefits of Medical Care, Housing, & Other Care Services	$11,603,159,211
Total Benefits	$13,006,181,095
Total Expenses	$313,360,290
Net Benefits	$12,692,820,805
Benefit-Cost Ratio (Benefits per dollar of expenses)	$42

[3] Source: https://www.havenforhope.org/our-partners/
[4] Data provided by Haven for Hope.
[5] While operations did not begin until 2010, expenses to establish Haven for Hope began in 2007, so while the benefits were measured from 2010 through 2024, the expenses were calculated going back to 2007.

While the scope of this study only analyzed the benefits through 2024, it is also worth noting that Haven for Hope has continued to innovate and push its model of excellence in serving persons experiencing homelessness and the broader San Antonio community. This is exemplified through its contributions to the community's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. While much of the community was in lockdown and experiencing unprecedented economic stress due to the pandemic, Haven for Hope made numerous adaptations to their operations in order to keep safely providing their services. This included the creation and implementation of Operation Hope Away from Haven focused on serving their highest-risk clients who had become exposed to COVID-19 and to maintain social distancing.

As shown in this analysis, Haven for Hope's impact on the San Antonio community has been profound, especially for those they serve, but their overwhelmingly positive impacts extend well into the broader community. By providing a path to a new beginning for those who are experiencing homelessness, Haven for Hope's work towards the achievement of their mission contributes substantially to both the quality of life of those they serve and all who live in San Antonio and Bexar County. By helping those persons experiencing homelessness find permanent housing and providing them with the care, guidance, and skills each individual needs to begin a successful journey to self-sufficiency, these benefits will be felt throughout their lifetimes and will also serve as a catalyst for economic development well into the future.

II. Haven for Hope Overview

From its beginning of operations in 2010, Haven for Hope has been successful in fulfilling its mission "to offer a place of hope and new beginnings" (Haven for Hope(a), n.d.). They achieve this mission by addressing the root causes of homelessness through an "approach [that] is person-centered, trauma-informed and recovery-oriented." (Haven for Hope(a), n.d.). Haven for Hope is the only provider of services to persons experiencing homelessness in San Antonio where families are never denied access to their services (Haven for Hope, 2022, p.3). In collaboration with its 75 partners (43 of them being onsite),[6] the services offered to the community are listed in Table 2 (Haven for Hope, 2022, p. 3).

Table 2. Services Provided at Haven for Hope

1,700 beds in 3 dorms and a courtyard	Public restrooms & showers
ID recovery/legal services	Laundry services
Medical, dental & vision care	Indoor sleeping environment
Behavioral healthcare	Clothing & toiletries provided
On site detox, substance use recovery & sober living	Move out support
Counseling	Rental assistance
Case management	Spiritual services
GED classes	Hair care services
Job skills development	Three hot meals daily
Job placement	Post office
Veterans services	Fitness center
Onsite child care & after school care	Kennel and cattery for pets
Children's programs	Low barrier option with indoor sleeping

Through this extensive support and with the "radical compassion" Haven for Hope and its partners provide for those in the community experiencing homelessness, it is truly a

[6] Source: https://www.havenforhope.org/our-partners/

"transformational campus" where "individuals and families are empower[ed] to transform their lives" (Haven for Hope(b), n.d.).

The results Haven for Hope has achieved is evidence that they are truly transforming lives. Since Haven for Hope opened, they have served 52,108 people who have experienced homelessness.[7] After one year upon graduating from Haven for Hope, 92.42 percent of those who exited to housing in 2023 remained in housing for at least twelve months through 2024. The retention rate for all of those who exited Haven for Hope and remained out of homelessness for at least twelve months, including those who exited to another facility for higher care, to stay with family or friends, to a transitional housing facility, and including all those who exited without completing an exit interview was 75.01 percent as of 2023. In part, this high housing retention rate is the result of the fact that 683 clients of Haven for Hope in 2024 found employment.[8]

These results are why Haven for Hope has become a model as to how an organization and a community can successfully assist those who are experiencing homelessness (Tsai et al., 2025). Even with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, Haven for Hope innovated and adapted in order to continue to serve people experiencing homelessness with their "radical compassion" in a manner that kept the people they serve, their staff and volunteers, and the broader San Antonio community as safe as possible. Remarkably, Haven for Hope maintained their level of service with no evictions from their on-campus housing or facilities. A key innovation in achieving this success through the pandemic was their collaboration with the City of San Antonio, MetroHealth, and their many partner agencies to create and implement Operation Hope Away from Haven. This Operation expanded their operations into a local hotel in order to continue to provide services to their highest-risk clients while maintaining social distancing and other

[7] Data provided by Haven for Hope.
[8] Data provided by Haven for Hope.

protocols during the pandemic. The success of Operation Hope Away from Haven is yet another illustration of the success and impacts Haven for Hope has on the San Antonio community, even during very difficult times.

It is the purpose of this study to assess the net economic benefits of Haven for Hope over the period from 2007 to 2024. This covers the period back to 2007 as costs were incurred to establish the organization before Haven for Hope began serving persons experiencing homelessness in 2010. The benefits measured in this analysis are shown in Table 3. The benefits measured included the economic impacts of the Haven for Hope operations. This captures the effects of their employment and spending in the local economy. The operations and services provided by Haven for Hope are supported by a dedicated team of volunteers, so the economic value of the services they provide are calculated using standard economic impact techniques. The benefits of the volunteers extend beyond those that could be measured in this analysis because the volunteers help develop social capital in a community. The benefits derived from enhanced social capital may result in more empathy and compassion for persons experiencing homelessness and a greater understanding of the causes of homelessness. More broadly, social capital may also have the effect of making the overall economy run more efficiently while also reducing inequality.

There is a substantial body of research showing that facilities and services, such as those provided by Haven for Hope, lead to a reduction in crime in the community in which they exist. The benefits from reduced crime capture the social benefits of this reduced criminal activity to San Antonio and the Bexar County area. These benefits include reduction in criminal justice system costs, tangible costs to the victim, crime career costs, and pain and suffering costs. In total, the benefits derived from the reduced criminal activity are about $165 million.

Haven for Hope serves many children whose families are experiencing homelessness. The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act requires that students who are experiencing homelessness "have the right to remain in their schools of origin" if they move and "transportation must be provided to or from a student's school of origin" (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 2). While they are at Haven for Hope, these children are kept in the same school they were attending before they came to Haven for Hope. In yet another example of the radical compassion and respect and dignity with which they care for persons experiencing homelessness, Haven for Hope works with each of the school districts so the children at Haven for Hope are the first ones picked up in the morning and the last one dropped off each day, so none of the other students become aware that their classmates are staying at Haven for Hope. Being able to have the stability provided by staying in the same school can have significant benefits to the educational outcomes of these students. In other words, being moved from school to school even a few times has been shown to negatively affect educational outcomes. This is likely to have effects on the wages these students will earn over their lifetimes once they enter the workforce. The benefits of providing them this school stability is projected to yield higher wages of $307 million for the population of students served at Haven for Hope over their careers. This increased income will also result in more economic activity due to the increased spending of the students served at Haven for Hope. This will result in enhanced economic growth that will generate more jobs and incomes for others in the local economy contributing an additional $276 million in benefits.

The last benefits measured are the value of the medical care, housing, and other care services provided at Haven for Hope. These services improve the quality of life and even extend the lives of those who receive these services. For example, it is well documented that persons

experiencing homelessness have higher mortality rates, so by finding them homes, these mortality rates may be reduced. Additionally, providing those who are experiencing homelessness with a full range of healthcare will also likely improve their quality of life. Based on these effects, the value of these services is calculated using a measure called a quality-adjusted life year. It is standard practice in cost-benefit analysis to provide a range for these values, so low, high, and average values were calculated in this analysis. The average value of these services is estimated to be $11.6 billion with a range from $5.4 billion to $17.6 billion (see Table 3).

The costs of Haven for Hope used to calculate the net benefits were the organization's total expenses from 2007 to 2024. While operations did not begin until 2010, there were expenditures from 2007 to 2009, so those costs are included in the analysis.

Table 3. Net Benefits of Haven for Hope: 2007-2024

Haven for Hope Operations	
Employment	5,203
Labor income	$311,769,517
Contributions to gross regional product	$390,093,128
Output	$648,800,789
Revenues to local, state, and federal governments	$85,308,187
Economic Impacts of Volunteers	
Employment	22.6
Labor income	$1,172,311
Contributions to gross regional product	$1,959,249
Output	$6,043,578
Revenues to local, state, and federal governments	$438,733
Benefits from Reduced Crime	
Reduction in criminal justice system costs	$102,000,000
Reduction in other social costs of crime	$62,975,535

Benefits from School Stability	
Increased lifetime earnings	$307,332,569
Increased employment supported	1,575
Increased labor income	$82,053,569
Increased contribution to gross regional product	$154,689,912
Increased output	$275,869,413
Benefits of Medical Care, Housing, & Other Care Services	
Average Value	$11,603,159,211
Low Value	$5,438,980,880
High Value	$17,646,471,300
Total Benefits	
Average	$13,006,181,095
Low	$6,842,002,764
High	$19,049,493,184
Total Expenses: 2007-2024	$313,360,290
Net Benefits	
Average	$12,692,820,805
Low	$6,528,642,474
High	$18,736,132,894
Benefit-Cost Ratio	
Average	$41.51
Low	$21.83
High	$60.79

As shown in Table 3, over its history of operations from 2010 to 2024, Haven for Hope has provided net benefits to the community in the range of $6.5 billion to $18.7 billion with an average of about $6.5 billion. Measured by the benefit-cost ratio, the benefits to the community generated by Haven for Hope per dollar spent (measured as the organization's total expenses) ranged from $21.83 to $60.79 with an average of $41.51.

