

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit

Prepared for: City of Detroit Office of Eviction Defense

April 17, 2026

Table of Contents

Section I – Introduction	4
Section II – Executive Summary.....	6
KEY FINDINGS	7
ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACTS OF EVICTION RIGHT TO COUNSEL IN DETROIT	10
VALUE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRESERVATION IN DETROIT	11
DETROIT COVID EMERGENCY RENTAL ASSISTANCE ESCROW PROGRAM	12
Section III – Detroit Eviction Process.....	14
Section IV – Qualitative Evaluation Findings	18
DETROIT STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT.....	19
FEEDBACK FROM LANDLORDS AND REAL ESTATE DEVELOPERS	21
Section V – Estimated Fiscal Impacts	26
ESTIMATED HOUSING SOCIAL SAFETY NET FISCAL IMPACTS.....	28
RETAINED ECONOMIC VALUE BY MINIMIZING OUT-MIGRATION	31
ESTIMATED FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING RETAINED FOR DETROIT SCHOOLS.....	31
ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT RELATED TO INCREASED EMPLOYMENT STABILITY.....	32
ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT RELATED TO INCREASED EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT	33
ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL MEDICAID SPENDING ON HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATED WITH HOMELESSNESS	35
ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT OF RESPONDING TO CRIMES	36
ESTIMATED OUT-OF-HOME FOSTER CARE FISCAL IMPACTS	37
ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT OF INCARCERATING PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS	38
ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL MEDICAID SPENDING ON HEALTHCARE ASSOCIATED WITH POOR COMMUNITY HEALTH	39
Section VI – Recommendations	41
Section VII – Conclusion	45
Appendix A - Stout Profile and Qualifications	48
Appendix B - Exhibits	52

Detroit Eviction Right to Counsel – Evaluation and Estimated Fiscal Impact

March 2023 through December 2025



Stout was engaged by the City of Detroit Office of Eviction Defense to analyze the potential fiscal benefits associated with right to counsel for tenants in eviction proceedings in Detroit and provide recommendations for continued program success based on feedback from relevant stakeholders and its experience evaluating eviction right to counsel programs across the country.

Stout worked with the City of Detroit, legal service providers working on eviction right to counsel cases, United Community Housing Coalition, Lakeshore Legal Aid, Legal Aid and Defender Association, Michigan Legal Services, landlords and real estate developers in Detroit, and other relevant stakeholders to understand the impact of eviction right to counsel in Detroit and make recommendations for its ongoing implementation.

Key Findings

More than 16,000 Clients Served
(March 2023 – December 2025)



**Estimated \$48.5 Million in
Public Fiscal Impacts**



**Estimated Public Return on Investment of
\$3.74 for Every Dollar Invested**



**32% Decrease in Annual
Eviction Filings Since**

Compared to 2019



Section I – Introduction

Detroit’s Eviction Right to Counsel (ERTC) ordinance emerged out of longstanding concerns about high eviction rates, unequal access to legal representation in housing court and a long history of racially discriminatory policy and disinvestment in Detroit. Federal redlining practices, formalized through FHA underwriting standards and HOLC “residential security maps,” systematically denied mortgage access to Black neighborhoods and nearby areas, reinforcing segregation and limiting wealth-building opportunities. These patterns were compounded by industrial decline, racial inequality, the aftermath of the 1967 Detroit Rebellion, and later, the foreclosure and financial crisis from 2006-2012, which accelerated the loss of population and resources from the City and transformed the City from primarily homeownership to primarily rental housing. Over time, these forces concentrated poverty in Detroit, where rates of economic hardship have risen substantially and remain among the highest in the nation.

Prior to ERTC, approximately 4% of tenants had legal representation compared to approximately 83% of landlords.¹ In 2022 the eviction right to counsel ordinance was passed by the Detroit City Council, providing legal representation to tenants in Detroit who have received an eviction filing and whose incomes are at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level.

ERTC is funded through local, state and private funds. In May 2022, the City of Detroit (the City) passed an ordinance to use \$18 million in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds for ERTC while the Gilbert Family Foundation allocated \$12 million, and the Michigan State Bar provided \$2.5 million. As of December 2025, the Office of Eviction Defense (OED) has spent approximately \$13 million providing full representation to tenants in Detroit.² The \$13 million does not include tenants served using funds from the Gilbert Family Foundation or the Michigan State Bar, does not include costs such as staffing the OED or tenant outreach,³ and does not include funding for rental assistance provided to tenants and landlords. The \$13 million from ARPA funds has served over 16,250 Detroit tenants through full legal representation,⁴ resulting in approximately \$797 in funding per full representation case.⁵

¹ “The Estimated Economic Impact of an Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit.” Stout. February 9, 2022.

² The Office of Eviction Defense oversees eviction right to counsel in Detroit but does not provide legal representation to tenants in landlord-tenant disputes. Qualified tenants facing eviction are represented by one of the following legal services organizations; United Community Housing Coalition (UCHC), Lakeshore Legal Aid (LLA), Legal Aid and Defender Association (LADA), Michigan Legal Services (MLS), and Neighborhood Defender Service (NDS).

³ City-funded tenant outreach began August 2025 and included door-knocking and sending letters to residents who missed their first court hearing.

⁴ In full representation cases, ERTC attorneys are entered as the attorney of record for a client, which allows for representation at every stage of the proceeding. In full representation cases ERTC attorneys record the outcome of the case, allowing Stout to determine if clients were able to avoid disruptive displacement due to legal representation in their eviction case.

⁵ Does not include cases where only brief services were provided. From March 2023 through December 2025, 7,683 tenants received brief services, wherein the tenant received advice and assistance with document preparation but were not represented by legal counsel in their case. Brief Services cases were not paid for by the City of Detroit ARPA funding.

Section II – Executive Summary

Key Findings

Eviction Right to Counsel Significantly Increased Access to Legal Representation for Tenants

In Stout's 2022 Estimated Economic Impact of an Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit, Stout found that in 2017 only approximately 4% of tenants had legal representation in their eviction case compared to approximately 83% of landlords. In calendar year 2025, ERTC attorneys represented tenants in approximately 52% of all eviction cases (approximately 65% of all eligible tenants and 94% of all eligible tenants who appeared in court). This representation rate is significantly higher than in other jurisdictions that have enacted an eviction right to counsel. From March 2023 to April 2025, ERTC served 16,255 households with more than 44,000 individuals.⁶

Eviction Right to Counsel has contributed to transformative changes in the eviction filing ecosystem in Detroit

ERTC has improved the balance of power between tenants and landlords at Detroit's 36th District Court where tenants can meaningfully exercise their legal rights, landlord attorneys are expected to provide all required documentation and judges reject unfair agreements. This cultural shift has improved outcomes even for some unrepresented tenants. However, advocates warn that these gains are fragile and could reverse if tenant representation through ERTC is not sustained, which could potentially lead to higher eviction filing rates.

Eviction Right to Counsel Creates Fiscal Benefits for Detroit and Financial Impacts for Detroit Residents

Stout estimates that between March 2023 and December 2025, Detroit likely realized fiscal benefits of approximately \$48.5 million as a result of ERTC.⁷ Over the same time period, the Office of Eviction Defense approved of approximately \$13 million in ARPA funds for tenant legal representation, resulting in an estimated return on investment of \$3.74.⁸ The estimated fiscal impacts to the City we have been able to preliminarily quantify include:

⁶ Only includes households represented through ERTC with ARPA funds.

⁷ The estimated fiscal impact to Detroit only includes ERTC funded with ARPA funds. Including cases funded through the State Bar or private funders would increase the total fiscal impact to Detroit.

⁸ The estimated return on investment of \$3.74 reflects only the impact of legal representation and may not fully capture the incremental costs or benefits of rent assistance in stabilizing households those households that received it. Stout has observed, both in Detroit and in other jurisdictions, that rent assistance is not necessarily required in order to assist tenants in avoiding disruptive displacement when facing eviction. However, when rent assistance is available, it can have a synergistic impact for tenants that are able to access it in combination with legal representation. In some instances, the nature of housing stability achieved by the combination of rent assistance and legal assistance may be enhanced, and provide greater intermediate-term opportunities for stability, than certain instances where legal assistance is available but not rent assistance.

- Savings related to housing social safety net responses - ~\$14.5 million
- Retained economic value by minimizing out-migration - ~\$11.2 million
- Federal funding retained for Detroit public schools - ~\$9.8 million
- Increased employment stability - ~\$4.4 million
- Increased educational attainment - ~\$3.4 million
- Medicaid cost savings on health care due to homelessness - ~\$2.7 million
- Reduction in crimes associated with housing instability - ~\$1.1 million
- Savings related to out-of-home foster care costs - ~\$720,000
- Incarceration costs for people experiencing homelessness - ~\$710,000
- Medicaid cost savings on health care due to improved community health - ~\$650,000

ERTC has also returned thousands of dollars to Detroit tenants through the COVID Era Rental Assistance Rental Escrow Program. In Detroit, landlords without a certificate of compliance would only receive 80% of the rental assistance their tenants qualified for until repairs were made, and if repairs were not made the remaining 20% would be awarded to the tenants. As of February 2026, United Community Housing Coalition and Michigan Legal Services have processed 3,344 cases and returned nearly \$3 million to Detroit tenants.

Eviction Right to Counsel Clients Often Face Substantive Legal Issues Beyond Non-Payment of Rent

While most eviction filings in Detroit (and throughout the country) are brought for non-payment of rent, there can be substantive legal issues, defenses or procedural deficiencies with how the case was brought. Tenants seeking legal representation through ERTC often do so because they want an attorney to assist them with substantive legal issues with their case, potential defenses, or they are experiencing challenges within the household exacerbating the trauma of the eviction process. Stout found in its review of ERTC program data,

- Approximately 32% of ERTC cases were for reasons other than non-payment of rent.
- Approximately 22% of ERTC cases represented tenants in subsidized housing.
- Approximately 73% of ERTC cases involved a rental property that did not have a Certificate of Compliance.⁹
- In approximately 43% of ERTC cases the rental property that was not registered as a rental property with the City.
- In approximately 14% of ERTC the tenant reported not having heat or water.

⁹ In Michigan, rental properties without a Certificate of Compliance are not to be occupied or if they are, rent must be paid into a escrow account that the landlord can only access once the repairs are made. MCL - Section 125.530.

Feedback from Landlords and Developers

Feedback about ERTC from landlords and developers in Detroit centered on several key themes:

- Landlords appreciate there are circumstances where a tenant could benefit from legal representation during an eviction case.
- Removing tenant names from eviction judgments can lead to landlords adopting more stringent and robust tenant screening requirements that may make finding housing more difficult for other renters.
- Certain landlords may exit the rental property business or sell properties due to decreases in economic occupancy. In addition, some landlords may have insufficient cash flow to maintain rental properties or pay property taxes if they experienced prolonged periods of delinquency. While such impacts to the landlord community may not be solely attributable to increased tenant legal representation, landlords noted concerns and examples whereby prolonged eviction cases without substantive legal defenses or procedural deficiencies may have caused increases in unpaid rent that could not be collected by the landlord.
- Landlords support the use of rent escrow accounts to limit the financial losses experienced by landlords in instances of prolonged delinquency or where the eviction process may be protracted.
- Landlords who worked with the legal aid community on pre-filing eviction diversion and mediation see its value in efficiently and effectively resolving certain instances of delinquency without needing to file for eviction.

Recommendations For The Continued Implementation of Eviction Right to Counsel

- Collaborate with rental property owners, their counsel, agents, and property managers to address challenges and barriers in Detroit's rental housing and eviction ecosystem.
- The legal services organizations working on ERTC currently collect significant amounts of data related to client demographics, case characteristics, and case outcomes that is notable in both its consistency and completeness. However, the collection of additional data elements could further deepen the understanding of client and case circumstances and lead to additional program refinement and opportunities for collaboration.
- Consider opportunities to gather additional feedback regarding the effectiveness of community outreach from local community organizations and tenants (both those who appear at court and those who do not).
- Consider further investment in programs and strategies with the goal of addressing landlord-tenant disputes before an eviction filing.

- Consider further research regarding reasons for the loss of affordable rental housing in Detroit, disincentives for the creation of new affordable housing and ways housing policies can expand housing options for people facing eviction who are not able to afford market rents due long-term loss of income (e.g., loss of a job or loss of an income earner in the household).
- Expand partnerships with other City programs and community organizations to maximize program impact on improving the housing stock in Detroit. This could include home repair programs, lead testing programs, and home ownership programs.

Estimated Fiscal Impacts of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit

Through the City of Detroit’s investment of approximately \$13 million in an eviction right to counsel from March 2023 through December 2025, Detroit likely recognized fiscal benefits of at least an estimated \$48.5 million. For every dollar the City invested in providing free legal representation to eligible tenants through an eviction right to counsel, the City likely realized \$3.74 in fiscal benefits associated with a reduction in the disruptive displacement of tenants. Stout estimates approximately 71% of ERTC clients, 11,541 households, avoided disruptive displacement due to free legal representation.

