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From 2002 through 2004 the Economic Roundtable and the Institute for the Study of Homelessness and Poverty at the Weingart Center carried out research, listened to ideas from community stakeholders, and met with public officials in order to prepare this strategic plan for ending homelessness in Los Angeles County.

This strategy was prepared on behalf of Bring LA Home, whose mission was to “prevent and end homelessness in Los Angeles County by creating and implementing a comprehensive, innovative, and realistic 10-year strategic plan to end homelessness.” Pieces of the Roundtable/Institute strategy were incorporated into a simplified, less comprehensive plan, Bring Los Angeles Home, which was coordinated by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) and released on April 6, 2006.

The expectation was that the Roundtable/Institute strategy contained in this document would be tested and refined through public dialogue about its guiding principles and strategic actions. This strategy was completed in June of 2004, but remained out of the public domain until LAHSA concurred with a Freedom of Information Act request for its release in July 2006. The authors believe this strategy remains timely and important because it is the only comprehensive and coordinated plan that identifies the organizations accountable for each action with specific benchmarks for outcomes to be achieved by each action. Differences between the LAHSA-coordinated plan and the Roundtable/Institute strategy are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Coordinated By LAHSA</th>
<th>Roundtable/Institute Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTABILITY and APPROACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurable Objectives</strong> – Are there measurable objectives for each strategy?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timelines</strong> – Are there concrete timelines for each strategy?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Parties</strong> – Are organizations identified that are responsible for implementing each strategy?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Toolkit Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan puts a primary emphasis on program creation, without describing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who will create and manage those programs. measurably reducing homelessness among those with whom they work.

It secondarily provides analysis, programs and tools to help responsible parties achieve their goals.

**COMPLETENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Benchmarks for Measuring the Reduction of Homelessness</strong></th>
<th><strong>NO</strong></th>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishes an annual homeless reduction goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reasonable Goals and Strategies</strong> – Are the goals, strategies and action steps likely to “end homelessness?”</th>
<th><strong>INCOMPLETE</strong></th>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For example, while acknowledging that “we need at least 50,000 units of affordable housing”, the plan proposes a goal of 11,500 units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategies are carefully calculated to achieve the goal of ending homelessness in Los Angeles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address institutional “discharge to the streets” from the welfare system, jails, hospitals, foster care, etc.</strong></th>
<th><strong>INCOMPLETE</strong></th>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of action steps, such as opening up stabilization centers, developing respite centers, and creating a jail taskforce are proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four strategies with responsible parties and measurable objectives specifically target GR and CalWorks recipients, individuals discharged from jails/prisons, youth leaving foster care/youth facilities and people discharged from hospitals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Detailed Cost Analysis</strong></th>
<th><strong>INCOMPLETE</strong></th>
<th><strong>YES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The fundamental and most important differences between the Roundtable/Institute strategy and the plan coordinated by LAHSA lie in **approach and accountability**. The released plan is a list of toolkit items, many of which are important, but it does not systematically integrate the complex network of needed institutional actions, nor does it set accountability benchmarks for what those institutions must accomplish.

The next steps for transforming this strategy into actions that prevent and eliminate homeless in Los Angeles County are to:

1. Initiate focused discussions with the institutions identified in this strategy to obtain their ideas and concurrence.
2. Update the information in this strategy; for example, including LA County’s Homeless Prevention Initiative approved on April 4, 2006.
3. Build a working coalition of cities throughout the county, the county, philanthropic institutions, and key stakeholders to oversee the implementation of this strategy.

*August 2006*
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10-Year Strategy to End Homelessness
Chapter 1

Executive Summary

The acute deprivation, desperation, and chaos inherent in homelessness destabilize the lives of individuals and also communities. In restoring shelter and intactness to the lives of placeless residents we also restore the health of our communities. This is a crisis that truly confronts every neighborhood from the beaches of Santa Monica and Long Beach to the suburban valleys. And it is a crisis that we can end.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND 25 ACTIONS TO END HOMELESSNESS

This strategy to end homelessness grows out of seven guiding principles that will continue to shape operational actions as the strategy is implemented, and an eighth pragmatic principle to ensure that the strategy is successful. These principles, and 25 strategic actions for implementing the principles to end homelessness are as follows:

I. Prevent homelessness.
   1. Preserve existing affordable housing units in the County of Los Angeles.
   2. Reduce homelessness among acutely impoverished residents.
   3. Reduce homelessness among public assistance recipients.
   4. Reduce homelessness among individuals released from incarceration.
   5. Reduce homelessness among youth leaving foster care and youth facilities.
   6. Reduce homelessness among individuals discharged from public hospitals.

II. Maintain the existing capacity to serve homeless residents and build new capacity where it is needed.
   7. Obtain a commitment from each city and the county to develop essential services and housing for homeless residents.