III. The Economic and Fiscal Impacts of Haven for Hope Operations

III.1. Economic Impact Concepts

Economic impact analysis measures the effects on an economy of the operations of an organization or new spending activity. This economic activity generates revenue to businesses that is used to pay their workers' salaries and benefits, purchase inputs from local suppliers, and pay government taxes and fees. The direct economic impact is derived from the production activity of the businesses and the salaries and benefits they are then able to pay their workers. This also generates additional economic activity oftentimes referred to as the multiplier effects.

The multiplier can be separated into two effects: the indirect effect and the induced effect. The indirect effect results from the company purchasing inputs (physical goods or services) from its local suppliers. This then sets off additional spending by the supplier in its purchases of inputs and payment of salaries and benefits to its employees. The induced effect is derived from the spending of the employees of the company resulting from the incomes they receive. This is where the economic impact really begins to spread throughout the economy as workers spend their incomes to buy the various goods and services that they need and desire. All of this economic activity also benefits the government at various levels as the spending by businesses, their employees, and others generate tax revenues and fees. For instance, these activities will generate excise, income, and property tax revenues, social security contributions, and various license fees.

Of course, not all of this economic activity is captured within the local economy. There are leakages as businesses and individual consumers purchase goods and services outside of the local economy causing some money to leak or flow out of the local economy. This is also the case as federal and state taxes and fees are paid resulting from these activities. These leakages

are accounted for in the model and are not counted as part of the economic impact. In fact, they reduce the impact of these activities.

There are generally four basic multipliers used to measure the overall impacts. The output multipliers measure the indirect and induced changes in output across the economy resulting from a change in economic activity within the local economy. The gross regional product[9] or value added multipliers measure the indirect and induced changes in gross regional across the economy resulting from a change in economic activity within the local economy. The employment multipliers measure indirect and induced changes in employment across the economy resulting from this change in economic activity. Finally, the labor income multiplier measures the indirect and induced changes in labor income (including benefits) across the economy resulting from the change in economic activity. Like the proverbial ripples resulting from a rock being thrown in a pond, the multiplier effects will register successive rounds of effects until eventually the leakage from each round halts the process.

Input-output analysis was introduced by Wassily Leontief for which he later received the Nobel Prize in economics in 1973.[10] An input-output model describes the economic interactions or trade flows among businesses, households, and governments and shows how changes in one area of the economy impact other areas. The multipliers that result from these models are the expressions of these interactions. The analysis is conducted using the IMPLAN input-output model for the San Antonio metropolitan statistical area. The IMPLAN model measures the economic interactions across 546 industries.

---

[9] Gross regional product is the same as the gross domestic product and is a measure of value added by firms in the region resulting from the changes in economic activity. Gross regional product is used to indicate the value added at the regional or metropolitan area geography.

[10] For an example of his seminal work, see: Leontief, Wassily et al., *Studies in the Structure of the American Economy: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in Input-Output Analysis,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

III.2. Data and Adjustments to Impact Results

The IMPLAN input-output model for the San Antonio Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) was used to calculate the economic and fiscal impacts of the operations of Haven for Hope. The total income, employment, and employee compensation were pulled from the Form 990 filed for each year and were input into the model as industry events.

Since Haven for Hope is a non-profit, two adjustments were made to the economic and fiscal impact outputs from the model. One, the direct taxes on production and income and the direct taxes on enterprises at the state and local and federal government levels were summed and then subtracted from the direct gross regional product (GRP) and output impacts. Two, the model automatically calculates the direct tax payments as if the organizations were for-profit entities, but since they are non-profits, the direct tax payments were removed from the fiscal impact results. In other words, only the tax revenues generated by the induced and indirect economic activity generated by the operations of Haven for Hope were included in the fiscal impacts of the operations.

Over the period from 2010 to 2024, the operations at Haven for Hope supported average employment of 347 jobs per year or 5,203 jobs in total, although the total jobs are not unique jobs in that some of the positions are present from year-to-year (see Table 4). The workers in these jobs earned income, including benefits, over the fifteen years of $311.8 million or $20.8 million on average per year. The economic impact of the operations of Haven for Hope as measured by contributions to gross regional product in the San Antonio metropolitan economy amounted to almost $26.0 million per your or $390.1 million over the entire time period. As measured by total output generated in the economy, the overall economic impacts exceeded $648.8 million, equivalent to $43.3 million per year.

Table 4. Economic Impacts of Haven for Hope Operations: 2010-2024
(Includes multiplier effects)

	Total Impacts	*Average Annual Impacts*
Employment	5,203	347
Labor Income (2025 $)	$311,769,517	$20,784,634
Contributions to GRP (2025 $)	$390,093,128	$26,006,209
Output (2025 $)	$648,800,789	$43,253,386

The economic activity of the operations of Haven for Hope as previously discussed also generated revenues to government agencies at all levels. As shown in Table 5, over the fifteen-year period, $85.3 million in revenues flowed to the various government agencies due to the economic activity stimulated by Haven for Hope. On average, the cities and towns within the San Antonio area received almost $107 thousand dollars per year, and the school districts and other specials districts received revenues of about $247 thousand annually. The county governments in the area received $93 thousand per year, while the State of Texas and Federal governments received $539 thousand and $4.7 million on average each year, respectively.

Table 5. Fiscal Impacts of Haven for Hope Operations: 2010-2024
(Includes multiplier effects)

Government Agency	*Total Revenues (2025 $)*	*Annual Average Revenues (2025 $)*
Cities and Towns	$1,604,985	$106,999
School Districts and Other Special Districts	$3,701,963	$246,798
Counties	$1,391,285	$92,752
State	$8,087,921	$539,195
Federal	$70,522,034	$4,701,469
Total	$85,308,187	$5,687,212

The operations of Haven for Hope also impact many other industries across the San Antonio metropolitan economy. This results from the spending of the organization to support their operations, as well as the spending of their employees (i.e., the indirect and induced multiplier effects). The top twenty industries impacted based on total employment supported by the economic activities of Haven for Hope are shown in Table 6.[11] These industries include restaurants, real estate, hospitals, and retail, among others.

Table 6. Impacts on Employment of Haven for Hope Operations by Industry: 2010-2024
(Top 20 Industries)

Industry	*Total Employment (Includes multiplier effects)*
Full-service restaurants	139
Other real estate	100
Limited-service restaurants	82
Other financial investment activities	69
Employment services	64
Couriers and messengers	58
Monetary authorities and depository credit intermediation	48
Hospitals	46
Offices of physicians	44
All other food and drinking places	37
Retail - Food and beverage stores	35
Retail - General merchandise stores	33
Management of companies and enterprises	31
Home health care services	30
Retail - Nonstore retailers	29
Individual and family services	28
Truck transportation	27
Warehousing and storage	26
Automotive repair and maintenance, except car washes	26
Management consulting services	26

[11] The industry in which Haven for Hope operates is not included in the table because all of the employment, except for five jobs, is Haven for Hope employment, and the purpose of this table is to illustrate the other industries positively imapacted by Haven for Hope.

IV. Impacts of Volunteers at Haven for Hope

IV.1. Methodology

Data were provided by Haven for Hope on the number of individual and group volunteers and the total number of hours of service contributed by the volunteers for each fiscal year from 2013 through 2024. The service hours for individuals were not recorded for 2013 and 2014, but the number of individual volunteers for these years was provided. In order to get an estimate of the dollar value of the contribution of the volunteers to Haven for Hope, the total number of service hours was multiplied by the average wage (discussed below), so it was necessary to estimate the number of service hours of the individual volunteers for 2013 and 2014. In order to get this estimate, the average number of service hours per individual volunteers was calculated for each year from 2015 through 2019. The period from 2015-2019 was used as it fit the trend better than using all of the data from 2015-2024, which included large declines in 2020 and 2021. The average across all of those years was calculated and multiplied by the number of individual volunteers in 2013 and 2014 to get an estimate of the number of individual volunteer service hours in those respective years. The total number of individual volunteers and service hours by year is provided in Table 7.

Wages were pulled from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Statistics database for the San Antonio metropolitan statistical area.[12] In order to calculate an average wage to be used to calculate an estimate of the value of the contribution of the volunteers, occupations were selected that match the kind of activities in which the volunteers engage at Haven for Hope. The average wage across all of these occupations was calculated (see

[12] Source: https://data.bls.gov/oes/#/geoOcc/Multiple%20occupations%20for%20one%20geographical%20area

Table 8) and then multiplied by the number of volunteer hours contributed each year to get the dollar value of the contribution of the volunteers as shown in Table 7. Data were available as of March 2024, so this wage was used across all years.