Stout uses the phrase “disruptive displacement” to capture outcomes of cases beyond “winning” and “losing” and “evicted” or “not evicted.” For example, there may be circumstances where tenants did not have a formal writ of removal executed against them and therefore were not displaced but still have experienced disruption in their lives because of the eviction filing and/or eviction proceeding. There may also be circumstances where a tenant needs or wants to move but access to legal counsel and representation by a lawyer during the eviction proceeding minimizes the disruption that the move may have had on the tenant’s household. Stout has found the phrase “disruptive displacement” to be helpful in demonstrating the variety of circumstances tenants experience and the impact of counsel in assisting with navigating a complex, high-stakes legal proceeding. Local advocates may use alternative terminology to describe the outcomes of cases and the impacts to tenants.

It is important to recognize the essential role landlords play in providing housing, including for low-income Detroit residents, and that many avoid using eviction except as a last resort. The landlords Stout connected with for purposes of this evaluation, consistent with landlords Stout has interviewed in jurisdictions across the U.S., expressed support for tenant legal representation in eviction proceedings, while emphasizing that the manner in which ERTC is implemented can affect their financial capacity to maintain safe, suitable housing. In some cases, implementation challenges and practices, together with broader macro- and micro-economic factors, may contribute to deferred maintenance, rent increases, tighter tenant screening, or property sales, with potential implications for housing stability and the need for responsive public services for tenants and to respond to abandoned properties. Although Stout did measure the potential fiscal impact of such circumstances faced by landlords or their

response to multiple externalities, the ways in which certain elements of ERTC implementation may impact the landlord community (as discussed in Section II), should be carefully considered to ensure a financially stable rental housing income ecosystem supporting the housing needs of Detroiters with low incomes.

In addition to fiscal impacts likely realized by Detroit, counties and municipalities in Detroit (such as Wayne County) may also realize fiscal impacts associated with social safety net responses to disruptive displacement funded by these local jurisdictions. County and municipal social safety net fiscal impacts would be realized without additional investment and would be in addition to the amounts calculated herein.

In circumstances where tenants are facing eviction, avoiding disruptive displacement often requires that the tenant remain in their home or be connected to services that can assist with facilitating a non-disruptive departure while finding alternative safe, stable housing – all of which can often be achieved through legal representation provided in an eviction right to counsel. In the face of financial challenges for municipalities, an investment in an eviction right to counsel can result in significant economic benefits or cost savings relative to the significant costs that may be incurred by the State to support Detroit residents enduring the potential trauma of the eviction process (including homelessness) without the assistance of an attorney.

Stout’s estimates of fiscal impacts do not include the impacts that may arise from rental property owners’ perceptions of and responses to ERTC. For example, Stout’s estimates do not include quantifications of additional rental arrears that may accumulate and not be collected or housing market impacts if a small rental property owner decides to sell their property to a corporate rental property owner (local or out-of-state) because of the actual or perceived impacts that may arise from increased rates of tenant representation. These fiscal impacts are exceedingly challenging to quantify as there are significant externalities and a variety of factors that rental property owners consider when amending their business practices or considering exiting the rental property business. Isolating and controlling for the specific impact of increased tenant representation on rental property owners’ business decisions is outside of the scope of Stout’s evaluation.

Value of Affordable Housing Preservation in Detroit

There is a significant shortage in the amount of affordable habitable housing in Detroit, leaving thousands of residents to either leave the City, live in blighted housing, become severely rent burdened or double-up with other households.¹⁰ To address this, the City of Detroit made the creation and preservation of existing affordable housing one of its key housing goals in 2025, seeking to create 3,000 and preserve 10,000 affordable housing units by 2030, with over \$100 million in direct City investment.¹¹ However, the majority of new development in Detroit is not

¹⁰ Erb-Downward, Jennifer and Merchant, Sally. “Losing Home: Housing Instability & Availability in Detroit.” Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan. May 2020.

¹¹ Detroit Affordable Housing Strategy. City of Detroit.

affordable housing and rising construction costs have increased the cost to create new affordable housing.¹² Building new affordable housing often requires gap financing from the City, which a March 2025 report found is approximately \$43,000 per affordable unit.¹³

Affordable housing can be preserved by keeping existing tenants in their homes and ensuring these homes are safe to live in. Keeping tenants in their homes results in less turnover in affordable units, which are less likely to go vacant or stay vacant for extended periods of time. When affordable housing (especially single-family homes) goes vacant in Detroit there is a heightened risk the property is abandoned, forfeited to the City, and may be demolished. In addition to the cost to replace a single unit of affordable housing, the City also often is forced to demolish these homes. In 2021 and 2022, the City spent approximately \$49 million demolishing vacant single-family homes, approximately \$17,000 to \$20,000 per home.¹⁴

From March 2023 through August 2025, approximately 53% of ERTC clients retained possession of their homes at the conclusion of their case, a significant portion of whom Stout estimates would have likely been forced to move if not for ERTC.¹⁵ In addition to assisting tenants remaining in their homes, ERTC attorneys also assisted in getting improved conditions in clients' homes. Approximately 14% of ERTC cases resulted in improved habitability, such as a repair order or restoration of utilities.

[Detroit COVID Emergency Rental Assistance Escrow Program](#)

The federal COVID Emergency Rental Assistance (CERA) began providing over \$1.1 billion in aid to Michigan residents facing housing instability in 2021. Administered by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority, cash assistance was used to prevent evictions by paying rental and utility arrears directly to landlords and service providers. The City of Detroit implemented the additional rule that for a landlord to receive the full assistance amount, the rental property must have a Certificate of Compliance (CoC). When a rental property did not have a CoC, the landlord could only receive 80% of the CERA amount, while the remaining 20% would be held in escrow, which could be released when the CoC was obtained, or the landlord could demonstrate they spent an equal amount on repairs. Funds were held in escrow accounts for 90 days, after which the landlord could claim the escrow balance if the CoC was obtained or an equal amount was spent on repairs or if not, the defendant could claim the escrow.¹⁶

ERTC attorneys assisted clients in getting CERA escrow funds returned to them as a part of ERTC, although the case was often a follow-up to the original landlord-tenant dispute. In October 2025, the 36th District Court established a special docket to close approximately 4,000

¹² City of Detroit Housing Market Study. April 2024.

¹³ Comparison of Development Costs: Multi-Family and Single-Family Housing. Housing & Revitalization Department, City of Detroit. March 21, 2025.

¹⁴ "Huffman, Bryce and Lickliter, Kayiegh. "Detroiters Spent \$49 million on Demolition. Where Did The Money Go?" Bridge Detroit. August 19, 2022.

¹⁵ The Estimated Economic Impact of an Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit." Stout. February 9, 2022.

¹⁶ COVID19 Emergency Rental Assistance (CERA) Rental Compliance Guidance. City of Detroit.

outstanding escrow accounts. By the end of December 2025, nearly all cases were resolved, and defendants were given 6 months to claim the escrow if the court determined they were entitled to it. If the tenant could not be contacted, then the escrow would be returned to the Michigan State Housing Development Authority. Stout received the outcomes of CERA escrow cases from United Community Housing Coalition and Michigan Legal Services 3,344 cases, the following chart shows the outcomes of CERA escrow cases as of February 2026.

Outcome	# of Cases	Total Escrow Amount	Escrow Amount per Cases
Escrow Returned to landlord	659	\$1,089,099	\$1,653
Escrow Returned to Defendant	1,749	\$2,957,158	\$1,691
Potential Escrow to Defendant if Contact is Made	936	\$1,546,659	\$1,652

Stout did not include the escrow funds returned to ERTC clients in its return on investment as the funds do not represent a fiscal benefit to Detroit. However, Stout expects that the return of escrow to low-income Detroit residents would have significant downstream impacts to Detroit residents and the City. These include, but would not be limited to:

- Paying a security deposit or moving to a new house,
- Paying off debt,
- Receiving medical care that was previously avoided due to cost,
- Opting for more stable childcare arrangements, and
- Saving for an emergency fund.

Section III – Detroit Eviction Process

The eviction process in Detroit includes 4 primary steps summarized below. The cost of an eviction filing in Detroit is \$55 for the possession complaint, plus additional fees for service, judgment and bailiff execution.

1. Eviction Notice (Demand for Possession)

Before initiating an eviction filing, a landlord must provide the tenant with written notice. If the tenant complies within the specified time frame (e.g., pays rent or fixes the issue), the eviction process stops. If not, the landlord may proceed with legal action. The type of notice depends on the reason for eviction:

- **7-Day Demand for Possession (Nonpayment of Rent):** Issued when rent is unpaid. The tenant has 7 days to either pay the full amount owed or move out.
 - Per federal requirements, 1 month notices may be used in some subsidized housing programs.
- **30-Day Notice to Quit (Termination of Tenancy / Lease Violations):** Used for month-to-month terminations or other violations of the lease.
- **7-Day Notice to Cure or Quit (Health/Safety Violations):** Given when a tenant causes substantial damage or a serious health hazard, the tenant must fix a problem within 7 days or vacate.
- **24-hour Notice to Quit (Unconditional Quit Notice):** Used for specific and severe situations such as unlawful drug activity.

2. Filing a Complaint and Serving the Tenant

The landlord files a Complaint for Possession (eviction) with the appropriate district court (in Detroit, usually the 36th District Court). The court then issues a Summons and schedules a hearing, typically within 10 days of filing. Finally, the tenant is served with the summons and complaint, usually 3 days before the hearing, notifying them of:

- The reason for eviction
- The hearing date
- Any money claimed (e.g., unpaid rent)

3. Pretrial Hearing

At the scheduled hearing (often a pretrial within ~10 days of filing), the court determines whether the landlord is entitled to possession, confirm proper notice was given and ask whether rent is owed or violation occurred. At this time typically no final judgment will be made unless

the parties reach a settlement or agreement, otherwise the trial will be set for a date between 7 and 14 days later.¹⁷

4. Trial and Judgment

At trial, both the landlord and tenant have the opportunity to present evidence, testimony, and legal arguments. Tenants may ask for a stay in their case if they are applying for rental assistance, which can result in a stay between 14 and 28 days.

- The landlord must demonstrate:
 - Proper notice was served
 - A legal basis for eviction exists (e.g., nonpayment, lease violation)
 - They are the rightful owner of the property
- The tenant may raise defenses such as:
 - Ledger disputes (e.g., rent already paid or miscalculated)
 - Poor housing conditions or repair issues
 - Paid for repairs that were the landlords responsibility
 - Constructive eviction
 - Improper notice or procedural errors
 - Late fees are excessive

If the court rules in favor of the landlord, it will issue a Judgment of Possession, which legally entitles the landlord to regain control of the property. In cases involving nonpayment of rent, the judgment can also include a money judgment for unpaid rent and court costs. Importantly, a tenant's failure to appear in court often results in a default judgment, meaning the landlord automatically prevails. After a Judgment of Possession is entered, Michigan law provides a mandatory minimum 10-day waiting period (up to 30 days) before a tenant can be physically removed.¹⁸ This period is a critical final opportunity for the tenant to resolve the situation.

During the 10 to 30-day waiting period, the tenant may:

- **Pay the full amount owed (nonpayment cases only):** Payment of all rent, fees, and court costs within this window can stop the eviction entirely.

¹⁷ While uncommon, a final judgment can be requested by the plaintiff if the tenant does not appear and the tenant was personally served or if they were served by mail and the court mailed a second copy in a court envelope. The case can also potentially be dismissed if both parties fail to appear at the pretrial hearing.

¹⁸ There can be cases where an immediate Writ of Eviction is entered where there are significant health or safety risks.

- **Move out voluntarily:** Tenants can avoid a formal eviction on their record by vacating before further enforcement.
- **File post-judgment motions or an appeal:** Although less common, tenants may challenge the judgment or seek additional time under certain circumstances.

5. Order of Eviction (Writ) and Physical Eviction

If the tenant does not comply within the 10-day period, the landlord may request an Order of Eviction (Writ of Eviction). In their request, the landlord must state whether any money has been paid since the court issued the judgment. The court will then process the request and sends it to a court officer/bailiff who schedules the eviction, typically within a few days to about a week, depending on availability. Landlords are responsible for property removal (such as labor and arranging a dumpster), while the bailiff performs the eviction to ensure it is carried out lawfully.

