COMPARING HOUSING FIRST BETWEEN HELSINKI AND NEW YORK
STUDY METHODS AND DATA

• Comparative study between New York and Helsinki, between original model (PHF) and it's implementations (CHF)

• DATA: Observations, interviews and public documents

• 4 year follow-up study in Helsinki

• 4 month visit in New York

• Institutionalization as a object of examination

• Broad question: When a new innovative service model (Housing First) is imported from behind the Atlantic Ocean, how is the implemented model mirroring the original model?
HOUSING MARKET IN FINLAND

Birth

Living with parents

College hostel

Rented flat
Social housing 16%

Right of residence apartment

Private owned flat or house
74%
STAIRCASE MODEL IN FINLAND

- Street
  - Shelter (wet department)
    - Municipalities
  - Shelter (dry department)
    - NGOs and private companies
  - Hostel
    - NGOs and private companies
  - Transitional housing unit
    - Municipalities, NGOs and private companies
  - Independent apartment
    - Social housing, Y-foundation

Rehab
HOUSING FIRST MODEL IN FINLAND

- Independent apartments
  - Social housing, Y-foundation
- Supported housing units
  - NGOs and private companies
- Service centers (former shelters)
  - Municipalities and NGOs
- Street & other services
- Rehab
EXAMPLE OF FINNISH CHF UNIT

Single site HF-unit for 29 LTH men, long term rental agreements, single or double rooms with kitchen, 24/7 housing support, harm reduction, maintained by NGOs, funded by the government and City of Helsinki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Choice</th>
<th>Tenants was picked up from the shelters and from the streets by the staff, no evaluation of housing readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation of Housing and Services</td>
<td>Long term rental agreements, 24/7 on site housing support, no obligations for a change of a life style (harm reduction), on site medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Oriented Services</td>
<td>Support and opportunities are provided as needed and wished by the tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Integration</td>
<td>Homogenious community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHF (New York)</th>
<th>CHF (Helsinki)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scattered housing</td>
<td>Segregated housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly private sector apartments</td>
<td>Mainly third sector institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Homelike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of housing and services</td>
<td>24/7 on site support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community integration</td>
<td>Homogenous community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Patronization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective</td>
<td>Not very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale solution</td>
<td>Big scale solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood effects</td>
<td>Stigmatization, NIMBY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cures homelessness</td>
<td>Cures rooflessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent solution (if it works)</td>
<td>Another intermediate step (but permanent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOME PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

- There is only little left in transition from PHF to CHF
- PHF and CHF are aimed for different target group?
- Harm reduction orientation in segregated buildings improves tolerance = less evictions = housing stability is at good level
- In-house support services reduces the people's autonomy – client's are objects of patronization
- HF in Finland is not a paradigm change, it's just a new step in staircase system
- Is there a real difference between institutional care and supported housing units? Many tenants don't think so.
Good housing stability means low turnover of tenants, there is endless need for new supported housing units in larger cities.

In some cases, harm reduction orientation leaves clients with no substance abuse problem without feasible choices.

Reduction of shelter places, more rough sleepers?

Concentrating resources on long term homeless people rises a question of social equality, how about homelessness of working poor, senior citizens, young students etc.?

Lack of shelters creates new business opportunities for providing extremely expensive temporary housing services.

How will the new homeless services integrate a growing amount of immigrants, especially illegal ones?
• Path dependency prevents implementing innovations
• Same decision makers in charge for over 20 years
• Small market, only few established service providers
• Long and tight connections between government and SP's
• Tailored and targeted government funding, lack of real competition
• Lack of small and affordable studio apartments
• Financial capital of service providers is bound to buildings
• Established professions and resistance to change
• The ethos of welfare state and licence to patronize
NEAR FUTURE CHALLENGES IN FINLAND

• Because of government program, no shelters in biggest cities
• Third sector resources are tied to renovated CHF units
• Because of increased amount of immigration, the situation is rapidly changing and getting worse

• Growing amount of illegal immigrants. The estimated number for 2017, approximately 5000-6000 illegal immigrants will stay in Finland. If the estimate realizes, the amount of homeless people doubles in next two years

• The Finnish parliamentary commissioner has given prejudgement (18.9.2017), everyone is entitled to shelter = someone needs to rebuild the shelters

• Immigration detention centre = a new shelter?
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