Table 7. Volunteer Contribution by Year

	Number of Volunteers	*Volunteer Service Hours*	*Volunteer Contributed Value*
2013	1,124	4,205	$65,975
2014	1,525	5,581	$87,563
2015	1,464	8,623	$135,291
2016	1,895	9,178	$143,999
2017	2,227	13,600	$213,378
2018	3,175	18,339	$287,731
2019	2,575	14,087	$221,019
2020	1,433	8,771	$137,613
2021	705	4,374	$68,626
2022	1,815	8,891	$139,496
2023	2,807	9,587	$150,416
2024	3,021	11,486	$180,210
Total	23,766	116,722	$1,831,315

Table 8. Average Wage by Occupation: 2024

Occupation Code	*Occupation Title*	*Average Hourly Wage*
21-0000	Community and Social Service Occupations	$27.60
35-2011	Cooks, Fast Food	$12.94
35-2012	Cooks, Institution and Cafeteria	$15.90
35-2014	Cooks, Restaurant	$15.83
35-2015	Cooks, Short Order	$14.93
35-2019	Cooks, All Other	$14.80
35-2021	Food Preparation Workers	$15.20
35-3023	Fast Food and Counter Workers	$13.32
35-3031	Waiters and Waitresses	$15.16
35-3041	Food Servers, Nonrestaurant	$13.95
35-9011	Dining Room and Cafeteria Attendants and Bartender Helpers	$13.74
35-9021	Dishwashers	$13.76

35-9031	Hosts and Hostesses, Restaurant, Lounge, and Coffee Shop	$12.62
35-9099	Food Preparation and Serving Related Workers, All Other	$13.82
37-2011	Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	$15.75
37-2012	Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	$14.28
37-2019	Building Cleaning Workers, All Other	$18.73
37-2021	Pest Control Workers	$22.39
37-3011	Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers	$17.39
39-2021	Animal Caretakers	$15.66
39-3091	Amusement and Recreation Attendants	$13.13
39-9011	Childcare Workers	$14.27
	Average of All Occupations	$15.69

IV.2. Value of the Contribution of Volunteers Measured by Economic Impacts

Volunteers contribute valuable unpaid work to many nonprofit organizations, including Haven for Hope. However, since they are not employees of the organization and do not get paid for their work, the direct employment and labor income are zeroed out in the economic impact figures provided in Table 9. Additionally, the direct labor income is subtracted from the direct contribution to gross regional product (GRP) and the output. The full indirect and induced multiplier effects are included in the assessments of their economic impacts.

Looking at the contribution and impacts of the volunteers, there were 23,766 volunteers who contributed 116,722 service hours with an estimated value of $1,831,315. As shown in Table 9, the impacts on employment and labor income of the volunteers amounts to 22.6 jobs with labor income of $1,172,311 over the twelve-year period. These figures only include the indirect and induced effects. The number of volunteers and the estimate of the dollar value of their contributed work are not counted in the economic impacts.[13] The contributions to GRP of

[13] See the following link on this methodology from IMPLAN for further details. https://implanhelp.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/360049725453-Volunteers-Estimating-the-Economic-Impact-of-Free-Labor

$1,959,249 and output of $6,043,578 include all of the economic impacts – direct, indirect, and induced – less the direct labor income subtracted from the direct contributions to GRP and output. Only the revenues received by government entities derived from the induced and indirect effects are included in the fiscal impacts shown in Table 10.

Table 9. Economic Impacts of Volunteers at Haven for Hope: 2013-2024

	Total Impacts	*Average Annual Impacts*
Employment	22.6	1.9
Labor Income (2025 $)	$1,172,311	$97,693
Contributions to GRP (2025 $)	$1,959,249	$163,271
Output (2025 $)	$6,043,578	$503,631

Table 10. Fiscal Impacts of Volunteers at Haven for Hope: 2013-2024

Government Agency	*Total Revenues (2025 $)*	*Annual Average Revenues (2025 $)*
Cities and Towns	$17,778	$1,481
School Districts and Other Special Districts	$40,833	$3,403
Counties	$15,146	$1,262
State	$85,693	$7,141
Federal	$279,284	$23,274
Total	$438,733	$36,561

IV.3. Other Contributions of Volunteers

These numbers illustrating the economic impacts of the volunteers at Haven for Hope provide a measure of the value of their contributions, but they do not capture the full value to the community and even more so to the local economy. This is because volunteering is a key factor in the development of trust among the diversity of people in the community (Putnam, 2000;

Wilson & Musick, 2000) further enhancing the social capital of a community (Miller et al., 2011; Afif, 2010; Fox, 2019).

While not measured, a valuable contribution that warrants consideration, the social capital is defined as "connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" (Putnam, 2000, p. 19), or to broaden the definition a bit, social capital is "the shared experiences, webs of relationships, and norms of reciprocity that underpin the smooth functioning of society" (Cortright, 2015a, p. 4). "The smooth functioning of society" certainly includes the local economy, and as such, enhances the economic impacts of volunteering through its effects on social capital.

> [A] sense of mutual obligation is important both to society, and the effective function of markets. When we live in communities, places where most people have a strong sense of mutual obligation to look out for and take care of one another, social problems are lessened and economies run more smoothly…One of the most fundamental of these measures [of social capital] is volunteering (Cortright, 2017).

However, as Putnam (2000) documented over three decades ago in his publication, *Bowling Alone*, social capital has been on the decline, and we have been experiencing some of its effects, as he so presciently foresaw. Cortright has also more recently discussed the continued decline in social capital and its effects through his research.

> The civic commons, the places we share with the rest of society, are where interaction underpins opportunity and democracy.
>
> While cities continue to fulfill this critical role, there is compelling evidence that the connective tissue that binds us together is coming apart. In particular, it appears that the level of social capital—the connections and norms of reciprocity that smooth

> interpersonal actions and support community—has declined in the United States over several decades (Cortright, 2015a, p. 2).

The possibility that the enhancement of social capital through the volunteer activities at Haven for Hope arrests some of this decline lends even more to its importance. This holds true for volunteerism generally, but specifically to the issue of homelessness, the volunteer opportunities at Haven for Hope provide many people with more empathy for persons experiencing homelessness and a deeper understanding of the causes of homelessness. This may serve as a catalyst to find solutions to the reduction of homelessness that may otherwise not have occurred or would have taken longer to be conceived and implemented were it not for the volunteer opportunities at Haven for Hope.

Social capital also has the potential of being a driver of economic policy. There often exists a tension between whether an economic policy will make the economy more efficient or more equitable. Efficiency and equity are often times deemed to be mutually exclusive; public policy can achieve one or the other but not both. The evidence provided by the research seems to indicate that the development of social capital through volunteering may make the economy both more efficient and potentially more equitable. In other words, volunteering, through its effects on the development of social capital, removes the barrier between efficiency and equity. This may especially be the case with respect to homelessness as the work of Haven for Hope in collaboration with its volunteers and partners helps reduce the inequities in housing, income, health, and education while building trust among disparate groups that makes the local economy function more efficiently.

V. Social Benefits Associated with Reduction in Crime

Many people experiencing homelessness suffer with various health ailments, including mental illness and substance use (Baggett et al., 2013; Burt, 1999; Breakey et al., 1989; Wright, 1990; Hwang, 2000; Koegel et al., 1988; Koegel & Burnam, 1988; Susser et al. 1989; Gelberg et al., 1990; Ferenchick, 1991; Fischer & Breakey, 1991; Gelberg & Linn, 1992; Gelberg & Leake, 1993; Nusselder et al., 2013; Fazel et al., 2008; Nielsen et al., 2011; Beijer et al, 2011). In Bexar County, 51% of patients experiencing homelessness have a mental illness diagnosis (Capital Healthcare Planning, 2018, p. 16). Besides engaging in criminal activity out of necessity due to severe deprivation of resources, being mentally ill or engaging in substance use may also lead to criminal activity among persons experiencing homelessness (Solarz, 1985; Dover, 2017; Martell et al., 1995). This means that providing persons experiencing homelessness with more expansive access to healthcare is not only compassionate, but it may also reduce criminal activity and the associated costs in the community (Doleac, 2018).

Bondurant et al. (2016) analyzed the effects on crime of increasing the number of substance abuse treatment (SAT) facilities in a community. As they argue, SAT facilities may reduce crime by reducing the use of drugs and reducing related illegal financial activity and reducing the violence oftentimes associated with the drug trade (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 2). They also note that since a large number of drug abusers also have mental illnesses that exacerbate their addiction and related violent behavior, SAT facilities can help ameliorate such violent behavior and related crimes by "direct[ing] patients towards treatment for underlying mental health problems" (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 2).

However, there is often concern among residents in the neighborhoods near a SAT facility that it will cause crime to increase because it attracts people who are more prone to commit crimes. Bondurant et al. (2016) find the opposite in their research when analyzing the effects of increasing SAT facilities at the county level.