Section IV – Qualitative Evaluation Findings

Detroit Stakeholder Engagement

Throughout early 2026, Stout engaged with a variety of Detroit stakeholders with experience and expertise interacting with the local and statewide housing and eviction ecosystems or serving clients or residents who may have interacted with eviction ecosystem. The purpose of these meetings was to learn from local stakeholders who have different perspectives and experiences with the eviction process or who have observed the impact of evictions on Detroit residents and landlords. Stout met with:

- Attorneys representing tenants
- Representatives from the 36th District Court
- Representatives from Detroit Right to Counsel Coalition
- Representatives from the Detroit Housing Commission
- Representatives from the City of Detroit Office of Housing and Homelessness Services
- Representatives from the City of Detroit Department of Public Health
- Academics studying eviction and housing instability in Detroit and Michigan
- Landlords and real estate developers that own and / or manage housing for individuals and families with low incomes

Many of the stakeholders discussed the importance of tenant legal representation for ensuring households know their rights and to prevent illegal evictions. Representatives from social service providers shared examples of responses that can be required after a household is displaced, which may include emergency shelter and hospitalization. Many stakeholders also described how the implementation of ERTC in Detroit has resulted in partnerships to connect households to legal representation or for ERTC attorneys to connect individuals to social safety net programs in Detroit. Provided below is a summary of the feedback about ERTC in Detroit from stakeholders Stout connected with.

Legal Services Attorneys Representing Tenants

Legal services attorneys described ERTC as shifting 36th District Court from an unbalanced system, where landlords had significant power, to one where tenants could actually exercise their rights. Prior to ERTC, legal services providers stated cases were resolved quickly with sometimes no consideration of the relevant document or conditions of the buildings. Since ERTC, judges are now more likely to require rent ledgers, proof of ownership and building inspection results. Legal services attorneys indicated that ERTC has also led to a culture change at the 36th District Court, with judges now more likely to mention legal aid, tell tenants to speak to a lawyer, and sometimes reject bad agreements, with more dismissals and more repair orders than before ERTC. The effects of these culture shifts also impact unrepresented tenants, with plaintiff attorneys increasingly beginning negotiations with offering more time to move out a

unit than the required minimum of 10 days and are more frequently producing documentation such as ledgers, improving outcomes for certain unrepresented tenants.

Legal services attorneys also stressed that the eviction ecosystem is vulnerable to reverting back to pre-ERTC dynamics and there are still areas for continued improvement. Without ERTC and increased tenant representation, legal services attorneys indicated that the changes in the eviction ecosystem described above would likely be undone and eviction filings could begin to increase towards pre-ERTC levels.

Representatives from the Detroit Right to Counsel Coalition

Representatives from the Detroit Right to Counsel Coalition indicated that ERTC has given tenants a sense of security, and that tenants no longer feel alone in the eviction process. They also indicated that tenants often learn about ERTC too late due to a lack of timely and effective outreach, only making contact with an ERTC attorney at court. While acknowledging the transformation to the 36th District Court associated with ERTC, representatives expressed concerns that certain court practices continued to create barriers to tenants' access to justice. Concerns were raised that some judges may not dismiss cases involving properties that lack a valid Certificate of Compliance and may not require landlords to provide residents' contact information, thereby limiting ERTC attorneys' ability to reach tenants in advance of trial.

Additionally, representatives communicated to Stout that ERTC would better serve the community if tenants' housing instability could be addressed upstream, through mediation and dispute support, before delinquency escalates into an eviction filing.

Representatives from the 36th District Court

Representatives from the 36th District Court, including current judges and court administration, indicated ERTC has improved court functions as the resolution of cases is more efficient when the tenant has an attorney, as they know their rights before the hearing. ERTC attorneys have also reduced work for court staff by informing tenants of their rights and assisting them with filling out forms which court staff would often typically assist with.

Representatives from the Detroit Housing Commission (DHC)

Representatives from DHC stated that ERTC has made the eviction process more efficient for them, regardless of whether a tenant stays or goes. However, representatives from DHC indicated that whenever they move to evict a tenant, all other options have already been exhausted, and they are confident in the legal foundation of their case. Thus, it can be frustrating when an ERTC attorney uses opportunities to delay the process in their effort to prevent the eviction.

Representatives from the City of Detroit Office of Housing and Homeless Services (OHHS)

OHHS coordinates closely with ERTC through referrals for legal representation and for housing support. When a household calls OHHS after receiving an eviction notice and indicate they may experience homelessness, they are referred to UCHC for legal representation. Conversely, households may be referred by ERTC attorneys to OHHS when they are unable to stay in their home and at risk of experiencing homelessness.

Representatives from the City of Detroit Department of Public Health (DPH)

Representatives from DPH described the interconnectedness of health, use of public assistance, and housing instability. Households in Detroit who experience housing instability (often due to eviction) may utilize other social safety net responses such as SNAP and TANF due to their lack of stable housing.¹⁹ DPH representatives indicated that the lack of stable housing for mothers in Detroit may contribute to higher maternal mortality and worse infant mental health.

Representatives from the Academic Community Studying Housing Instability in Detroit

Researchers studying the impact of housing instability in Detroit described the impact of housing instability on school-aged children in Detroit. In Detroit, research has demonstrated that housing instability is associated with children being more likely to drop out of school, more likely to change schools mid-year, more likely to face disciplinary action, and less likely to graduate. Detroit Public Schools Community District receives funding to assist students experiencing housing instability, but there are limited funds available and the majority of students experiencing homelessness in Detroit are not accounted for.²⁰

Feedback from Landlords and Real Estate Developers

During its evaluation of ERTC, Stout sought feedback from rental property owners, their counsel, and property managers in Detroit. Stout has worked to incorporate their perspectives into the evaluation and analyses. The following paragraphs summarize the themes that emerged from conversations with the following representatives:

- Operators of affordable multi-family housing in Detroit
- Developers of non-profit multi-family housing in Detroit
- Representatives from single-family landlords in Detroit

Landlords Appreciate There Are Circumstances Where a Tenant Could Benefit From Legal Representation During an Eviction Case

Landlords communicated that legal representation is important and valuable when tenants are experiencing substantive issues or disputes with the rental property owner and when the tenant

¹⁹ 2025 Strategic Issue Data Brief. Detroit Department of Public Health.

²⁰ The Educational Implications of Homelessness and Housing Instability in Detroit. Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan. August 2021.

needs assistance accessing rental assistance or other social programs. However, there is often selection bias in the population of people seeking legal representation. These tenants are disproportionately experiencing substantive legal issues, complex case and personal circumstances, and often the most significant consequences if they were to experience disruptive displacement. This is consistent with our observations from the ERTC data; from March 2023 through December 2025, 32% of ERTC cases were for reasons other than non-payment of rent, 22% of RTC cases represented tenants in subsidized housing, and 73% of ERTC cases involved a rental property that did not have a Certificate of Compliance.²¹

Landlords emphasized the importance of time in the eviction process and its relationship to the rental housing business model. Rental income supports ongoing ownership costs, including mortgages, taxes, repairs, and maintenance, and prolonged periods of nonpayment can significantly disrupt cash flow. Because unpaid rent is rarely recovered through eviction proceedings, delays can impose substantial financial strain, especially for smaller landlords. For example, a case that extends by an additional 60 days may will result in 2 months of additional unpaid rent (in addition to what will likely be 2 or more months of unpaid rent prior to the eviction filing). This can materially affect a landlord's ability to maintain the property. In response to these risks, some landlords may increase rents or tighten tenant screening practices. Several landlords we engaged with noted that, when implemented effectively, legal representation can support fair and efficient case resolution without unnecessarily prolonging proceedings.

Removing Tenant Names from Judgments Can Lead to Landlords Adopting More Stringent and Robust Tenant Screening Requirements²²

While landlords Stout engaged with appreciated that there are cases where a tenant deserved to have their name removed from the eviction judgment, in their view the practice was too frequent, which could have consequences that impacted other renters. However, landlords are still able to screen an applicant by looking up their previous addresses to see if there was an eviction filing or judgment when the tenant lived there. The removal of tenants' names from judgments has led some landlords to deny more applicants due to perceived risk that the applicant may be at risk for non-payment, such as when there is an eviction filing at a unit a tenant lived (regardless of the outcome) or tenants lived at an apartment for less than a year or frequently moved apartments. Landlords also described how they have changed their leasing practices since ERTC, with more landlords opting for month-to-month leases, especially for tenants with low-incomes.

Tenant organizers concurred with the landlords Stout spoke with that the practice of removing tenants' names from eviction judgments can lead to adverse consequences for other renters. If

²¹ The Office of Eviction Defense believes that between 80% and 90% of rental properties in Detroit do not have a Certificate of Compliance.

²² Eviction records at the 36th District Court are not sealed, in certain cases the tenant's name will be removed from the judgment if there is a conditional judgment and the tenant upholds their end the agreement.

some landlords begin denying rental applicants with an eviction filing, regardless of the outcome of their case, then even tenants who complied with the terms of a conditional judgment can struggle to find new housing. However, tenant organizers added that the practice of denying tenants who had an eviction filing against them, regardless of outcome, was already a common practice before ERTC.

Certain Landlords May Exit the Rental Property Business or Sell Properties Due to Decreases in Economic Occupancy, Which May Not Necessarily Be Due Exclusively Increased Tenant Legal Representation

Landlords Stout engaged with indicated that since the end of COVID they have struggled with decreased economic occupancy.²³ Decreased occupancy particularly impacts operators of low-income housing, who often have lower margins compared to other multi-family housing. A March 2025 report regarding the rental property market in Detroit reported that ERTC contributed to lower margins due the increase in the time the eviction process takes.²⁴ However, the report and landlords Stout spoke with noted that other market forces (such as higher property taxes and insurance rates) have also impacted margins on rental properties. Landlords Stout spoke with in Detroit (and around the country) have stressed that decreasing cash flows due to lower rent collection impacts their ability to maintain rental properties or pay property taxes if they experienced prolonged periods of delinquency. While such impacts to the landlord community may not be solely attributable to increased tenant legal representation, landlords noted concerns and examples whereby prolonged eviction cases without substantive legal defenses or procedural deficiencies may have caused increases in unpaid rent that could not be collected by the landlord.

One operator of naturally occurring affordable housing in Detroit stressed that decreased economic occupancy and lower margins threatened the continued operation of some of their properties.²⁵ Due to the affordable housing environment in Detroit as well as recent steep increases in assessed property values, landlords are concerned that multi-family properties would not be able to be sold to another landlord.²⁶ If a property becomes unprofitable to an extent that threatens business operations, operations could be ceased resulting in the property

²³ Economic occupancy measures how much rent the landlord is collecting compared with the gross potential rent, which is the maximum amount of rent you could collect from a property. Allred, Christian. Rocket Mortgage, “How Economic Occupancy Can Help You Maximize Rental Income.” September 15, 2025.

²⁴ 2026 Update Understanding the Rental Landscape: A Profile Analysis of Detroit Landlords. Data Driven Detroit & Detroit Future City. March 2026.

²⁵ Naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) refers to residential properties that are “affordable” but are not subsidized by any federal programs; the rents are naturally relatively low compared to the regional housing market. Chapman, Mia and Lowery, Lauren. “What is Affordable Housing.” National League of Cities. January 8, 2024. Gap financing is funding source provided by a city (or other jurisdiction) to cover the shortfall between project development costs and the available primary funding.

²⁶ “Detroit home values increased an average of 19% in 2024; Individual tax increases capped at 3.1%, Detroit homeowners gained \$1.4 billion in wealth in 2024 from appreciating property values, the second largest in history.” City of Detroit Mayor’s Office. January 21, 2025.

becoming vacant and the City will lose affordable housing units. Due to the high demand for and shortage of affordable housing in Detroit, the preservation of affordable housing in Detroit has remained a priority for the City.²⁷ A City of Detroit Report from March 2025 found that the City provides gap financing of an average of \$43,000 per affordable unit.²⁸ However, as noted above several economic factors have impacted rental property (for both multi-family and single-family owners) which can lead to a rental property ceasing operations. Stakeholders in Detroit shared that cooperation between landlords and legal aid organizations working on ERTC and changes in eviction filing practices can frequently prevent lengthy eviction processes that can cause months of lost rent, without having to forego increased legal representation in Detroit.

Other landlords Stout spoke with added that if they have to sell their affordable housing (especially multi-family housing) the buyer often will increase rent or redevelop the housing such that it would no longer be affordable.

Landlords Support the Use of Rent Escrow Accounts Through the Court

Detroit is in the process of developing a rent escrow program for when a rental property lacks a Certificate of Compliance, or there are other serious code violations in their unit (e.g., dangerous wiring, lack of water, severe plumbing issues, structural hazards, fire risks, etc.).²⁹ The tenant will be able to pay their rent into an escrow account overseen by Detroit Housing and Revitalization Department (HRD).³⁰ Funds are to be released to the landlord once the repairs are made or after 120 days the funds are to be released to the tenant if the property is not brought into compliance. Participation in the rental escrow program will not suspend or supersede an eviction case against a tenant, however retaliatory cases against tenants who participate in the program will be able to be dismissed. Tenants must be current on their rent for participation in the program.

Operators of multi-family rental properties in Detroit who Stout engaged with endorsed the mandatory use of rental escrow accounts for tenants in prolonged eviction proceedings while the case is pending. This would prevent landlords from incurring significant unpaid rent during the case if they are found to be in compliance and would hold non-compliant landlords accountable. Currently, tenants do not need to participate in the rental escrow program to raise compliance issues in their case.