III. Address the structural causes of homelessness.
   8. Establish an annual goal for reducing the number of homeless people.
   9. Place employable homeless individuals in jobs.
   10. Strengthen the job readiness, retention, and earnings of welfare recipients.
   12. Provide living wages for LA’s labor force, invest in education and training, and encourage adoption of living wage ordinances.

IV. Ensure rapid reconnection with housing for people who become homeless.
   13. Provide essential services for homeless and potentially homeless persons.
   14. Obtain more federal Section 8 vouchers to subsidize rental housing.

V. Bring homeless residents into the mainstream of society.
   15. Create more substance abuse treatment slots for homeless individuals.
   16. Provide effective mental health services for mentally ill homeless persons.
   17. Increase access to county provided and funded health care services.
   18. Ensure that homeless children receive special educational services.
19. Increase access to Community Courts to provide restorative justice.
20. Enforce local laws and ordinances regarding standards for public conduct.

VI. **Respect the individualized nature of problems that make people homeless and the need for individual solutions.**
21. Measure and evaluate the effectiveness of homeless service providers in responding to the individual needs of homeless residents.

VII. **Call on all communities to participate fairly in helping homeless residents.**
22. Adopt this Strategic Plan.
23. Leverage all potential public and private resources for homeless programs.

VIII. **Build capacity to follow through with informed and effective action.**
24. Improve the completeness, reliability and usefulness of homeless data.
25. Establish an oversight agency for plan implementation.

**GEOGRAPHY AND INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES**

We find homelessness and must take action to end it in the same places where we find people who are acutely impoverished and disconnected from their community.
- The greatest number of unserved homeless residents is in South Los Angeles.
- The greatest scarcity of services is in the San Gabriel and Antelope valleys.
- The greatest number of foster youth nearing emancipation is in South LA.
- The Department of Public Social Services has the largest institutional role to play in preventing and ending homelessness.
- Mentally ill homeless residents are over-concentrated in the downtown area.
- The justice system has an important role to play in preventing the harm done by crime and helping to restore homeless residents as members of society.

**COSTS AND RESOURCES TO END HOMELESSNESS**

Local jurisdictions spend an estimated $404 million annually on services and housing for homeless residents, with an additional $115 million in private outlays.
- More effective efforts to help homeless residents re-enter the labor force and obtain public benefits will reduce costs by an estimated 16 percent.
- Reducing the flow of people being cared for by major social institutions into homelessness will reduce costs by an estimated 47 percent.
- Facilitating the transition of some homeless residents out of subsidized housing and into market rate housing will reduce costs still further.
- Even with highly effective strategies it will be necessary to take additional steps to improve how resources are used and to bring in new resources.
- Current expenditures already equal 35 to 59 percent (depending on the year) of the estimated annual cost of an effective strategy to end homelessness over the next ten years. With full participation of all local, state and national stakeholders there are adequate resources to end homelessness in 10 years.
Chapter 2
Mission and Guiding Principles

Homelessness is the most extreme manifestation of poverty. The acute deprivation, desperation, and chaos inherent in homelessness destabilize the lives of individuals and also communities. In restoring shelter and intactness to the lives of placeless residents we also restore the health of our communities. The crisis of homelessness in Los Angeles is not limited to pockets of concentration in a few areas. While homeless residents are most obvious in “Skid Row,” they are also found in every community throughout Los Angeles County. This is a crisis that truly confronts every neighborhood from the beaches of Santa Monica and Long Beach to the suburban valleys.

MISSION

Bring LA Home, the partnership to end homelessness, was convened by political and civic leaders from across Los Angeles County. The Blue Ribbon Panel for Bring LA Home is made up of more than 65 leaders who represent the political, functional and moral leadership of Los Angeles. At their first meeting the Panel unanimously agreed that the mission of Bring LA Home is:

To prevent and end homelessness in Los Angeles County by creating and implementing a comprehensive, innovative, and realistic 10-year strategy to end homelessness.

This mission statement embraces all homeless residents, affirming that homelessness is unacceptable to our entire community and that it is a solvable problem. This document sets forth the 10-year strategy that the Panel has adopted.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

This strategic plan grows out of seven guiding principles that will continue to shape operational strategies as the plan is implemented. These seven principles are:
1. Prevent homelessness.

The best solution for homelessness is to prevent it. This can be achieved in part by paying particularly careful attention to the most vulnerable populations, including foster youth, mentally ill low-income residents, and individuals being released from incarceration. Mainstream human service institutions must meet the basic needs of people entrusted to their care. Homeless programs must use their limited resources to fill gaps in the service delivery mandates of mainstream human service institutions rather than to stand-in for those institutions.

2. Maintain the existing capacity to serve homeless residents and build new capacity where it is needed.

The hard-won but insufficient programs and facilities for homeless residents currently in-place must be preserved, and new programs and facilities must be developed where they are most needed.

3. Address the structural causes of homelessness.

Escalating rents, escalating poverty, and lack of living-wage jobs are the root cause of most of the region’s homelessness. Increasing the supply of affordable housing and the number of workers who are employed and receiving living wages for their work will address these core deficits.