> Our analysis reveals significant and robust evidence that expanding access to SAT through additional treatment facilities reduces local crime. The effects appear to be particularly pronounced for relatively serious violent and financially motivated crimes: homicides, aggravated assaults, robbery, and motor vehicle theft. We do not find significant effects on more frequent but less serious crimes (simple assault, burglary, and larceny), nor do we find a significant effect on sexual assault. Overall, we find that an additional treatment facility reduces felony-type crimes by 0.10 percent annually (Bondurant et al., 2016, pp. 3-4).

Through their analysis, they find that an additional SAT facility reduces the mortality rate associated with drug abuse by 0.5% annually resulting in a reduction "in a county's annual drug-related mortality costs by 4.2 to 4.8 million dollars" (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 18) based on a value per life saved between 7 to 8 million dollars. Beyond these reductions in the social cost of crime, they find "that an additional SAT facility in a county reduces municipal crime costs by 0.14% annually, which corresponds to approximately $700,000 per municipality" (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 18). The results in a total reduction in crime costs to local governments of about $4.2 million annually, assuming an average of six municipal governments in each county. The upshot is that adding a SAT facility in a local community may yield total annual benefits between 8.4 to 9 million dollars (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 18).

Similarly, Haven for Hope directs the people they serve with mental illness and/or drug addiction to their on-campus and off-campus partners who can provide appropriate treatments. Additionally, they work with local law enforcement agencies helping those involved in related criminal activities to receive treatment instead of just being incarcerated. The social benefits derived from increasing accessing to a broad scope of health services through the programs provided by Haven for Hope and their partners are analyzed elsewhere in this report and thus cover these benefits discussed by Bondurant et al. While Haven for Hope is not specifically a SAT facility, it seems reasonable that the services they provide in collaboration with their healthcare partners and law enforcement agencies to increase access to health care, especially for mental illness and substance use, effectively make it an additional SAT facility in the San Antonio community.

Another important service provided to persons experiencing homelessness at Haven for Hope is assistance with attaining the various public services available to them, including Medicaid coverage. “28% of patients identified as Homeless (or Near Homeless) had Medicaid coverage” (Capital Healthcare Planning 2018, 18). This expands their access to healthcare and hopefully helps them feel better and enhances their quality of life. This is the compassionate thing to do and in and of itself provides some justification for the existence of these programs, but beyond that, there is a benefit to the community of increasing their access to healthcare by getting them their Medicaid benefits.

In an analysis of the expansion of Medicaid services across states between 2001 and 2008, Wen et al. (2017) find that the increased access to healthcare through expansion of Medicaid yields a “benefit-cost ratio of 1.8 to 3.2, that is, a 10 percent relative increase in the SUD [substance use disorder] treatment rate at an average cost of $1.6 billion yields a crime

reduction benefit of $2.9 billion to $5.1 billion" (Wen et al, 2017, p. 68). Their study focuses on the benefits from reduction in crime due to increased access to treatment for substance use through the Medicaid expansion, but "it's possible that Medicaid expansions affect criminal behavior through other channels as well – for instance, it also increases access to mental health care and reduces financial instability" (Doleac, 2016). To this latter point, Aos et al. (2006) find that the crime reduction resulting from receiving mental health treatment yields social benefits of $0.26 per dollar spent on treatment. Vogler (2018) also analyzes the effects of the expansion of Medicaid on reduction in crime and the related social cost savings. His analysis focuses on the expansion with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. He finds that in those states that chose to increase Medicaid coverage, the incidence of violent crime fell by 6.0% and property crime fell by 3.1% with an overall reduction in criminal activity of 3.3% compared to those states that chose not to increase Medicaid coverage. This results in a social cost savings of $13 billion (Vogler, 2018, p. 3).

Haven for Hope in collaboration with its partners are increasing access to healthcare, especially treatment for mental illness and substance use, assisting their clients in getting Medicaid, Veterans benefits, and other social services. As shown by the research discussed above, these services are found to reduce criminal activity. This has also been the case for the services provided by Haven for Hope. In a study conducted by Center for Healthcare Services – Restoration Center, these services provided by Haven for Hope along with their collaborations with local law enforcement agencies have resulted in "$100 million in cost savings for jails, emergency rooms and courtrooms for City and County governments." These services have also resulted in $2 million in savings for the San Antonio Police Department by allowing officers to

be back on the streets due to Haven for Hope's campus and the services offered there (as cited in Haven for Hope, 2022, p.4).

However, crime has costs to society beyond the costs to local governments. In other words, there is a social cost to crime. While these social costs include those of the criminal justice system, they also include tangible costs to the victim, crime career costs, and pain and suffering costs (McCollister et al., 2011, pp. 6-9). Tangible victim costs can include "medical expenses, cash losses, property theft or damage, and lost earnings because of injury and other victimization-related consequences" (McCollister et al., 2011, p. 7). Crime career costs are the productivity losses derived from "an individual choos[ing] to engage in illegal activities as opposed to legal employment that contributes to Gross Domestic Product (GDP)" (McCollister et al., 2011, p. 7). Accounting for the social costs of crime, therefore, provides a broader or more complete measure of the costs of crime to society.

In order to calculate the value of the reduction in social costs of crime, it was assumed that the annual social cost of crime is $1,551,538 per 1,000 people (Bondurant et al., 2016, p. 16). This figure was multiplied by the Bexar County population each year from 2010 to 2019 to get the total social costs of crime. To estimate the reduction in the social cost of crime, it is assumed that reduction in the social cost of crime is the same as the reduction in crime cost savings to local governments resulting from a substance abuse treatment center of 0.14% reported buy Bondurant et al. (2016, p. 16). Multiplying the 0.14% by the total social cost of crime in Bexar County yields the reduction in the total social cost of crime due to Haven for Hope. As shown in Table 11, this results in a total reduction in the social costs of crime in Bexar County of $62.9 million over the fifteen-year period covered in this analysis.

Table 11. Reduction in Social Cost of Crime

Year	*Bexar County Population*	*Social Cost of Crime*	*Reduction in Social Cost of Crime*
2010	1,714,773	$2,660,535,471	$3,724,750
2011	1,756,262	$2,724,907,231	$3,814,870
2012	1,784,731	$2,769,077,966	$3,876,709
2013	1,813,421	$2,813,591,591	$3,939,028
2014	1,846,354	$2,864,688,392	$4,010,564
2015	1,890,984	$2,933,933,533	$4,107,507
2016	1,918,444	$2,976,538,767	$4,167,154
2017	1,952,946	$3,030,069,931	$4,242,098
2018	1,979,294	$3,070,949,854	$4,299,330
2019	1,997,417	$3,099,068,377	$4,338,696
2020	2,015,635	$3,127,334,297	$4,378,268
2021	2,031,425	$3,151,833,082	$4,412,566
2022	2,064,050	$3,202,452,009	$4,483,433
2023	2,098,449	$3,255,823,365	$4,558,153
2024	2,128,031	$3,301,720,962	$4,622,409
	Total		$62,975,535

As mentioned above, Haven for Hope has yielded $102 million in cost savings to the jails, emergency rooms, courtrooms, and San Antonio Police Department. This is likely a conservative figure since it was reported in 2022, so it does not include the years following that are covered in this report. Adding the $62.9 million to the $102 million gives a reduction in crime costs of $164.9 million. McCollister et al. (2010) found that the tangible costs to the victim, crime career costs, and pain and suffering costs comprise about 35% of the total social costs of crime across a range of criminal activity, while the costs to the criminal justice system account for the balance of the social costs. Our measure of these former components of the social costs fits with the findings of the Center for Healthcare Services – Restoration Center on the reduction in the costs to the local criminal justice system derived from the services provided at

Haven for Hope, given all of the years covered in the reduction in the social costs of crime are not included in the cost reductions to the criminal justice and healthcare systems.

VI. Benefits from Providing Medical Care, Housing, and Other Care

Haven for Hope and its partners provide a number of interventions or elements of care for each individual person. For example, these include medical care, dental care, mental health care, meals, temporary housing, facilitation with applications for government support programs, job search guidance, and assistance finding permanent housing. Many of those who receive some combination of these elements of care are able to extend their lives and enhance their quality of life. One example of the success of Haven for Hope and its partners is illustrated by the fact that they have helped 7,598 individuals find employment over the period from 2011 to 2024.[14] Their success in helping those receiving services at Haven for Hope find housing is discussed later.

One common way to measure the value of these benefits in cost-benefit analysis is through the use of the quality-adjusted life-year.

> The quality-adjusted life year (QALY) is the academic standard for measuring how well all different kinds of medical treatments lengthen and/or improve patients' lives, and therefore the metric has served as a fundamental component of cost-effectiveness analyses in the US and around the world for more than 30 years. If evidence shows that a treatment helps lengthen life or improve quality of life, these benefits are comprehensively summed up to calculate how many additional QALYs the treatment provides…(Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, n.d., para. 3)

[14] Data provided by Haven for Hope.