Landlords Who Worked With the Legal Aid Community on Pre-Filing Eviction Diversion and Mediation See its Value in Efficiently and Effectively Resolving Certain Non-Payment Eviction Cases

²⁷ Detroit Affordable Housing Strategy: 2025-2030. City of Detroit.

²⁸ Comparison of Development Costs: Multi-Family and Single-Family Housing. Housing & Revitalization Department, City of Detroit. March 21, 2025.

²⁹ The Rent Escrow Program is not operating as of the release of Stout's evaluation, but the program is expected to launch in 2026.

³⁰ Rental Escrow Program. <https://detroitmi.gov/node/100016>.

Every rental property owner Stout engaged with in Detroit indicated they never want to file an eviction and view an eviction filing as the last resort. Landlords indicated that programs that focus on preventing eviction filings and that work with tenants and landlords would lead to more stable outcomes for tenants and rental property owners. Many landlords of low-income affordable housing in Detroit already have a process for when a tenant is facing short- and long-term economic disruptions in their lives'. These include payment plans and helping tenants relocate to more affordable units (both temporarily and long-term). Landlords agreed that the expansion of these programs can further contribute to lower eviction filing rates in Detroit. However, landlords indicated that certain tenants with long-term income disruptions may not be able to be served through eviction diversion programs when safe housing is not available at the rents they are able to afford. Accordingly, landlords indicated that other forms of naturally developed housing for very low-income households may need to be developed in Detroit.

Section V – Estimated Fiscal Impacts

The fiscal impacts and programmatic costs of eviction to states, cities, counties, and municipalities are significant and multi-dimensional. Substantial reporting has documented the negative impact evictions have on individuals, families, businesses, and communities. While many of these impacts are not yet quantifiable based on available data and research, clear fiscal costs or economic impacts of disruptive displacement do exist. This section details estimates of fiscal impact that ERTC is likely having on publicly funded systems in Detroit. These estimates of fiscal impacts provide insight into how legal representation in eviction cases can mitigate these fiscal impacts or assist in redirecting funds to other efforts undertaken by local governments.

Additionally, it is important to consider the impacts to a variety of key stakeholders in the eviction process, including landlords. Landlords Stout engaged with throughout the country have described the potential economic impacts and costs they experience when filing evictions, which many only use as a measure of last resort. The economic impacts and costs they communicated include but are not limited to attorney fees, filing fees, and other court costs; the time and costs associated with tenant screening and due diligence; costs of repair and maintenance to units needing to be re-rented; and the economic impact of tenants not paying rent as their eviction is being litigated. In Detroit, these economic impacts in combination with other external factors could contribute to housing developments becoming unprofitable and potentially result in closure or a cessation of operations.

As noted above, it is important to appreciate that ERTC is often assisting tenants with substantive legal issues, challenging personal circumstances, serious consequences that could arise from disruptive displacement (such as unsheltered homelessness), and a variety of disputes with the landlord. ERTC, like other eviction right / access to counsel programs Stout has evaluated, infrequently assists clients who do not have these issues and complications with their cases and circumstances, representing a subset of all instances of delinquency and eviction filings (a subset of typically the most serious and severe cases). This is important context when considering potential fiscal impacts as well as the potential impacts of an eviction right to / access to counsel on other stakeholders, including landlords, courts, and social service providers. It is also important to note that only a small portion of rental units in Detroit were subject to an eviction filing where the tenant was represented through ERTC. Detroit has an estimated 188,000 rental units,³¹ approximately 10.8% were subject to an eviction filing, and about 5.7% of all tenants received legal representation through ERTC.

³¹ 2026 Update Understanding the Rental Landscape: A Profile of Detroit Landlords. Data Driven Detroit & Detroit Future City. March 2026.

Stout estimates that of the 16,255 households served through ARPA-funded ERTC,³² approximately 71%, 11,541 households, avoided disruptive displacement from March 2023 through December 2025. Of these 11,541 households, Stout estimates that approximately 97% or 11,195 households would have remained in Detroit following experiencing disruptive displacement and may have required a social safety net response.³³ In these households, Stout estimates there are approximately 31,162 individuals comprised of 15,935 adults and 15,227 children.

Stout estimated ERTC has resulted in approximately \$48.5 million in fiscal impacts to Detroit resulting from 11,541 households likely avoiding disruptive displacement from March 2023 through December 2025. See **Exhibit A** for a summary of the estimated fiscal impacts to Detroit and the return per dollar invested in an eviction right to counsel. The estimated potential fiscal impacts are related to:

- Housing social safety net programs³⁴
- Retained economic value through decreased out-migration
- Retained federal funding for Detroit Public Schools
- Decreased need for Medicaid-funded health care associated with homelessness
- Increased employment stability
- Increased educational attainment for children
- Decrease in crimes associated with housing instability
- Decreased need for out-of-home foster care placements
- Decreased frequency of criminalizing people experiencing homelessness
- Decreased need for Medicaid-funded health care associated with community health

Estimated Housing Social Safety Net Fiscal Impacts

It has been well known for many years in Detroit, as elsewhere in the U.S., that eviction is a pathway to homelessness. On March 25, 1991, in a televised production of the Detroit Black Journal, Olivia Wilcox from the Coalition on Temporary Shelter, outlined the key reasons why Detroit residents were seeking shelter, which include eviction due a landlord, eviction from the residence of family or friend and eviction from an assisted living facility.³⁵ Over 35 years later,

³² Cases funded through the Michigan State Bar or the Gilbert Family Foundation are not included in Stout's analysis.

³³ Stout observed approximately 3% of households indicate they would have to move out of their jurisdiction in its evaluations of eviction right to counsel programs in Cleveland, Connecticut, Maryland, Milwaukee, Nashville, and Oklahoma.

³⁴ Housing social safety net programs in Detroit include but are not limited to emergency shelter, cash assistance for housing with friends/family and rapid rehousing.

³⁵ "Homeless 1991." American Black Journal. March 25, 1991.

eviction remains one of the primary reasons why Detroit residents seek shelter and other social safety net services.³⁶

In Detroit, services for those experiencing homelessness include emergency shelter, transitional housing, homelessness prevention and support services, cash assistance for housing with friends/family and services for individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness.³⁷ Data from Detroit's 2024 Point-In-Time County indicates 1,724 people were experiencing homelessness in one night in Detroit,³⁸ while another report estimated that over the course of 2022 over 8,500 individuals in 5,901 households accessed the emergency shelter system. However, the Point-in-Time counts in Detroit undercount the number of families experiencing homelessness, especially single mother households, who may avoid interacting with housing social safety net services out of fear of being separated from the children.

Because eviction has been linked to homelessness, avoiding disruptive displacement through an eviction right to counsel can reduce costs associated with housing social safety net responses such as emergency shelter, rapid rehousing, and When people experience homelessness, research has shown a portion of them will experience homelessness again even after exiting a housing program. Stout estimated the average housing social safety net fiscal impacts to Detroit for an initial interaction with the housing social safety net system and the first subsequent re-entry to these systems.

Stout estimates 11,195 households in Detroit likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained residents of Detroit due to ERTC.³⁹ The eviction process (for some people but not all) creates a degree of housing instability that requires costly intervention to return people to stable housing. Representatives from the City of Detroit Department of Housing and Homelessness conveyed to Stout that approximately 20% of households entering into emergency shelters were recently evicted. Based on this estimate, Stout estimates approximately 15% of ERTC clients would have entered into emergency shelter but for ERTC. Based on this metric, Stout estimated 1,719 households in Detroit likely avoided experiencing homelessness and requiring emergency shelter but for an eviction right to counsel between March 2023 and December 2025.

Using publicly available data from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and local emergency shelter providers, Stout estimated the cost of an emergency shelter stay per household is approximately \$7,280 in Detroit.⁴⁰ Because there are

³⁶ Wilson, Meghan and Kuk, John. "Detroit's Lack of Affordable Housing Pushes Families to the Edge." Michigan Advance. April 29, 2025.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ HUD PIT Count by State. 2024 AHAR: Part 1 – PIT Estimates of Homelessness in U.S.

³⁹ Stout estimates approximately 3% of households would have moved outside of Detroit due to disruptive displacement if not for ERTC.

⁴⁰ Based on the average cost per night for Wave Project Winter Shelter (\$18.47), the average household size for ERTC clients, and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development data on the average duration of homelessness in Detroit.

many ways that individuals experience homelessness, particularly after an eviction when re-renting can be challenging, there are a variety of possible outcomes. For a portion of individuals and households, there may be short shelter stays, attempts to move in with family or friends, and re-entry into shelter. Others may experience longer shelter stays or rapid re-housing. Each of these scenarios has different (but significant) cost implications. Stout used the estimated cost of emergency shelter per household as a proxy for the cost of a housing social safety net response because the response is likely necessary for people experiencing homelessness and likely incurred by Detroit over time.

Applying the estimated cost of housing social safety net programs in Detroit of \$7,280 to the 1,719 households in Detroit that likely avoided experiencing homelessness and entering an emergency shelter but for ERTC results in an estimated fiscal impact of \$12.5 million to Detroit.

A portion of the estimated 1,719 households that would have required a housing social safety net response likely would have required a second housing social safety net response. Data from HUD indicates approximately 16% of all households exiting emergency shelter returned to emergency shelter in Detroit.⁴¹ Applying the 16% metric to the 1,719 households that would have likely required a first housing social safety net response results in an estimated 275 households who would have likely experienced homelessness a second time and required a subsequent housing social safety net response but for ERTC. At an estimated cost of \$7,280 per household for emergency shelter, the estimated cost of 275 households requiring a second housing social safety net response would be approximately \$2 million.

The total estimated fiscal impact to Detroit related to people experiencing homelessness because of disruptive displacement who would likely require a housing social safety net program is approximately \$14.5 million. Of the total \$14.5 million, approximately \$12.5 million is related to the first housing social safety net response, and approximately \$2 million is related to the second housing social safety net response that a portion of households would likely require.

Emergency shelter costs are one form of a social safety net response to the need for shelter, even in jurisdictions without a right to shelter and jurisdictions with people experiencing homelessness who are living unsheltered. Emergency shelter costs provide a proxy for costs jurisdictions bear (or are willing to bear) in response to severe housing instability. Furthermore, the incremental nature of shelter beds (i.e., the number of shelter beds increasing as the number of people experiencing homelessness increases) does not restrict the application of these costs to the households that are experiencing disruptive displacement because the costs may manifest in other ways, particularly if households are unable to enter emergency shelter and must use other Detroit services to achieve housing stability. Regardless of actual emergency shelter entry by households experiencing disruptive displacement, housing social safety net program costs can be a proxy for the other costs necessary to achieve housing stability for these households. Thus, the \$14.5 million cost of providing housing social safety net programs to people experiencing disruptive displacement is not a direct cost saving to Detroit. Rather, the

⁴¹ 2023 Detroit Continuum of Care Profile, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

\$14.5 million represents a fiscal impact related to homelessness because of disruptive displacement, which will include significant cost savings to Detroit from decreased use of housing social safety net responses.

See **Exhibit B** for Stout's detailed calculation of estimated fiscal impacts related to housing social safety net responses in Detroit.

Retained Economic Value by Minimizing Out-Migration

Detroit's population decrease over the last 60 years is well documented, and residents have moved out of the city for a variety of reasons, including disruptive displacement of renter households facing eviction.⁴² Data collected by attorneys representing tenants in jurisdictions where Stout is conducting independent eviction right to counsel program evaluations indicates approximately 3% of tenants would move out of their jurisdiction if they were evicted.⁴³ Applying the 3% to the 11,541 Detroit households who likely avoided disruptive displacement results in 346 households with 935 individuals that likely remained in Detroit due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

Stout used data from a study of population loss in Detroit,⁴⁴ per capita state and local expenditures,⁴⁵ and the present value of investments cities and states have been willing to make to attract new residents to estimate that for every person remaining in Detroit, the City would likely realize an estimated \$12,000 in economic value.⁴⁶ Applying this metric to the 935 households who remained in Detroit due to ERTC, Stout estimates Detroit retained approximately \$11.2 million in economic value from March 2023 through December 2025. See **Exhibit C**.

Estimated Federal and State Funding Retained for Detroit Schools

Stout quantified the federal funding retained for Detroit Public School Community District (DPSCD) by avoiding student migration out of Detroit as a result of disruptive displacement.

⁴² Mah, Julie. "Gentrification-Induced Displacement in Detroit, Michigan: An Analysis of Evictions." Routledge. July 21, 2020.

⁴³ Stout observed approximately 3% of households indicate they would have to move out of their jurisdiction in its evaluations of eviction right to counsel programs in Cleveland, Connecticut, Maryland, Milwaukee, Nashville, and Oklahoma.

⁴⁴ Aguilar, Louis. "Detroit population continues to decline, according to Census estimate." Bridge Michigan. May 2020.