It is well documented that persons experiencing homelessness have higher mortality rates (Ackeret et al., 2014; Aldridge, 2015; Baggett et al., 2015; Hwang, 2000; Roncarati et al., 2018; Roncarati et al., 2020; Nusselder et al., 2013; Romaszko, 2017). So, while the various interventions provided by Haven for Hope and its partners may not all fit under the definition of a "medical treatment," the combination of the treatments, even if not considered medical, could result in the enhancement of the quantity and/or quality of life of the people they serve. "Estimating the number of quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) enables comparison with interventions that save lives or enhance the quality of life" (Fuguitt and Wilcox, 1999, p. 278). This technique has been applied to assess the value of medical treatments of persons experiencing homelessness (Ackeret et al., 2014; Aldridge, 2015). It is on this basis that in order to measure the social benefits of the interventions provided by Haven for Hope, the value of the quality-adjusted life years (QALY) attained by the people helped with the services at Haven for Hope are calculated. This methodology is summarized in the following description.

> The term "quality-adjusted life-year" or "QALY" is a measure of health outcomes pertaining to disease burden and is used to assess the value of medical interventions. As health can be defined as length of life and the quality of life, the QALY combines the two factors into a single figure.
>
> In other words, quality-adjusted life-year measures how many additional months or years of life of a reasonable quality a patient or person may gain due to treatment (Health Analytics, 2022, para. 1 and 2).

The calculation of the number of quality-adjusted life years and the related social benefits relied upon plug-in values from published research and data provided by Haven for Hope. According to Aldridge (2015), each year a person experiences homelessness is equivalent to the

loss of 0.117 quality-adjusted life year. Romazsco et al. (2017) find that "the average life span of a homeless person was shorter by about 17.5 years than that recorded for the general population" (p. 1). Additionally, a study of the mortality rates of persons experiencing homelessness in Rotterdam found that the "life expectancy at age 30 years was 11.0 (95% CI 9.1-12.9) and 15.9 (95% CI 10.3-21.5) years lower for homeless men and women compared to men and women in the general population respectively" (Nusselder et al., 2013, p. 1). In a study of unsheltered adults in Boston, Massachusetts, the average age at death of a person experiencing homelessness was 53 years (Roncarati et al., 2018, para. 9). The average age of a person receiving services at Haven for Hope is 38 years. In order to be conservative in terms of the estimated life span of a person experiencing homelessness in San Antonio, it is assumed they will live another fifteen years on average if they continue to experience homelessness. This corresponds to the age at death of persons experiencing homelessness of 53 years as found in Roncarati et al. (2018), and the result of the research of Nusselder et al. (2013) that the life span of men and women experiencing homelessness is 11.0 and 15.9 years lower than the general population, respectively.

Since a year of homelessness was found to be equivalent to 0.117 quality-adjusted life year, multiplying the 0.117 by fifteen years results in 1.755 quality-adjusted life years persons experiencing homelessness would lose if they continued to experience homelessness. With services provided by Haven for Hope, many of the homeless will attain shelter and gain the quality-adjusted life years they would have lost were they to experience homelessness.

The gain of 1.755 quality-adjusted life years can be translated into a dollar value by multiplying this figure by the value of a statistical life instead of placing a value on each life. "The proper value of the risk reduction benefits for government policy is society's willingness to

pay for the benefits. In the case of mortality risk reduction, the benefit is the value of the reduced probability of death that is experienced by the affected population, not the value of the lives that have been saved ex post" (Viscusi and Aldy, 2003, p.2). This follows the best practices recommended for application of cost-benefit analysis to assess the net benefits of federal government policies. "OMB [Office of Management and Budget] has published guidelines for all Federal agencies, such as its report with respect to the use of 'best practices' in these analyses (U.S. OMB 1996). The guidance recommends the use of a value of a statistical life to monetize the benefits associated with rules that change the population's mortality risk" (Viscusi and Aldy, 2003, p. 55).

The value of a statistical life is a measure of how much people are willing to pay for a reduction in their mortality risk. The value of a statistical life is not the value that a specific individual places on their life or willingness or ability to pay. The following discussion from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency clarifies what the value of a statistical life measures.

> In the scientific literature, these estimates of willingness to pay for small reductions in mortality risks are often referred to as the "value of a statistical life." This is because these values are typically reported in units that match the aggregate dollar amount that a large group of people would be willing to pay for a reduction in their individual risks of dying in a year, such that we would expect one fewer death among the group during that year on average. This is best explained by way of an example. Suppose each person in a sample of 100,000 people were asked how much he or she would be willing to pay for a reduction in their individual risk of dying of 1 in 100,000, or 0.001%, over the next year. Since this reduction in risk would mean that we would expect one fewer death among the sample of 100,000 people over the next year on average, this is sometimes described as

> "one statistical life saved." Now suppose that the average response to this hypothetical question was $100. Then the total dollar amount that the group would be willing to pay to save one statistical life in a year would be $100 per person × 100,000 people, or $10 million. This is what is meant by the "value of a statistical life." Importantly, this is not an estimate of how much money any single individual or group would be willing to pay to prevent the certain death of any particular person (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, n.d., para. 2).

In some instances, the value of a life is equated to the wage or income a person earns, or it is argued that the value of a statistical life is too high because the person is not able to pay that much money. Such an argument is not correct given what the value of a statistical life measures. Furthermore, it is also not appropriate given that a person experiencing homelessness earns little to no income, so arguing that their lives are worth the value of the income or wages they earn over their lifetime is similar to saying their lives are worth nothing or very little at best. The same issue arises with the idea that the value of a statistical life cannot represent the willingness to pay of a person experiencing homelessness because they cannot afford to pay such an amount, but again, this is not what the value of a statistical life measures, as stated above.

To calculate the value of a statistical life for this analysis, the guidance on the value to use from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services was used as the base figures. Their average recommended value for the U.S. is $9.6 million with a range between $4.5 million and $14.6 million (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2016, p. 15). Since these figures are in 2014-dollar values, they were adjusted to 2024 values using the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers in the U.S. (i.e., CPI-U). These adjustments gave an average value of $11,776,649 with a range from $5,520,304 to $17,910,321. In addition, these figures are adjusted

to reflect the local socio-economic and demographic conditions, since the value of a statistical life varies across many of these factors such as income, gender, age, occupation, and culture among others (Blomquist, 2004; Kochi, Hubbell, and Kramer, 2006; Lindhjem, Navrud, Braathen, and Biausque, 2011; Mrozek and Taylor, 2002; Viscusi, 1993; Viscusi and Aldy, 2003). There is also evidence of a positive income elasticity of the value of a statistical life, so it is common practice to adjust the value of a statistical life with differences in income over time and across places (Kneiser and Viscusi, 2019; U.S. Department of Transportation, 2016; Hammitt and Robinson, 2011). This is done by multiplying the figures by the weighted average of the difference in median earnings by educational attainment of the population in the U.S. who are 25 years and older and the same population in Bexar County. This resulted in a reduction of 14.5%. The figures were then adjusted further to be more representative of the incomes of those who seek services at Haven for Hope. This adjustment was done by multiplying the proportion of median earnings of those who are 25 years or older in Bexar County relative to the median earnings of those in Bexar County who have attained at least some college education. This is a further reduction in the value of a statistical life of 54.5%.[15] With these adjustments the average value of statistical life for someone who receives services at Haven for Hope is $5,923,452 with a low of $2,776,618 and a high of $9,008,583.

The value of a life year is then calculated using an annuity factor based on the discount rate of 5.24%, equivalent to the rate on the tax-exempt general obligation bonds issued by the City of San Antonio from 2010 to 2024[16] and the average additional years of the life span of

[15] The data used for the income calculations were pulled from the U.S. Census 2024 American Community Survey 1-year estimates for Bexar County (https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP1Y2024.DP03?g=050XX00US48029), and the 2024 Current Population Survey (https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2025/demo/income-poverty/p60-286.html).

[16] Source: City of San Antonio Annual Comprehensive Financial Reports, Note to Financial Statements, Long-Term Obligations. https://www.sanantonio.gov/Finance/bfi/annual-report

those at Haven for Hope assuming they experience homelessness for fifteen years. This gives an annuity factor of 10.22. The annuity factor is then divided into the average value of a statistical life resulting in an average value of a life year of $579,813. This value of a life year is multiplied by the number of quality adjusted life years of 1.755 to get the total value of services provided by Haven for Hope per person of $1,017,572.

In order to calculate the total value of the benefits of the medical, housing and other care services provided by Haven for Hope, it is necessary to determine the number of unique people who received these services. One of the core functions of Haven for Hope is to help people get back into housing or help them get situated where they can receive a higher level of care or transitions to permanent housing, so the number of persons experiencing homelessness at Haven for Hope who were placed into housing or a higher level of care or place of transition to permanent housing (e.g., group homes, transitional housing, detox programs, or to live with family or friends) is counted as the number who received these various services. For the period of this study, this amounted to 20,646 people. The purpose of these figures it to establish a measure of the benefits of these services provided to those who receive them. The range of services that each person received surely varies from person to person, but finding housing is fundamental to ameliorating any health and other issues beyond the treatment received at Haven for Hope. As such, those who were placed in housing were counted as the number who received these various services.