⁴⁵ "State and Local Expenditures." Urban Institute. 2018. Referencing State & Local Government Finance Data Query System and Data from U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of State and Local Government Finances, Volume 4. 2020.

⁴⁶ Estimated by Stout using data from: (1) Aguilar, Louis. "Detroit population continues to decline, according to Census estimate." Bridge Michigan. May 2020. (2) "State and Local Expenditures." Urban Institute. 2018. Referencing State & Local Government Finance Data Query System and Data from U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of State and Local Government Finances, Volume 4. 2020. (3) Present value of investments that cities and states have been willing to make to attract new residents.

Enrollment in DPSCD schools for the 2024-2025 school year has decreased by approximately 4% since the 2018-2019 school year, however, it has increased approximately 2% from the 2023-2024 school year.

Researchers have found the children in households threatened with eviction are approximately 6% more likely to change schools and approximately 11% school districts by the next academic year.⁴⁷ In Detroit, 1 in 5 students who experience homelessness transfer schools part way through the school year.⁴⁸ When children in households are threatened with eviction do switch schools, they are more likely to switch to schools with fewer resources.⁴⁹ After switching schools, these children were also more likely to be chronically absent and be suspended from school.⁵⁰

Stout estimates approximately 15,227 children likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit from March 2023 through December 2025, of which approximately 45% are enrolled in DPSCD schools.⁵¹ As mentioned above, if not for ERTC, approximately 11% likely would have transferred out of their DPSCD school, resulting in approximately 758 children who remained in a DPSCD school from March 2023 through December 2025.

DPSCD receives approximately \$9,600 in state funding and \$3,400 in federal funding per student enrolled.⁵² Applying the estimated per student state and federal funding received to the estimated 758 children results in approximately \$9.8 million in retained state and federal funding for Detroit public schools from March 2023 through December 2025. See **Exhibit D**.

Estimated Fiscal Impact Related to Increased Employment Stability

Stout estimated social safety net costs related to job loss were likely avoided due to ERTC. As described previously, Stout estimates that 11,195 households in Detroit likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit due to ERTC.

Research has demonstrated the negative impact eviction has on employment stability, particularly the increased likelihood of a person experiencing job loss after being evicted.⁵³ Of the 11,195 estimated households that likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit, Stout estimates approximately 15% would have likely had their head of household

⁴⁷ Hepburn, Peter et al. "Consequences of Eviction-Led Forced Mobility for School-Aged Children." *Sociology of Education*. March 2025.

⁴⁸ Jennifer Erb-Downward et al. "The Educational Implications Of Homelessness And Housing Instability In Detroit." *Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan*. 2021.

⁴⁹ Hepburn, Peter et al. "Consequences of Eviction-Led Forced Mobility for School-Aged Children." *Sociology of Education*. March 2025.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*.

⁵¹ Winchell Lenhoff, Sarah and Singer, Jeremy. "Detroit K-12 Education System Overview." *Detroit Peer*. 2025.

⁵² National Center for Education Statistics.

⁵³ Desmond, Matthew and Gerhenson, Carl. "Housing and Employment Insecurity among the Working Poor." *Harvard University*. January 11, 2016.

experience job loss in the absence of an eviction right to counsel.⁵⁴ This results in an estimated 1,707 individuals who avoided job loss associated with disruptive displacement from March 2023 through December 2025.

Stout estimated the reduction in social safety net expenditures due to decreased job loss associated with disruptive displacement that Detroit due to ERTC. Stout estimates Detroit likely avoided an estimated \$2,600 in social safety net expenditures per household avoiding job loss as a result of ERTC.⁵⁵ This results in estimated fiscal impact of approximately \$4.4 million from March 2023 through December 2025. See **Exhibit E**.

Estimated Fiscal Impact Related to Increased Educational Attainment

School-aged children who experience homelessness face significant mental and physical health challenges that can prevent them from focusing on their education.⁵⁶ These challenges can result in students who are experiencing homelessness becoming chronically absent from school, dropping out of school and failing to graduate.⁵⁷ During the 2023-2024 school year, more than 3,000 children enrolled in Detroit Public Schools Community District experienced homelessness.⁵⁸ The following table shows chronic absenteeism, high school graduation rates, and high school drop-out rates for students currently experiencing homelessness, students who have ever experienced homelessness, and all economically disadvantaged students in Detroit.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Stout's methodology for calculating the estimated fiscal impacts of increased employment stability is based on estimates of social safety net expenditures in Detroit such as TANF, SNAP, housing assistance, and Medicaid for people experiencing employment instability.

⁵⁶ Bishop, Joseph. "Our Children Can't Wait: The Urgency of Reinventing Education Policy in America"

⁵⁷ "Chronic Absenteeism Among Students Experiencing Homelessness in America." National Center for Homeless Education. 2022.

⁵⁸ Detroit Department of Education, Number of Homeless Children and Youth Enrolled in Public School in Detroit.

⁵⁹ Jennifer Erb-Downward et al. "The Educational Implications Of Homelessness And Housing Instability In Detroit." Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan. 2021.

	Formerly Homeless	Economically Disadvantaged, Never Homeless	Not Economically Disadvantaged, Never Homeless
Chronic Absenteeism Rate	69%	56%	45%
High School Drop-Out Rate	23%	14%	11%
Graduation Rate	50%	73%	84%

As mentioned above, Stout estimates approximately 15,227 children likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit from March 2023 through December 2025. Approximately 31% of school aged youth are high school aged,⁶⁰ and in Detroit, students who ever experienced homelessness are approximately 31% more likely to not graduate high school.⁶¹ Stout estimates 372 children in Detroit would complete high school who otherwise would not have but for ERTC.

Research has demonstrated not completing high school has a significant impact on an individual’s future income.⁶² Additionally, the relationship between higher levels of education and lower likelihood of welfare program utilization have also been identified.⁶³ Completion of high school and college has been shown to significantly decrease the likelihood of the future need for cash and housing assistance,⁶⁴ applying for and utilizing Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits,⁶⁵ and being enrolled in Medicaid.⁶⁶ Detroit funds a portion of several social safety net programs, including but not limited to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, SNAP, and Medicaid.

Stout estimates increased educational attainment could result in approximately \$9,000 less social safety net spending per individual who would have not completed high school but for ERTC.⁶⁷ Applying this to the estimated 372 Detroit children who avoided disruptive

⁶⁰ National Center for Education Statistics.

⁶¹ "Reducing Barriers for Students Experiencing Homelessness." Detroit Department of Education. October 2023.

⁶² Tamborini, et al. "Education and Lifetime Earnings in the United States." Demography. 2016.

⁶³ Cliff, Aiden. "The Relationship Between Education and Welfare Dependency." The Brown Journal of Philosophy, Politics & Economics.

⁶⁴ Waldfogel, J, et al. "Public Assistance Programs: How Much Could be Saved with Improved Education?" Working Paper for Education Symposium, Teacher’s College, Columbia University. 2005.

⁶⁵ Rank, M and Hirschl, T. "The Likelihood of Using Food Stamps During the Adult Years." Journal of Nutrition and Behavior. 2005.

⁶⁶ Muennig, P. "Health Returns to Educational Interventions." Columbia University. 2005.

⁶⁷ Stout's methodology for calculating average benefits derived through increased educational attainment is based on estimate of yearly social safety net expenditures using average expected yearly amounts of publicly funded social safety net programs, such as TANF, SNAP, housing assistance, and Medicaid as an estimate.

displacement between March 2023 and December 2025 and who likely would have not completed high school but for ERTC results in approximately \$3.4 million in reduced social safety net expenditures in Detroit. See **Exhibit F**.

Estimated Additional Medicaid Spending on Health Care Associated with Homelessness

Stout quantified Medicaid spending on health care associated with homelessness in Detroit that was likely avoided due to ERTC. The categories of care that could reasonably be quantified are in-patient care, emergency room care, ambulatory care, pharmacy costs, and other healthcare costs.

Stout estimates 31,162 individuals in Detroit likely avoided disruptive displacement due to ERTC. Of the 31,162 individuals who likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit, approximately 25% will likely experience homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement but for an eviction right to counsel.⁶⁸ Applying the 25% metric results in approximately 7,790 individuals who likely avoided homelessness due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

The table below summarizes the estimated utilization rates and Medicaid expenditures for individuals experiencing homelessness by type of service based on publicly available research.⁶⁹ Stout incorporated these estimates into its Medicaid fiscal impact.

Service	Utilization Rate Among Individuals Experiencing Homelessness	Medicaid Expenditure per Individual Experiencing Homelessness
In-patient care	20%	\$3,627
In-patient care (3x or more)	4%	\$10,881
Emergency room care (3x or more)	58%	\$1,048
Emergency room care	10%	\$6,288
Ambulatory care sensitive admissions	32%	\$339
All other care	64%	\$875

⁶⁸ Based on metrics developed Robin Hood, a New York City based non-profit organization that provides funding to more than 200 programs across New York City. This metric differs from the 15% of households who would enter into emergency shelter, as a portion of households who would experience homelessness would not enter shelter or receive a housing social safety net response.

⁶⁹ Cantor, Joel C. "Homeless Service Use and Medicaid Spending in New Jersey." Rutgers Health: Center for State Health Policy. January 26th, 2018; Shannon, Micheal Evan et al. "Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions Encountered by a Homeless Healthcare Team." Journal of General Internal Medicine. December 2024; Kushel, Margot, et al. "Factors Associated With the Health Care Utilization of Homeless Persons." The Journal of the American Medical Association. January 10, 2001.

Additional research indicates individuals experiencing homelessness utilize in-patient care and emergency room care more frequently than people who are not experiencing homelessness.⁷⁰ For emergency room care this metric is 75%,⁷¹ for inpatient care, ambulatory sensitive care admissions, and all other care, this metric is 80%.⁷² Furthermore, approximately 93% of ERTC clients in Detroit are eligible for Medicaid.⁷³

Applying individual costs to the portion of individuals who avoided homelessness due to ERTC, will utilize each type of care (including frequent and one-time users), and are eligible for Medicaid and then adjusting for the portion of Medicaid expenditures paid by localities in Michigan (16%) results in an estimated fiscal impact to Detroit of \$1.1 million in emergency room care, \$1 million for in-patient care, \$100,000 for ambulatory sensitive care and \$520,000 in all other care. The total estimated fiscal impact from avoided Medicaid costs due to homelessness to Detroit is approximately \$2.7 million from March 2023 through December 2025.⁷⁴ See **Exhibit G**.

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Responding to Crimes

Stout estimated the criminal justice fiscal impacts associated with a reduction in crime resulting from fewer evictions. Research has demonstrated that higher rates of eviction correspond to higher rates of homicide, robbery, and burglary.⁷⁵ As previously described, Stout estimates that 11,195 households in Detroit likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit due to ERTC. Researchers have found a correlation between eviction and crimes associated with procuring shelter, forcible entry, and vehicle theft.⁷⁶ Using these findings, Stout estimates that Detroit likely experienced 168 fewer vehicle thefts and 27 fewer forcible entries due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

There is a breadth of research estimating the cost of crime, from which a range of cost per crime calculations have been made. While there is no agreed upon methodology for cost of crime calculations,⁷⁷ numerous studies have grouped cost of crime into four categories: victim costs,

⁷⁰ Kushel, Margot, et. al. "Factors Associated With the Health Care Utilization of Homeless Persons." *The Journal of the American Medical Association*. January 10, 2001. & Kushel, Margot, et. al. "Emergency Department Use Among the Homeless and Marginally Housed: Results From a Community-Based Study." *The American Journal of Public Health*. May 2002.

⁷¹ Kushel, Margot, et al. "Emergency Department Use Among the Homeless and Marginally Housed: Results From a Community-Based Study." *The American Journal of Public Health*. May 2002.

⁷² Kushel, Margot, et al. "Factors Associated With the Health Care Utilization of Homeless Persons." *The Journal of the American Medical Association*. January 10, 2001.

⁷³ Estimated by Stout using Detroit ERTC program data and Michigan Medicaid eligibility requirements from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.

⁷⁴ "Medicaid Financing States' Increased Reliance on Funds from Health Care Providers and Local Governments Warrants Improved CMS Data Collection." United States Government Accountability Office. July 2014.

⁷⁵ Semenza, D. C., Stansfield, R., Grosholz, J. M., & Link, N. W. "Eviction and Crime: A Neighborhood Analysis in Philadelphia." *Crime & Delinquency*. August 2022.

⁷⁶ Falcone, Stefano. "Forcing Out, Breaking In: Do Evictions Increase Crime." July 2022. See Table B.1.

⁷⁷ Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/costs-crime>.

criminal justice costs, crime career costs, and intangible costs.⁷⁸ Stout utilized the most recent scholarship that evaluates prior studies as well as government reports to determine the criminal justice cost per forcible entry and vehicle theft. Stout only considers the public criminal justice costs, which represent direct fiscal impacts to Detroit, in its calculation. The criminal justice cost of a single vehicle theft was calculated to be approximately \$5,700 and a burglary to be approximately \$6,000.⁷⁹ Applying these criminal justice fiscal impacts to the likely avoided vehicle thefts and forcible entries, Detroit likely realized approximately \$1.1 million in criminal justice fiscal impacts due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.⁸⁰ See **Exhibit H**.