These calculations are derived from data on the number of total exits to housing or a higher level of care. Data were also provided on the retention rates based over one-year, two-year, three-year, four-year, five-year, and ten-year periods. The retention rate measures the percentage of clients who remain out of Haven for Hope and all community street outreach,

emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven enrollments during the period. In order to account for potential double-counting of people who return to Haven, the number of those who exited Haven for Hope into permanent housing or a higher level of care was reduced by the ten-year retention rate. This captures only those who did not return to Haven for Hope. The ten-year retention rates are only available for 2010-2014 because the time period of the study only covers through 2024 (e.g., 2015 is only nine years from 2024). It is possible to use the one-year, two-year, three-year, four-year, or five-year retention rates and cover more years of data on retention rates but using the average ten-year retention rate for 2010-2014, equal to 55.23%, provided a more conservative measure given it is a smaller figure, since it covers a longer time period..

The retention rate of 55.23% was multiplied by the number of people who exited Haven for Hope into permanent housing or a higher level of care (20,646) to get the number of people who benefited from the medical care, housing services, and other care services (11,403) provided by Haven for Hope and its partners. As shown in the following table, the total value of the benefits of the medical care, housing, and other care services provided by Haven for Hope and its partners amounts to $11.6 billion on average with a range between $5.4 billion and $17.6 billion.

Table 12. Value of Medical Care, Housing, & Other Care Services

Average	$11,603,159,211
Low	$5,438,980,880
High	$17,646,471,300

VII. Benefits from School Stability

For families who have school-age children, Haven for Hope coordinates with the local school districts to have the school buses come to Haven for Hope to pick-up and drop-off the children and take them to the same school they were attending before they began staying at Haven. Furthermore, the pick-up and drop-off times are coordinated, so the students are the first to be picked-up in the mornings and the last to be dropped-off in the afternoon in order to keep other students on the school bus and at their school from knowing where they are staying. Maintaining stability in their schools is important because moving schools has been shown to reduce academic attainment and increase the probability that students will not complete high school (Haveman et al., 1991; Rumberger & Larson, 1998; Roy et al., 2008; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994; Mehana & Reynolds, 2004; Swanson & Schneider, 1999; Scanlon & Devine, 2001). Furthermore, "the effects of mobility intensify when school and residential mobility are combined" (Roy et al., 2008, p. 8). Since these students are already experiencing residential mobility, being able to stay in the same school may reduce the intensity of these impacts.

Improving the students' academic attainment will also likely lead to them earning higher wages over their lifetimes, which will help provide a long-term boost to the local economy. This part of the analysis provides a projection of the economic benefits measured by the potentially higher wages they may earn.

The research by Haveman et al. (1991) shows that if a student moves schools three times at any point before graduation, the probability of graduating from high school declines from 88% to 80%. More specifically, with three moves during the ages of 12 to 15 years, the probability

declines to 74%, and with three moves between the ages of four and seven, the probability declines to 71%. Haveman et al. (1991) obtain these results even after controlling for a number of other potential effects, such as gender, race/ethnicity, religion, "child's family position" (e.g., number of siblings), time spent by parents caring for the child, education level of the parents, "family economic circumstances" (e.g., number of years family was in poverty), whether child's grandparents were poor, and family stressors, such as parental separations and number of times the family moved (Haveman et al., 1991, pp. 138-139). Rumberger and Larson (1998) use similar control variables as Haveman et al. (1991) with the addition of some measures for school characteristics and student engagement and show that students who change schools during high school are 50% more likely to not graduate compared to students who did not change school. According to data from the Texas Education Agency, the high school completion rate (including equivalency) was 91.9% in 2024 (the most recent year in which data are available).[17] It is important to keep in mind the control variables these studies used because they account for many of the conditions, characteristics, and circumstances in which the students at Haven for Hope may also have experienced and which may influence their ability to graduate from high school. By controlling for these factors, these studies isolate the effects of moving schools on educational attainment and as such, provide "clean" plug-in values for use in this analysis.

In order to be as conservative in the calculations as possible, it was assumed that moving schools would have reduced high school graduation rates among the cohort of students at Haven for Hope an additional 8%. This is conservative because based on the aforementioned research the reduced graduation rate could be as high as 26% or 29% depending on the age of the student or 50% if they move while already in high school. Subtracting the 8% from the 92% high school

[17] Source: https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/accountability-research/completion-graduation-and-dropout/four-year-graduation-and-dropout-data-class-of-2024

completion rate, this results in the assumption of 84% of the students completing high school even if they had moved schools. According to data provided by Haven for Hope, they have served 6,173 unique students since 2010. Based on the high school completion rate in 2024, this would mean there would have been 5,673 who would have typically completed high school, and assuming an 8% reduction in completion rates if they would have moved schools would result in 5,185 students who would have completed high school. This means that by allowing the students to stay in their schools, an additional 488 will complete high school.

By completing high school, the students will likely be able to earn a higher wage as they enter the workforce. The amount of this higher wage was calculated by taking the difference between the median annual earnings of the population age 25 years and older in Bexar County in 2024 who have not completed high school (equal to $25,910) and the weighted average median annual earnings of those in the same population who have completed high school or some higher level of education (equal to $51,627).[18] This results in annual median earnings that will be $25,717 higher on average because the students stay in school and at least graduate from high school.

To get to the total amount of increased wages by providing school stability requires additional adjustments. Not all of these students will join the workforce, so it is assumed that 64.3% will participate in the labor force upon completion of their education, equivalent to the labor force participation rate in Bexar County as of 2019.[19] Furthermore, some will experience unemployment during their careers, so the calculation was also adjusted by the average unemployment rate in the San Antonio Metropolitan Statistical Area from January 2000 through

[18] Data source: U.S. Census Bureau 2024 ACS 1-Year Estimates. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP1Y2024.DP03?g=050XX00US48029
[19] Data source: U.S. Census Bureau 2024 ACS 1-Year Estimates. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP1Y2024.DP03?g=050XX00US48029

December 2019, which equals 5.0%.[20] Since some workers will move outside of the area in the future, so this is accounted by applying the outmigration rate in Bexar County from 2016-2020 of 4.5% based on data from the U.S. Census is necessary.[21] Lastly, it is assumed that each person will have a working career of forty-two years based on working from age 25 to 67, corresponding to the retirement age set by Social Security. The calculations are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Calculations of the Benefits of Keeping Students in Their Same School

Data Used in Calculations		*Calculations*
A) # children served	6,173	
B) All students graduation rate: 2018	91.90%	
C) Assumed % students who will complete high school even with moves	84%	
D) # students who would typically complete high school	5,673	A*B
E) # students who will complete high school even with moves	5,185	A*C
F) # students who will not complete high school b/c of moves	488	D-E
G) Difference in wage w/o HS diploma and with diploma or higher education	$25,717	
H) Total lost wages annually (assuming all employed)	$12,541,275	F*G
I) Labor force participation rate in Bexar County: 2019	64.3%	
J) Average unemployment rate in San Antonio MSA: Jan 2000-Aug. 2025	4.9%	
K) Outmigration rate for Bexar County: 2016-2020	4.5%	
L) Total lost wages annually with adjustments	$7,317,442	H*I*(1-J)*(1-K)
M) # working years (Age 25-67)	42	
N) Total lost wages over career	$307,332,569	L*M

Under these assumptions, the program to keep the children in the same schools they were attending before they came to Haven for Hope is projected to add over $307.3 million to the total wages of this population of students over their working lives. Another way to consider the impacts of this program is that it adds over $12.5 million in additional earnings on average per

[20] Data source: Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
[21] https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2020/demo/geographic-mobility/county-to-county-migration-2016-2020.html

year to the local economy because the students have a barrier removed that facilitates their graduating from high school and attaining even higher levels of education for some. The upshot is that by improving the chance these students will get more education and training the program enhances their future productivity leading to faster growth in the San Antonio economy.

These higher earnings will also register additional economic impacts as these workers will have the financial means to spend more on various goods and services in the local economy than they otherwise would. This increase in income was run through the IMPLAN input-output model to calculate these impacts, which are shown in the following table. Since these are impacts resulting from higher compensation, the impacts are only measured as an induced multiplier effect. The spending resulting from the higher incomes earned over their lifetimes will support 2,575 jobs with the workers earning $82.1 million in compensation. The economic activity will contribute $154.7 million in gross regional product and output of $275.9 million.

Table 14. Economic Impacts from Lifetime Higher Incomes due to School Stability

Employment	*Labor Income (2025 $)*	*Contributions to GRP (2025 $)*	*Output (2025 $)*
1,575	$82,053,569	$154,689,912	$275,869,413

The impacts will also extend to various government agencies as they receive higher revenues due to the enhanced economic activity (see Table 15). The cities and towns within the San Antonio MSA will receive revenues exceeding $1.6 million, and school districts and other special districts will see their revenues increase by over $3.7 million. Revenues of $1.4 million will flow to counties within the region. The State of Texas and Federal governments will receive revenues of almost $7.7 million and $19.9 million, respectively.

Table 15. Fiscal Impacts from Lifetime Higher Incomes due to School Stability

Government Agency	*Revenues*
Cities and Towns	$1,597,802
School Districts and Other Special Districts	$3,668,238
Counties	$1,358,772
State	$7,665,475
Federal	$19,935,875
Total	$34,226,164

VIII. Response of Haven for Hope to the COVID-19 Pandemic

While the time period of the analysis in this study only covers through 2024 it is worth briefly discussing the response of Haven for Hope to the COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020 because it is yet another illustration of the substantial and important contributions that Haven for Hope makes to our community. The COVID-19 pandemic presented many very difficult and unique challenges for every person and organization, yet those organizations providing essential services to the community had to find ways to meet these challenges even during lockdown and through the slow period of reengaging in typical daily activities. Haven for Hope not only rose to meet these extraordinarily difficult challenges, but they yet again became a model of excellence.

The team at Haven for Hope made numerous adaptations to their operations in order to keep providing their services while ensuring the health and safety of their staff, volunteers, those experiencing homelessness, and the broader San Antonio community. For instance, they implemented head to toe sleeping in the courtyard and campus and developed activities for the children that allowed them to maintain social distancing. They also continued to provide children assistance with their schoolwork in a socially distanced manner. Being in lockdown and having

your movements restricted greatly affected the morale of people everywhere. Recognizing that this may be an issue, Haven for Hope created a "joy" team of staff whose purpose it was to spread cheer and joy throughout the Haven for Hope community (Haven for Hope(a), 2020). Additionally, Haven for Hope has had forty interns from various universities, some of whom were in the Army ROTC programs at their schools, including the University of Kentucky, Our Lady of the Lake University, University of Oklahoma, University of Southern California, University of Texas at San Antonio, University of Texas at Austin, and University of Texas at Arlington (Haven for Hope, personal communication, July 3, 2022).

In collaboration with the City of San Antonio, MetroHealth, and its other partner agencies, Haven for Hope created Operation Hope Away from Haven at a local hotel for their highest-risk clients in order to ensure they continued to receive the care they needed should they become exposed and to aid in social distancing. A 27-page operational plan was developed and implemented for the hotel. Along with being able to closely monitor and provide these clients the care they need, Operation Hope Away from Haven also provided many other services, such as:

- Blankets and sheets
- Towels and washcloths
- Hygiene products
- Coffee and water
- Three meals per day
- Snacks
- Oversized clothing and shoes
- Medication disposal and purchase
- Medical equipment purchase

- Transportation
- Mail distribution (Haven for Hope(b), 2020, p. 4)

Operation Hope Away from Haven was a resounding success at continuing to provide their highest-risk clients with the services and care they needed while limiting the spread of COVID-19 so much so that it continues in operation to this day. Like Haven for Hope has long been, their response in collaboration with the City of San Antonio and their Partner Agencies to the COVID-19 pandemic has become a model.

IX. Conclusion

Haven for Hope has become a model of excellence for how to establish and operate a facility to effectively and efficiently serve those who are experiencing homelessness. As shown in this analysis, their impact has been profound, especially for those they serve, but their overwhelmingly positive impacts extend well into the broader community. In this study, the benefits to the community provided by the services of Haven for Hope during the period from when it started serving persons experiencing homelessness in 2010 through 2024 were calculated. Besides the economic and fiscal impacts of the operations of Haven for Hope, including the important contributions of their numerous partners and volunteers, Haven for Hope is a place where the 52,108 people they have served have been able to find hope and seek a new beginning. The broad array of services provided by Haven for Hope to those persons experiencing homelessness help them not only find permanent housing, but provide them with the care, guidance, and skills each individual needs to begin a successful journey to self-sufficiency. Of course, this enhances their quality of life, but they also become more positively

engaged in the community and more productive members in the local economy. As such, the services provided by Haven for Hope yield benefits throughout their lifetimes.

Haven for Hope's work towards the achievement of their vision of "Empowering individuals and families experiencing homelessness to transform their lives" (Haven for Hope (c), n.d.) has shown to have significantly positive, even lifesaving, impacts on those persons experiencing homelessness. These impacts, in and of themselves, yield substantial benefits to the community, but they will also enhance the quality of life throughout San Antonio and be a catalyst for economic development well into the future.

References

Ackeret, B., Weimer, D.L., Ranheim, E.A., Urban, L., & Jacobs, E. 2014. Net benefits of hospital-sponsored health care for the homeless: Cost-benefit analysis of a demonstration project. La Follette School Working Paper No. 2014-010. https://lafollette.wisc.edu/research/publications/net-benefits-of-hospital-sponsored-health-care-for-the-homeless-cost-benefit-analysis-of-a-demonstration-project

Afif, S. (2010, July). Voluntary work in civil society: Saudi women volunteers as a social capital. [Conference session]. Ninth International Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Istanbul, Turkey. https://knowledge.unv.org/evidence-library/voluntary-work-in-civil-society-saudi-women-volunteers-as-a-social-capital

Aldridge, R.W. (2015). Homelessness and quality adjusted life years: Slopes and cliffs in health inequalities a cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 44(1), i80-i81.

Aos, S., Mayfield, J., Miller, M., & Yen, W. (2006). *Evidence-based treatment of alcohol, drug, and mental health disorders: Potential benefits, costs, and fiscal impacts for Washington State.* Washington State Institute for Public Policy. https://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/945

Baggett, T.P., Chang, Y., Singer, D.E., Porneala, B.C., Gaeta, J.M., O'Connell, J.J., & Rigotti, N.A. (2015). Tobacco-, alcohol-, and drug-attributable deaths and their contribution to mortality disparities in a cohort of homeless adults in Boston, *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(6), 1189-1197.

Baggett, T., Hwang, S., O'Connell, J., Porneala, B., Stringfellow, E., Orav, E., Singer, D., & Rigotti, N. (2013). Mortality among homeless adults in Boston: Shifts in causes of death over a 15-year period. *JAMA Intern Med.*, 173(3), 189-195. https://doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.1604

Bassuk, E.L., Rubin, L., & Lauriat, A. (1984). Is homelessness a mental health problem? *Am J Psychiatry,* 141(12): 1546-1550. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.141.12.1546

Beijer, U., Andreasson, S., Agren, G., & Fugelstad, A. (2011) Mortality and causes of death among homeless women and men in Stockholm. *Scand J Public Health,* 39(2), 121–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494810393554

Blomquist, G. (2004). Self-protection and averting behavior, values of statistical lives, and benefit cost analysis for environmental policy. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 2, 89–110.

Bondurant, S., Lindo, J., & Swensen, I. (2016) *Substance abuse treatment centers and local crime*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 22610. http://www.nber.org/papers/w22610

Breakey, W.R., Rischer, P.J., Kramer M., Nestadt, G., Romanoski, A.J., Ross, A., Royall, R.M., & Stine, O.C. (1989). Health and mental health problems of homeless men and women in Baltimore. *JAMA,* 262(10), 1352-1357. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1989.03430100086034

Capital Healthcare Planning. (2018). *Bexar County high utilizer/homeless healthcare analysis*. Southwest Texas Regional Advisory Council.

Cortright, J. (2015a). *Less in Common*. CityObservatory. https://cityobservatory.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CityObservatory_Less_In_Common.pdf

Cortright, J. (2015b, September 6). *Less in Common*. CityReports. https://cityobservatory.org/less-in-common/

Cortright, J. (2017). *Volunteering as a measure of social capital.* CityCommentary. https://cityobservatory.org/volunteering-as-a-measure-of-social-capital/

Doleac, J. (2018, January 3). New evidence that access to health care reduces crime. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2018/01/03/new-evidence-that-access-to-health-care-reduces-crime/

Dover, R. (2017, July 10). Crime and the homeless. Burien Homelessness Think Tank. http://www.homelessthinktank.org/2017/07/10/crime-homeless/

Fazel, S., Khosla, V., Doll, H., & Geddes, J. (2008). The prevalence of mental disorders among the homeless in western countries: Systematic review and meta-regression analysis. PLoS Med 5: e225. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050225

Ferenchick, G.S. (1991). Medical problems of homeless and nonhomeless persons attending an inner-city health clinic: A comparative study. *Am J Med Sci,* 301(6):379-382. https://doi:10.1097/00000441-199106000-00004

Fischer, P.J., Breakey, W.R. (1991). The epidemiology of alcohol, drug, and mental disorders among homeless persons. *Am Psychologist,* 46(11):1115-1128. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.46.11.1115

Fox, S. Volunteering and its effects on social capital and wellbeing in the UK: Insights from the United Kingdom Household longitudinal study. Wales Institute of Social and Economic Research, Data and Methods. https://wiserd.ac.uk/publications/volunteering-and-its-effects-social-capital-and-wellbeing-uk-insights-united-kingdom

Fuguitt, D., & Wilcox, S.J. (1999). *Cost-benefit analysis for public sector decision-makers.* Quorum Books.