While Stout only calculated the fiscal impacts of responding to forcible entries and vehicle thefts, the actual criminal justice fiscal impact is likely higher. Research has shown that eviction is associated with a number of other crimes⁸¹ and gun violence,⁸² each of which has its own criminal justice fiscal impact. However, these studies relating to other crimes associated with eviction do not currently include quantifications of cost.

Estimated Out-of-Home Foster Care Fiscal Impacts

Stout quantified potential out-of-home foster fiscal impacts related to children who avoided being placed in out-of-home foster care due to ERTC.

As mentioned above, Stout estimates approximately 15,227 children likely avoided disruptive displacement and remained in Detroit from March 2023 through December 2025. Approximately 4% of children from evicted families are placed in foster care and are likely to live in foster care for at least one year.⁸³ This results in an estimated 609 children who avoided being placed in foster care as a result of disruptive displacement from March 2023 through December 2025.

Based on Michigan foster care cost data published by Child Trends in 2020 (the most recent year for which data is available), Michigan spent approximately \$286 million on out-of-home foster care.⁸⁴ Using data from Child Trends, Stout estimated an average cost of \$21,696 per child in out-of-home foster care.⁸⁵ Applying the \$21,696 cost to the estimated 609 children in Detroit

⁷⁸ McCollister KE, French MT, Fang H. The Cost of Crime to Society: New Crime-Specific Estimates for Policy and Program Evaluation. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* April 2010.

⁷⁹ Ibid. Stout used the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index Inflation Calculator to adjust the dollar amounts to 2023 dollars. <https://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl>.

⁸⁰ Current research only calculates the cost of burglary, however for a crime to be considered a burglary, there must be forcible entry. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Report, Burglary.

⁸¹ Semenza, D. C., Stansfield, R., Grosholz, J. M., & Link, N. W. "Eviction and Crime: A Neighborhood Analysis in Philadelphia." *Crime & Delinquency.* August 2022.

⁸² Gaston, Melanie. "The Impact of Eviction on Neighborhood Gun Violence." Rutgers, State University of New Jersey. May 2021.

⁸³ Berg, Lisa and Brannstrom, Lars. "Evicted children and subsequent placement in out-of-home care: a cohort study." *Public Library of Science.* April 18, 2018.

⁸⁴ "Child Welfare Agency Spending in Detroit in SFY 2020." Child Trends.

⁸⁵ "Commissioner's Monthly Report." Detroit Department of Children and Families. February, 2024.

who likely avoided entering out-of-home foster care due to ERTC results in a total avoided cost of approximately \$12.5 million. In Michigan, approximately 5% of expenditure is funded by localities,⁸⁶ resulting in Detroit likely realizing \$720,000 in fiscal impacts related to avoided out-of-home foster care placements due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

The potential fiscal impact related to out-of-home foster care placements for Detroit is likely significantly understated. There are many additional services offered to children who are living in foster care that accompany foster care. The cost of social workers, case managers, maintenance payments, and monitoring the well-being of children placed with families, for example, are not included in Stout's analyses as reliable, publicly available data to estimate these costs was limited. There may also be fiscal impacts related to children who are living in foster care for reasons not related to housing but who cannot return home because their family is facing a housing instability issue that could be addressed by eviction right to counsel. See **Exhibit I**.

Estimated Fiscal Impact of Incarcerating People Experiencing Homelessness

Stout estimated the fiscal impacts of incarcerating individuals experiencing homelessness who would have avoided homelessness as a result of ERTC. Stout estimates 15,935 adult individuals in Detroit likely avoided disruptive displacement due to ERTC. Of these adult individuals, approximately 25% would have likely experienced homelessness because of disruptive displacement but for ERTC,⁸⁷ resulting in an estimated 3,984 individuals in Detroit.

Individuals experiencing homelessness are more likely to interact with police, be fined for quality-of-life crimes, and be arrested relative to housed individuals.⁸⁸ A study of homelessness in Minnesota found 12% of adults experiencing homelessness had been incarcerated within the past year.⁸⁹ A similar study conducted in New York City found 23% of emergency shelter residents had been incarcerated within the past 2 years.⁹⁰ Stout used the 12% metric identified in the Minnesota study, given that it is on an annual basis, to estimate that approximately 12% of adults who would have experienced homelessness would have also experienced incarceration. Applying the estimated 12% to the estimated 3,984 adult individuals likely

⁸⁶ "Child Welfare Agency Spending in Detroit in SFY 2020." Child Trends.

⁸⁷ Based on metrics developed by Robin Hood, a New York City based non-profit organization that provides funding to more than 200 programs across New York City.

⁸⁸ Speigman, Richard, Green, Rex S. "Homeless and Non-Homeless Arrestees: Distinctions in Prevalence and in Sociodemographic, Drug Use, and Arrest Characteristics Across DUF Sites." National Institute of Justice. 1999. See also, Herring, Chris. "Complaint-Oriented Policing: Regulating Homelessness in Public Space." American Sociological Association. 2019; Bailey, Madeline, Crew, Erica, Reeve, Madz. "No Access to Justice: Breaking the Cycle of Homelessness and Jail." Vera Institute of Justice. 2020; Zakrison, Tanya, Hamel, Paul, Hwang, Stephen. "Homeless People's Trust and Interactions with Police and Paramedics." Journal of Urban Health. 2004.

⁸⁹ "Overview of Homelessness in Minnesota 2006." Wilder Research. 2007.

⁹⁰ Metraux, Stephen, Caterina, Roman, Cho, Richard. "Incarceration and Homelessness." US Department of Veterans Affairs. 2008.

avoided homelessness due to ERTC results in 478 individuals who likely avoided incarceration from March 2023 through December 2025.

An individual detained for a low-level offense in Detroit spends 23 days⁹¹ on average incarcerated at an estimated cost of \$65 per day.⁹² Applying these metrics to the 478 estimated individuals who likely avoided experiencing homelessness and incarceration due to ERTC results in estimated fiscal impacts of approximately \$710,000 from March 2023 through December 2025. See **Exhibit J**.

Estimated Additional Medicaid Spending on Healthcare Associated with Poor Community Health

Researchers have found that forced moves due to evictions can lead to worse self-reported health, even if the household does not experience homelessness following an eviction. Representatives from the City of Detroit Department of Public Health described the health impacts of housing instability in Detroit, such as maternal mortality, children experiencing health issues from lead and mold related conditions, and households not being able to receive routine medical care or fulfill their prescriptions. Stout quantified Medicaid spending on health care associated with poor community health by Detroit that likely avoided due to ERTC.

As mentioned above, an estimated 31,162 individuals likely avoided disruptive displacement due to ERTC. Using research on the increase in poor self-rated health among households that have experienced eviction in Detroit⁹³ and the estimated proportion of low-income Detroit residents who have poor health,⁹⁴ Stout estimates that approximately 623 low-income Detroit residents would have experienced worse health outcomes if not for ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

Worse health typically results in more healthcare spending, which can result in thousands more in healthcare costs.⁹⁵ Based on available research on the incremental healthcare associated with poor health among non-senior adults, Stout used \$7,046 as the expected healthcare expenditures associated with poor health as a result of disruptive displacement. Applying this cost to the approximately 623 Detroit residents who would have experienced worse health as a

⁹¹ "What Jails Cost: Wayne County." Vera Institute.

⁹² "Exploring Jail Incarceration Trends in Wayne County." Vera Institute.

⁹³ Sealy-Jefferson et al. "Residential Evictions by Life Course, Type, and Timing, and Associations with Self-rated Health: Social Epidemiology to Combat Unjust Residential Evictions (SECURE) Study." *Journal of Urban Health*. May 2025.

⁹⁴ "Health and Health Insurance in Detroit: Identifying Barriers to Accessing Health Care." Detroit Area Communities Study at the University of Michigan. 2019.

⁹⁵ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. April 2016; Rhoades, Jeffery. "Access to Care and Use of Preventive Services, 2002: Estimates for the U.S. Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population, Age 18 to 64." Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. June 2025.

result of disruptive displacement but for ERTC results in \$5.3 million in incremental healthcare costs.

As mentioned above, approximately 93% of ERTC clients in Detroit are eligible for Medicaid,⁹⁶ and approximately 16% of Medicaid expenditures are paid by localities in Michigan.⁹⁷ This results in approximately \$650,000 in avoided Medicaid costs due to improved community health due to ERTC from March 2023 through December 2025.

⁹⁶ Estimated by Stout using Detroit ERTC program data and Michigan Medicaid eligibility requirements from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.

⁹⁷ "Medicaid Financing States' Increased Reliance on Funds from Health Care Providers and Local Governments Warrants Improved CMS Data Collection." United States Government Accountability Office. July 2014.

Section VI – Recommendations

Stout developed recommendations for the continued implementation of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit based on its engagement with stakeholders in Detroit, including landlords, tenants right advocates, legal aid attorneys working on ERTC, representatives of the 36th District Court, and other relevant stakeholders, as well as considering Stout’s work evaluating eviction right to counsel and eviction diversion programs across the U.S. While ERTC has already impacted thousands of Detroit residents, there are opportunities to refine ERTC to balance the concerns from stakeholders and deepen the understanding of the eviction landscape in Detroit.

- Collaborate with rental property owners, their counsel, agents, and property managers to address mutually agreed upon challenges and barriers in Detroit’s eviction ecosystem.
 - Understand efforts that landlords are undertaking to work with tenants prior to filing an eviction and how these efforts may differ based on rental property owner typology (e.g., large corporate owners v. owners of 1-3 units).
 - Landlords and property managers Stout spoke with emphasized the need for timely resolution to landlord-tenant disputes to avoid relying on an eviction filing.
 - Develop a framework and process to incorporate feedback from residents, tenant organizers, community organizations and the courts to inform changes to the ways ERTC operates.
- The legal aid providers currently collect data around client demographics, case characteristics, and case outcomes. The significant investment UCHC and the City have made in data collection is demonstrated in the consistency and completeness of the ERTC program data Stout reviewed. Nevertheless, the collection of additional data elements could further deepen the understanding of client and case circumstances and lead to additional program refinements:
 - If clients had previous evictions filed against them
 - Amount of rent stated in the notice, amount of rent sought in complaint, and amount of rent the client thinks they owe
 - Where clients would go if they had to move
 - Whether clients want to stay in their home
 - If a client was represented by ERTC in the previous 12 months
 - The distribution of hours spent on ERTC cases in total and by staff position (i.e., supervising attorney, attorney, paralegal, other support staff) and case / client circumstances that may require more or less time to reach an effective resolution
 - The frequency with which, and reason why, settlement agreements fail in the months following their execution (possibly using a client survey after the resolution of the case)

- Whether there are legal defenses, and if so, what type
- When the client's first court date was missed (if applicable)
- If the landlord's primary business address is outside Detroit and / or outside Michigan
- Consider opportunities to gather additional feedback regarding the effectiveness of community outreach from local community organizations and tenants.
 - This could include more outreach to the population facing eviction who do not appear for their hearing and lose the case by default, in order to better understand why they are not appearing.
- To be eligible for ERTC, a tenant must have already received an eviction filing. Consider if that requirement limits the ability to develop eviction prevention strategies.
- Consider the implementation of a complementary program with the goal of addressing landlord-tenant disputes before an eviction filing.
 - Stout has learned that landlords often try to work with tenants before filing an eviction, and the eviction filing is often perceived by landlords as a last resort. Effectively implemented eviction diversion and mediation programs (either pre- or post-filing), in addition to other wrap-around services, could significantly enhance the impact of ERTC, particularly when the only issue is the non-payment of rent. These cases could be handled outside of the adversarial legal system, leaving cases with substantive legal issues and disputes of fact to be litigated within the adversarial legal system.
 - Renters fall behind on their rent for several reasons such as short-term economic hardship (such as an unexpected expense or temporary employment disruption), long-term economic hardship (such as unstable employment or childcare challenges), or substantive legal issues with their landlord. By differentiating these issues, customized solutions can be developed, collaboratively (landlords, tenant advocates, organizers, policymakers) that can help create a healthy, thriving rental housing ecosystem that serves both landlords and tenants.
 - Based on Stout's experience evaluating eviction diversion initiatives, the implementation of a complementary pre-filing program may further contribute to the decline in eviction filings that begin with the implementation of ERTC.
 - There currently exists an eviction diversion pilot with UCHC in partnership with select landlords to work with tenants experiencing economic hardship. The pilot is still in its early stages of implementation.
- Consider further research regarding reasons for the loss of affordable rental housing in Detroit, disincentives for the creation of new affordable housing and ways housing policies can expand housing options for people facing eviction who are not able to afford

market rents due long-term loss of income (e.g., loss of a job or loss of an income earner in the household).

- Expand partnerships with other City programs and community organizations to maximize program impact on improving housing stock in Detroit. This could include Home repair programs, (Detroit Home Repair Program, Renew Detroit) lead testing programs (Childhood Lead Prevention Program, Detroit LeadSafe Housing), and home ownership programs (Make it Home).

Section VII – Conclusion

The estimated fiscal impact to Detroit from eviction right to counsel is approximately \$48.5 million from March 2023 and December 2025. The estimated fiscal impacts to the City we have been able to preliminary quantify include:

- ~\$14.5 million in savings related to housing social safety net responses
- ~\$11.2 million in retained economic value by minimizing out-migration
- ~\$9.8 million in federal funding retained for Detroit public schools
- ~\$4.4 million related to increased employment stability
- ~\$3.4 million related to increased educational attainment
- ~\$2.7 million in Medicaid cost savings on health care due to homelessness
- ~\$1.1 million for a reduction in crimes associated with housing instability
- ~\$720,000 in out-of-home foster care costs
- ~\$710,000 related to incarcerating people experiencing homelessness
- ~\$650,000 in Medicaid cost savings on health care due to improved community health

From March 2023 through December 2025, the City of Detroit Office of Eviction Defense distributed approximately \$13 million to the Providers to provide legal representation to Detroit residents facing eviction. For every dollar invested in an eviction right to counsel, Stout estimates a potential fiscal benefit to Detroit of \$3.74.

Additionally, data collected by civil legal services providers throughout the country indicates that many people who seek and receive legal assistance or legal representation in eviction proceedings are facing homelessness or have acute vulnerabilities that may require additional publicly funded social safety net responses. In its previous evaluations and cost-benefit analyses (pre- and post-legislation) of eviction right to counsel programs throughout the country, Stout has found the estimated return on investment of an eviction right to counsel has generally ranged from at least \$2.50 to \$4.84.⁹⁸

Stout's estimate of the fiscal impact is likely significantly understated. Included in the calculation are estimated benefits of an eviction right to counsel that are reasonably quantifiable with currently available data. However, if tenants experienced more stable housing, the State may realize many benefits that are not at this time reliably quantifiable and therefore are not included in Stout's calculations. The additional potential fiscal impacts Detroit may realize include, but are not limited to:

⁹⁸ Stout's pre- and post-legislation cost-benefit analyses and program evaluations include the following estimated returns on investment: Chattanooga / Hamilton County - \$4.84 (2024); Los Angeles County - \$4.80 (2019); Milwaukee County - \$4.66 (2025); Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties - \$4.21 (2024); Columbus - \$4.00 (2024); Detroit - \$3.52 (2022); City of Los Angeles - \$3.48 (2019); Chicago - \$2.75 to \$3.35 (2024); Cleveland - \$2.62 to \$3.11 (2024); Baltimore - \$3.06 (2020); Maryland - \$3.04 (2024); South Carolina - \$2.92 (2022); Delaware - \$2.76 (2021); Connecticut - \$2.64 (2024); Phoenix - \$2.58 (2025); and Davidson County \$2.50 (2024) .

- The education costs, juvenile justice costs, and child welfare costs associated with children experiencing homelessness
- The negative impact of an eviction on tenants' credit score, tenants' ability to re-rent, and the potential loss of a subsidized housing voucher
- The cost of family, community, and neighborhood instability
- Preservation of financial and personal assets
- The preservation of affordable housing in Detroit

The City also likely realized additional fiscal impacts associated with the decline in eviction filings since the implementation of ERTC. In 2019, there were approximately 30,000 eviction filings at the 36th district court, while in 2024 and 2025 there averaged approximately 20,500 eviction filings per year, an approximately 32% decrease. Stout has observed in its evaluations of eviction right to counsel programs in Connecticut, Cleveland, Delaware and Milwaukee County that after implementation of eviction right to counsel, evictions decreased between 8% and 25%. The decrease in eviction filings likely results in more tenants remaining in their homes, thus being at less risk of housing instability and the associated fiscal impacts highlighted above.

While Stout's analysis demonstrates a significant return on investment, the manner in which such programs are implemented can create undue financial stress on certain landlords, particularly in combination with other external factors. The financial stress to certain landlords has the potential to result in the selling or closure of certain rental properties affordable to individuals and families with low incomes, which the City of Detroit may otherwise provide funds to preserve.

Stout's conclusions are based on information received to date. Stout reserves the right to change those conclusions should additional information be provided. Stout's review, research, and analysis was conducted on an independent basis.

Appendix A - Stout Profile and Qualifications

Stout Risius Ross, LLC (Stout) is a global advisory firm specializing in corporate finance, accounting and transaction advisory, valuation, financial disputes, claims, and investigations. In addition to these services, Stout's professionals have expertise in strategy consulting involving a variety of socioeconomic issues, including issues of or related to access to justice and the needs of low-income individuals and communities. Under the direction of Neil Steinkamp, who leads Stout's Transformative Change Consulting practice, Stout is a recognized leader in the civil legal services community and offers the following services:

- Economic impact assessments and policy research for civil legal services initiatives
- Strategy consulting and action plan development for issues relating to access to justice
- Non-profit budget development, review, and recommendations
- Cost-benefit and impact analyses for non-profit initiatives and activities
- Data-driven program evaluation and implementation
- Dispute consulting and damages analyses for low-income individuals

Neil Steinkamp is a Managing Director at Stout and a well-recognized expert and consultant on a range of strategic, corporate, and financial issues for businesses, non-profit organizations, and community leaders and their advisors. Neil has extensive experience in the development of strategic plans, impact analyses, data evaluation, and organizational change. His work often includes assessments of data reporting, data collection processes, the interpretation or understanding of structured and unstructured data, the review of documents and databases, the development of iterative process improvement strategies, and the creation of data monitoring platforms to facilitate sustained incremental change toward a particular outcome and creating collaborative environments. Mr. Steinkamp also has experience with housing related issues, including eviction. He has authored numerous economic impact studies on providing low-income tenants with attorneys in eviction proceedings, one of which assisted in the passing of New York City's historic right to counsel law. Mr. Steinkamp also currently serves as the court-appointed Independent Data Analyst in *Baez v. New York City Housing Authority*, overseeing NYCHA's compliance with the timely remediation of mold and leak work orders.

In mid-2020, Stout developed innovative analyses of tenant household instability caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the estimated rental debt owed, and estimated how that instability could result in an unprecedented number of eviction filings in states throughout the country. Stout's research and analyses have been cited in local and national publications including but not limited to, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *CNBC*, *Reuters*, *Forbes*, *Politico*, and *Bloomberg*, and was referenced in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) September 4, 2020 Order enacting a nationwide eviction moratorium. Stout also maintains an [Eviction Right to Counsel Resource Center](#) which includes Stout's eviction cost-benefit analyses as well as a compilation of resources related to the eviction process, housing instability, racial bias, the impacts and economic costs of eviction, and draft and enacted legislation.

Stout was engaged by a recipient of the National Low Income Housing Coalition’s “ERASE” (End Rental Arrears to Stop Evictions) grant to assist it in estimating what financial commitment would be required to sustain emergency rental assistance. Stout completed a similar analysis in Maryland in December 2023. In Stout’s pre- and post-legislation evaluations, Stout is collecting data to determine how frequently tenants seeking legal representation have already applied for emergency rental assistance, the amount of back-rent owed, whether they were approved, what amount of assistance they received, and whether the landlords accepted the funds.

Stout has been engaged by more than 50 non-profit organizations serving low-income communities across the United States. These engagements often included program or public policy evaluations, return on investment analyses, and strategic action planning. Following the release of Stout’s reports in Baltimore, Cleveland, Columbus, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York City, and Philadelphia, eviction right to counsel legislation was enacted. In these engagements, Stout worked closely with funders/potential funders, legal services organizations, rental property owners, academics studying housing and eviction, government agencies and the continuum of care, non-profits serving low-income residents, community organizers, and impacted residents. The table below lists jurisdictions where Stout is serving or has served as the independent evaluator of eviction right or access to counsel programs and has completed fiscal impact or cost analyses of eviction right or access to counsel programs.

Independent Evaluations of Eviction Right to Counsel Programs	Independent Fiscal Impact and/or Cost Analysis of Implemented/Proposed Eviction Right to Counsel Programs
Atlanta Chicago Cincinnati Cleveland Connecticut Davidson County (Nashville) Dayton Maryland Milwaukee Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties Oakland County (Michigan)	Baltimore Broward County Chattanooga Chicago Cleveland Columbus Connecticut Davidson County (Nashville) Delaware Detroit Los Angeles Maryland Miami-Dade County Milwaukee New Jersey New York (outside of New York City) New York City Newark Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties Pennsylvania Philadelphia Phoenix South Carolina

Stout also currently serves as the evaluator for the National Center for State Court’s Eviction Diversion Initiative (EDI). The court-based EDI includes 22 distinct jurisdictions that vary in size, court process, program design, and data collection sophistication. Stout has effectively worked with each jurisdiction (and its court system) to create data collection tools that meet their local needs and will enable the NCSC to evaluate the impact of the program using a data-informed approach to program implementation across the 22 jurisdictions.

Stout also has significant experience consulting on eviction ecosystem elements, such as mediation (pre- and post-filing) coordinated / centralized intake, screening and referral mechanisms, and reasonable attorney caseloads. In 2023, Stout was appointed to a working group by then-acting Chief Judge Anthony Cannataro to assist with developing guidelines for the time required for attorneys to effectively and efficiently represent tenants in accordance with New York City’s Eviction Right to Counsel legislation. In 2024, Stout completed a similar analysis for the Washington State Office of Civil Legal Aid, which administers Washington’s Eviction Right to Counsel program.

Appendix B - Exhibits

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
 Exhibit A - Summary of the Estimated Fiscal Impacts of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit

			Exhibit
1	Estimated housing social safety net responses	\$ 14,500,000	B
2	Estimated retained economic value by minimizing out-migration	\$ 11,200,000	C
3	Estimated federal funding retained for Detroit Schools	\$ 9,800,000	D
4	Estimated fiscal impact related to increased employment stability	\$ 4,400,000	E
5	Estimated fiscal impact related to increased educational attainment	\$ 3,400,000	F
6	Estimated additional Medicaid spending on health care associated with homelessness	\$ 2,700,000	G
7	Estimated fiscal impact of responding to crimes	\$ 1,100,000	H
8	Estimated out-of-home foster care fiscal impacts	\$ 720,000	I
9	Estimated fiscal impact of incarcerating people experiencing homelessness	\$ 710,000	J
10	Estimated additional Medicaid spending on health care associated with improved community health	\$ 650,000	K
11	Total estimated fiscal impacts realized by Detroit as a result of eviction right to counsel (rounded)	\$ 48,500,000	
12	Total amount Detroit spent to provide a right to counsel in eviction cases for eligible tenants (rounded)	\$ 13,000,000	
13	Estimated fiscal impacts to Detroit per dollar invested in eviction right to counsel	\$ 3.74	

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
 Exhibit B - Estimated Housing Social Safety Net Responses

Estimated housing social safety net response - first use of housing social safety net		
1	Estimated number of households that likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	11,195
2	Estimated portion of households that would have likely required a housing social safety net response but for ERTC [b]	15%
3	Estimated number of households that would have likely required a housing social safety net response but for ERTC	1,719
4	Estimated average per household cost of a housing social safety net response [c]	\$ 7,281
5	Estimated cost to provide housing to households that would have likely experienced disruptive displacement without ERTC	\$ 12,517,348
Estimated housing social safety net response - second use of housing social safety net		
6	Estimated number of households that would have likely required a housing social safety net response but for ERTC	1,719
7	Estimated portion of households that would have required a second housing social safety net response but for ERTC [d]	16%
8	Estimated number of households that would have required a second housing social safety net response but for ERTC	275
9	Estimated average per household cost of a housing social safety net response [c]	\$ 7,281
10	Estimated cost to provide subsequent housing to households that would have likely experienced disruptive displacement without ERTC	\$ 2,002,776
11	Total estimated housing social safety net responses (rounded)	\$ 14,500,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income eligible households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of right to counsel and that would have not migrated out of
 [b] Representatives from the City of Detroit Department of Housing and Homelessness conveyed to Stout that approximately 20% of households entering into emergency shelters were recently evicted. Based on this estimate, Stout estimates that approximately 15% of RTC clients would have entered into emergency shelter but for eviction right to counsel.
 [c] Based on the average cost per night for Wave Project Winter Shelter (\$18.47), the average household size for ERTC clients, and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development data on the average duration of homelessness in Detroit.
 [d] United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Continuum of Care Performance Profiles: Detroit.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit C - Retained Economic Value by Minimizing Out-Migration

1	Estimated number of households that likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	11,541
2	Estimated portion of households experiencing an eviction filing who indicate they would likely leave Detroit if forced to move [b]	3%
3	Estimated number of households that would likely leave Detroit if forced to move	346
4	Number of individuals per household in ERTC households [c]	3
5	Estimated number of people who would likely leave Detroit if forced to move	935
6	Estimated economic value of a resident [d]	\$ 12,000
7	Estimated economic value retained by minimizing out-migration (rounded)	\$ 11,200,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement if a right to counsel were implemented in Detroit.