Gelberg, L., & Leake, B.D. (1993). Substance use among impoverished medical patients: the effect of housing status and other factors. *Med Care,* 31(9):757-766. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005650-199309000-00001

Gelberg, L., & Linn, L.S. (1992). Demographic differences in health status of homeless adults. *J Gen Intern Med,* 7(6):601-608. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02599198

Gelberg, L., Linn, L.S, Usatine, R.P., & Smith, M.H. (1990). Health, homelessness, and poverty: a study of clinic users. *Arch Intern Med,* 150(11):2325-2330. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2241441/

Hammitt, J. K., & Robinson, L. (2011). The income elasticity of the value per statistical life: Transferring estimates between high and low income populations. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*, 2(1), 1–29.

Haveman, R., Wolfe, B., & Spaulding, J. (1991). Childhood events and circumstances influencing high school completion. *Demography*, 28(1), 133-157. http://www.jstor.com/stable/2061340

Haven for Hope (a). (2020). COVID-19 efforts through April 15, 2020.

Haven for Hope (b). (2020). Operation Hope Away from Haven Emergency Shelter Handbook.

Haven for Hope (a). (n.d.). *About*. Haven for Hope. https://www.havenforhope.org/about/our-approach/

Haven for Hope (b). (n.d.). *Home page.* Haven for Hope. https://www.havenforhope.org/

Haven for Hope (c). (n.d.). *Our approach.* Haven for Hope. https://www.havenforhope.org/about/our-approach/

Haven for Hope. (2022). Organizational overview. https://www.havenforhope.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Organizational-Overview-with-UW-Logo-1.pdf

Health Analytics. (2022, March 14). *What is a quality adjusted life year (QALY)?* https://www.healthanalytics.com/what-is-a-quality-adjusted-life-year-qaly/

Hwang, S. (2000). Mortality among men using homeless shelters in Toronto, Ontario. *JAMA*, 283(16), 2152-2157.

Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. (n.d.). *Cost-effectiveness, the QALY, and the evLYG.* https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/cost-effectiveness-the-qaly-and-the-evlyg/

Kneiser, T.J., & Viscusi, W.K. (2019). *The value of a statistical life.* Vanderbilt University Law School Legal Studies Research Paper Series Working Paper Number 19-15. http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=3379967

Kochi, I., Hubbell, B., & Kramer, R. (2006). An empirical Bayes approach to combining and comparing estimates of the value of a statistical life for environmental policy analysis. *Environmental & Resource Economics*, 34(3), 385–406.

Koegel, P., & Burnam, M.A. (1988). Alcoholism among homeless adults in the inner city of Los Angeles. *Arch Gen Psychiatry,* 45(11), 1011-1018. https://doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800350045007

Koegel, P., Burnam, A., & Farr, R.K. (1988). The prevalence of specific psychiatric disorders among homeless individuals in the inner city of Los Angeles. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 45(12):1085-1092. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800360033005

Lindhjem, H., Navrud, S., Braathen, N. A., & Biausque, V. (2011). Valuing mortality risk reductions from environmental, transport, and health policies: A global meta-analysis of stated preference studies. *Risk Analysis*, 31(9), 1381–1407.

McCollister, K. E., French, M. T., & Fang, H. (2010). The cost of crime to society: New crime-specific estimates for policy and program evaluation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 108(1-2), 98-109. https://doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.12.002

Miller, A., Simpson, B., & Lieben, J. (2011). *Understanding the role of volunteerism in creating social inclusion.* SouthWest Communnities Resource Centre. http://swcrc.ca/wp-

content/uploads/2013/09/Understanding-the-Role-of-Volunteerism-in-Creating-Social-Inclusion-Final-Report-for-SWCRC-September-2011.pdf

Martell, D., Rosner, R., & Harmon, R. (1995). Base-rate estimates of criminal behavior by homeless mentally ill person in New York City. *Psychiatric Services*, 46(6), 596-601.

Mehana, M., & Reynolds, A.J. (2004). School mobility and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26(1), 93-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2003.11.004

Mrozek, J. R., & Taylor, L. O. (2002). What determines the value of life? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 21(2), 253–270.

Nusselder, W., Slockers, M., Krol, L., Slockers, C., Looman, C., & van Beeck, E. (2013). Mortality and life expectancy in homeless men and women in Rotterdam: 2001-2010. PLoS One, 8(10), e73979. https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073979

Nielsen, S.F., Hjorthoj, C.R., Erlangsen, A., & Nordentoft, M. (2011). Psychiatric disorders and mortality among people in homeless shelters in Denmark: A nationwide register-based cohort study. *Lancet,* 377(9784), 2205–2214. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(11)60747-2

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* Simon & Schuster.

Romaszko, J., Cymes, I., Draganska, E., Kuchta, R., & Glinska-Lewczuk, K. (2017). Mortality among the homeless: Causes and meterological relationships. PLoS ONE 12(12): e0189938. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189938

Roncarati, J.S., Baggett, T.P., O'Connell, J.J., Hwang, S.W., Cook, E.F., Krieger, N., & Sorensen, G. (2018). Mortality among unsheltered homeless adults in Boston, Massachusetts, 2000-2009. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 178(9), 1242-1248. https://doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.2924

Roncarati, J.S., O'Connell, J.J., Hwang, S.W., Baggett, T.P., Cook, F.E., Krieger, N., & Sorensen, G. (2020). The use of high-risk criteria to assess mortality risk among unsheltered homeless persons. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved,* 31(1), 441-454. https://doi:10.1353/hpu.2020.0032

Roy, J., Maynard, M., & Weiss, E. (2008). *The hidden costs of the housing crisis.* The Partnership for America's Economic Success. https://www.pewtrusts.org/~/media/legacy/uploadedfiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/reports/partnership_for_americas_economic_success/paeshousingreportfinal1pdf.pdf

Rumberger, R.W., & Larson, K.A. (1988). Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout. *American Journal of Education*, 107(1), 1-35. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1085729

Scanlon, E., & Devine, K. (2001). Residential mobility and youth well-being: Research, policy, and practice issues. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare,* 28(1): 119-138. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2708&context=jssw

Solarz, A. (1985, November). An examination of criminal behavior among the homeless [Conference session]. Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, San Diego, CA, United States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED269713.pdf

Susser, E., Struening, E.L., & Conomver, S. (1989). Psychiatric problems in homeless men: Lifetime psychosis, substance use, and current distress in new arrivals at New York City shelters. *Arch Gen Psychiatry,* 46(9), 845-850. https://doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810090087012

Swanson, C.B., & Schneider, B. (1999). Students on the move: Residential and educational mobility in America's schools. *Sociology of Education*, 72(1), 54-67. https://doi.org/10.2307/2673186

The Urban Institute. (1999). *Homelessness: Programs and the people they serve: Findings of the national survey of homeless assistance providers and clients.* U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. https://www.huduser.gov/portal//publications/pdf/HUD-8774.pdf

Tsai, J., Dillard Gonzalez, K., Orsinger, R., & Jefferies, K. (2025). Haven for Hope: A transformational campus model to address homelessness. *Community Mental Health Journal,* 61, 827-833. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-024-01419-8

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Supporting the Success of Homeless Children and Youths: A Fact Sheet & Tips for Teachers, Principals, School Leaders, Counselors, and Other School Staff.* *https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/160315ehcyfactsheet072716.pdf*

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2016). *Guidelines for Regulatory Impact Analysis*. https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/private/pdf/242926/HHS_RIAGuidance.pdf

U.S. Department of Transportation. (2016). *Revised department guidance 2016: Treatment of the value of preventing fatalities and injuries in preparing economic analyses*. https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/2016%20Revised%20Value%20of%20a%20Statistical%20Life%20Guidance.pdf

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). *Mortality risk valuation: What does it mean to place a value on life?* https://www.epa.gov/environmental-economics/mortality-risk-valuation#whatisvsl

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1994). *Elementary school children: Many change schools Frequently, Harming Their Education. https://www.gao.gov/assets/hehs-94-45.pdf*

U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (1996). *Economic Analysis of Federal Regulations Under Executive Order 12866.* Washington, DC: The White House. Internet: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/riaguide.html

Viscusi, W. K. (1993). The value of risks to life and health. Journal of Economic Literature, 31(4), 1912–1946.

Viscusi, W.K., & Aldy, J.E. (2003). *The value of a statistical life: A critical review of market estimates throughout the world.* National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 9487. http://www.nber.org/papers/w9487

Vogler, J. (2018, November 1). Access to health care and criminal behavior: Short-run evidence from the ACA Medicaid expansions [Seminar] University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Microeconomics Seminars, Urbana-Champaign, IL, United States. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3042267

Wen, H., Hockenberry, J., & Cummings, J. (2017). The effect of Medicaid expansion on crime reduction: Evidence from HIFA-waiver expansions. *Journal of Public Economics*, 154, 67-94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2017.09.001

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (2000). The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems,* 62(4), 141-168. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1192270.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A0de026d6372ae5f3f2fc4cc60c7e7eed

Wright, J.D. (1990). The Health of Homeless People: Evidence from the National Health Care for the Homeless Program. In P.W. Brickner, L.K. Scharer, & B. Conanan, M. Savarese, & B.C. Scanlan (Eds.), *Under the Safety Net: The Health and Social Welfare of the Homeless in the United States.* (pp.15-31).