[b] Stout observed approximately 3% of tenants indicate they would have to move out of their jurisdiction in its evaluations of eviction diversion programs in Cleveland, Connecticut, Maryland, Milwaukee, Nashville and Oklahoma.

[c] Based on Detroit ERTC program data provided to Stout (rounded).

[d] Estimated by Stout using data from: (1) Aguilar, Louis. "Detroit population continues to decline, according to Census estimate." Bridge Michigan. May 2020. (2) "State and Local Expenditures." Urban Institute. 2018. Referencing State & Local Government Finance Data Query System and Data from U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of State and Local Government Finances, Volume 4. 2020. (3) Present value of investments that cities and states have been willing to make to attract new residents.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit D - Estimated Federal Funding Retained for Detroit Schools

1	Estimated number of children in Detroit who likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	15,227
2	Estimated percent of children in Detroit who attend a Detroit Public School Community District School [b]	45%
3	Estimated number of children in Detroit who attend a Detroit Public School Community District School	6,895
4	Estimated percent of children who would disenroll from Detroit Public School Community District [c]	11%
5	Estimated number of children who would disenroll from Detroit Public School Community District	758
6	Estimated state funding per pupil received by Detroit Pubic School Community District [d]	\$ 9,589
7	Estimated federal funding per pupil received by Detroit Pubic School Community District [d]	\$ 3,390
8	Estimated federal funding retained for Detroit Schools (rounded)	\$ 9,800,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement if right to counsel were implemented in Detroit.

[b] Winchell Lenhoff, Sarah and Singer, Jeremy. "Detroit K-12 Education System Overview." Detroit Peer. 2025.

[c] Hepburn, Peter et al. "Consequences of Eviction-Led Forced Mobility for School-Aged Children." Sociology of Education. April 2025.

[d] National Center for Education Statistics.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit E - Estimated Fiscal Impact Related to Increased Employment Stability

1	Estimated number of households that likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	11,195
2	Estimated average percentage of households that experience job loss because of disruptive displacement [b]	15%
3	Estimated number of households that would have likely experienced job loss because of disruptive displacement	1,707
4	Incremental number of households that avoided disruptive displacement and job loss because of ERTC	1,707
5	Estimated percentage of Detroit residents who apply for and receive unemployment benefits [c]	23%
6	Estimated average weekly unemployment benefits payment in Detroit [c]	\$ 361
7	Estimated average number of weeks unemployment insurance benefits are received [c]	11
8	Estimated unemployment benefits not having to be paid to Detroit residents due to maintaining employment through ERTC	\$ 1,587,842
9	Incremental number of households that likely avoided disruptive displacement and job loss because of ERTC	1,707
10	Estimated cost of social safety net responses to employment instability [d]	\$ 1,664
11	Estimated social safety net responses avoided because employment stability realized through ERTC	\$ 2,840,053
12	Estimated fiscal impact related to increased employment stability (rounded) [e]	\$ 4,400,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income eligible households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of right to counsel and that would have not migrated out of Detroit.

[b] Estimated using Desmond, Matthew and Gerhenson, Carl. "Housing and Employment Insecurity among the Working Poor." Harvard University. January 11, 2016.

[c] Unemployment Insurance Data published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. <https://oui.doleta.gov/unemploy/DataDashboard.asp>

[d] Stout's methodology for calculating average benefits saved through increased employment stability is based on the average expected yearly amounts of publicly funded social safety net programs, such as TANF, SNAP, housing assistance, and Medicaid.

[e] On a per unemployed household basis, the average social safety net spending and unemployment benefits spending in Detroit is approximately \$2,600.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit F - Estimated Fiscal Impact Related to Increased Educational Attainment

1	Estimated number of children in Detroit who likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	15,227
2	Estimated percentage of households who experience homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement [b]	25%
3	Estimated number of children in Detroit who likely avoided homelessness as a result of ERTC	3,807
4	Estimated percentage of students who are in high school [c]	31%
5	Estimated number of students in high school who likely avoided homelessness because of RTC	1180
6	Estimated percent increase in a student not graduating high school due to ever experiencing homelessness in Detroit [d]	32%
7	Estimated incremental number of students who likely completed (or will complete) high school due to avoiding homelessness	372
8	Estimated per person social safety net responses required when a student does not complete school [e]	\$ 9,035
9	Estimated fiscal impact related to increased educational attainment (rounded)	\$ 3,400,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income eligible households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement because of right to counsel in Detroit.

[b] Estimated by Robin Hood. https://robinhoodorg-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2017/04/Metrics-Equations-for-Website_Sept-2014.pdf.

[c] National Center for Education Statistics.

[d] Jennifer Erb-Downward et al. "The Educational Implications Of Homelessness And Housing Instability In Detroit." Poverty Solutions at the University of Michigan. 2021.

[e] Stout's methodology for calculating average benefits derived through increased educational attainment is based on estimate of yearly social safety net expenditures using average expected yearly amounts of publicly funded social safety net programs, such as TANF, SNAP, housing assistance, and Medicaid as an

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
 Exhibit G - Estimated Additional Medicaid Spending on Health Care Associated with Homelessness

Cost Type	Individuals who likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	Estimated percentage of households who experience homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement [b]	Estimated individuals who avoided experiencing homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement	Utilization rate by people experiencing homelessness [c]	Individuals who avoided experiencing homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement utilizing healthcare services	Portion of individuals experiencing homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement utilizing healthcare services but for experiencing homelessness [d,e]	Portion of individuals experiencing homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement eligible for Medicaid [f]	Average cost per individual experiencing homelessness [g]	Estimated additional health care cost related to individuals experiencing homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement	Portion of Medicaid expenditures funded by localities in Michigan [h]	Estimated Medicaid savings related to individuals experiencing homelessness
1 In-patient care	31,162	25%	7,790	20%	1,566	80%	93%	\$ 3,627	\$4,225,523	16%	\$ 676,084
2 Frequent in-patient care (3x)	31,162	25%	7,790	4%	273	80%	93%	\$ 10,881	\$2,207,363	16%	\$ 353,178
3 Emergency room care	31,162	25%	7,790	58%	4,511	75%	93%	\$ 1,048	\$3,297,221	16%	\$ 527,555
4 Frequent emergency room care (6x)	31,162	25%	7,790	10%	787	75%	93%	\$ 6,288	\$3,450,977	16%	\$ 552,156
5 Ambulatory care sensitive admissions	31,162	25%	7,790	32%	2,495	80%	93%	\$ 339	\$628,762	16%	\$ 100,602
6 All Other Care	31,162	25%	7,790	64%	4,986	80%	93%	\$ 875	\$3,245,824	16%	\$ 519,532
7 Total - (rounded)											\$2,700,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income individuals with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of ERTC.

[b] Estimated by Robin Hood. https://robinhoodorg-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2017/04/Metrics-Equations-for-Website_Sept-2014.pdf. See also paragraphs 38-53 of the report.

[c] Cantor, Joel C. "Homeless Service Use and Medicaid Spending in New Jersey." Rutgers Health: Center for State Health Policy, January 26th, 2018; Shannon, Micheal Evan et al. "Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions Encountered by a Homeless Healthcare Team." Journal of General Internal Medicine. December 2024; Kushel, Margot, et al. "Factors Associated With the Health Care Utilization of Homeless Persons." The Journal of the American Medical Association, January 10, 2001.

[d] Kushel, Margot, et al. "Factors Associated With the Health Care Utilization of Homeless Persons." The Journal of the American Medical Association, January 10, 2001.

[e] Kushel, Margot, et al. "Emergency Department Use Among the Homeless and Marginally Housed: Results From a Community-Based Study." The American Journal of Public Health, May 2002.

[f] Estimated by Stout using Detroit ERTC program data and Michigan Medicaid eligibility requirements from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.

[g] Cantor, Joel C. "Medicaid Utilization and Spending among Homeless Adults in New Jersey: Implications for Medicaid-Funded Tenancy Support Services." The Milbank Quarterly, March 2020.

[h] "Federal and State Share of Medicaid Spending." Kaiser Family Foundation, FY2022.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit H- Estimated Fiscal Impacts of Responding to Crimes

1	Estimated number of households that likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	11,195
2	Estimated frequency of motor vehicle thefts per instance of eviction [b]	1.5%
3	Estimated fewer motor vehicle thefts as a result of ERTC	168
4	Estimated public cost per motor vehicle theft [c]	\$ 5,700
5	Estimated fiscal impact of fewer motor vehicle thefts	\$ 957,157
6	Estimated number of households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	336
7	Estimated frequency of forced entries per instance of eviction [b]	8%
8	Estimated fewer forced entries as a result of ERTC	27
9	Estimated public cost per forced entry [c,d]	\$ 6,000
10	Estimated fiscal impact of fewer forced entries	\$ 163,220
11	Estimated fiscal impacts of responding to crimes (rounded) [e]	\$ 1,100,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income eligible households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of right to counsel and that would have not migrated out of Detroit.

[b] Falcone, Stefano. "Forcing Out, Breaking In: Do Evictions Increase Crime." July 2022. See Table B.1.

[c] McCollister KE, French MT, Fang H. The Cost of Crime to Society: New Crime-Specific Estimates for Policy and Program Evaluation. Drug Alcohol Depend. April

[d] Current research only calculates the cost of burglary, however for a crime to be considered a burglary, there must be forcible entry. For this analysis the estimated cost of burglary is used as a reasonable proxy for the cost of forcible entry.

[e] This estimate is based on currently available research into the direct impacts of evictions on motor-vehicle and forced entry crimes. The actual cost-of-crime savings is likely significantly er as eviction is shown to have a significant impact on other crimes such as homicide and robbery. Semenza, Daniel & Stansfield, Richard & Grosholz, Jessica & Link, Nathan. "Eviction and Crime: A Neighborhood Analysis in Philadelphia." Crime & Delinquency. August 2021.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit I - Estimated Out-of-Home Foster Care Fiscal Impacts

1	Estimated number of children in Detroit who likely avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	15,227
2	Estimated percentage of children from evicted families placed in foster care [b]	4%
3	Estimated number of children from evicted families placed in foster care	609
4	Estimated out-of-home foster care cost per child in foster care to Detroit [c, d]	\$ 21,696
5	Estimated out-of-home foster care cost in Detroit for children living in foster care because of disruptive displacement	\$ 13,215,075
6	Estimated portion of foster care funding paid for by localities in Michigan [d]	5%
7	Estimated out-of-home foster care fiscal impacts (rounded)	\$ 720,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of income eligible households with a likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of right to counsel and that would have not migrated out of Detroit.

[b] Berg, Lisa and Brannstrom, Lars. "Evicted children and subsequent placement in out-of-home care: a cohort study." Public Library of Science. April 2018.

[c] "Commissioner's Monthly Report." Detroit Department of Children and Families. February, 2024. See also "Children Entering Out of Home Placement."

[d] "Child Welfare Agency Spending in Detroit in SFY 2022." Child Trends.

The Estimated Fiscal Impact of Eviction Right to Counsel in Detroit
Exhibit J - Estimated Fiscal Impact of Incarcerating People Experiencing Homelessness

1	Estimated number of adults who likely of avoided disruptive displacement because of ERTC [a]	15,935
2	Estimated percentage of individuals who experience homelessness as a result of disruptive displacement [b]	25%
3	Estimated number of adults that would avoid the likelihood of experiencing disruptive displacement	3,984
4	Estimated percentage of adults experiencing unsheltered homelessness who likely be incarcerated due to their homelessness [c]	12%
5	Estimated number of adults who would likely avoid homelessness and incarceration because of ERTC	478
6	Estimated cost per night in jail (booking cost) [d]	\$ 65
7	Estimated average number of nights in jail [e]	23
8	Estimated cost of incarcerating a person experiencing homelessness	\$ 1,495
9	Estimated fiscal impact of incarcerating people experiencing homelessness (rounded)	\$ 710,000

[a] Stout's calculation of the estimated number of adults from income eligible households with a high likelihood of avoiding disruptive displacement as a result of right to counsel and that would have not migrated out of Detroit.

[b] Estimated by Robin Hood. https://robinhoodorg-production.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2017/04/Metrics-Equations-for-Website_Sept-2014.pdf.

[c] A Wilder Research study on homelessness in Minnesota in 2006 found that 12% of adults experiencing homelessness had been incarcerated within the past year. Metraux and Culhane found in a 2005 study that 23% of New York State recent shelter occupants had been incarcerated in the past two years. These

[d] "What Jails Cost: Wayne County." Vera Institute.

[e] "Exploring Jail Incarceration Trends in Wayne County." Vera Institute.