4. Ensure rapid reconnection with housing for people who become homeless.

The first step in ending homelessness is to house people. Where necessary, the savings and incomes of homeless residents must be augmented to help them obtain housing.

5. Bring homeless residents into the mainstream of society.

Homeless residents must have genuine opportunities to fulfill their potential as human beings, and must also assume responsibility for upholding public standards of civil and law abiding conduct.

6. Respect the individualized nature of problems that make people homeless and the need for individual solutions.

There are solutions to the problems that make people homeless, but there is no single mass solution. Lasting solutions that keep individuals out of
homelessness require competent, individualized assistance as well as opportunities for homeless residents to rebuild their own lives.

7. **Call on all communities to participate fairly in funding and hosting homeless services and affordable housing.**

Homelessness emerges out of the overall economic and social fabric of the region, and every community must contribute equitably to ending homelessness by providing program funding, developing affordable housing, and providing sites for homeless services.

**BACKGROUND**

A large share of Los Angeles County’s population is vulnerable to homelessness. This includes roughly one-quarter of children and one-sixth of adults who are in poverty, mentally ill residents, and individuals who are cared for by institutions such as jails, prisons and the foster care system. Among those who are homeless on a given day, many escape through income from employment or public benefits, or a combination of the two, that enables them to obtain housing. Often this housing is precariously held and overcrowded, often these residents remain vulnerable to repeated cycles of homelessness, and often they are damaged by the experience of homelessness. For many the condition of destitution, uprootedness, and disconnection from society becomes a life course.

Los Angeles’ rate of homelessness is higher than the U.S. average because it has a higher rate of poverty and higher housing costs. And because of LA’s warm weather, a disproportionately large share of homeless residents is able to subsist on the streets.

- On a typical day approximately 79,000 individuals are homeless in Los Angeles County, including 45,000 single adults and 34,000 family members.
- At least 17 percent, or 13,000, of these individuals have been homeless for longer than a year.
- Over the course of a year an estimated 254,000 people experience homelessness, including 119,000 family members and 135,000 single adults.

The guiding principles for this plan call for us to recognize the individuality of homeless residents and to use the full capabilities of our institutions to equip individuals and families to escape homelessness in their own communities. As we act on these principles we can expect to find:

- Homeless residents are younger than the overall population. Many are children under 5 and young mothers 18 to 29 years of age.
- Homeless residents are 50 percent more likely to lack a high school diploma and 50 percent less likely to have attended college than the overall population of the county.
- African Americans are over-represented by a factor of 5 among homeless residents. All other ethnic groups are under-represented.
- One-third of all homeless residents are in South Los Angeles.
- Seventeen percent of homeless adults report a history of active military service. This is nearly double the 9 percent rate for the rest of the county.
- Forty-two percent of homeless residents report some type of disability - double the disability rate for the county.
- Roughly 30 percent of single homeless adults are seriously mentally ill.
- Roughly 60 percent of single homeless adults have substance abuse problems.
- Over 1,000 foster youth are emancipated each year and roughly half become homeless.
- Over 12,000 people are released from county jail each year only to enter homelessness.
- One-in-ten of the roughly 47,000 men and women on parole in Los Angeles County are homeless.
- Two-thirds of homeless residents are working age adults.
- The most frequent source of income before the onset of homelessness was a job.
- Most homeless adults have histories of work, but not of sustainable earnings.

People become homeless more easily in some parts of the county than others. Public assistance recipients who are homeless over the course of a year are equivalent to 34 percent of the poverty population in the Antelope Valley, 23 percent in South Los Angeles, and 9 percent in the rest of the county. The precariousness and unevenness of our social safety net is borne out by the fact that 60 percent of homeless single adults and 53 percent of families who seek last-resort refuge in Winter Shelter have just left the care of another organization that failed to solve their problem of homelessness.

In summary, we find homelessness and must act to end it in the same places that we find people who are acutely impoverished and disconnected from their community.

**OVERVIEW OF THE 10-YEAR STRATEGY**

This strategy sets out specific actions and deadlines to prevent, reduce and eliminate homelessness throughout Los Angeles County in ten years. The next chapters provide the following information:
Chapter 3 identifies the geography of homelessness and institutional linkages of major segments of the homeless population, showing where expanded services are needed.

Chapter 4 is the heart of the strategy, laying out 25 action steps for ending homelessness. Detailed tool kit strategies are provided for each step, along with a responsible party and timeline for accomplishing the step.

Chapter 5 outlines the scope of services and the cost required to end homelessness. It identifies current expenditures for homelessness by each unit of local government and the gap between these expenditures and the estimated cost of ending homelessness over the next ten years.

The Appendix contains summaries of community meetings, focus groups, and supporting data.
10-Year Strategy to End Homelessness
Information about the location of homeless residents as well as about the institutions to which they are linked provides a blueprint for many of the actions needed to prevent and eliminate homelessness. These two types of information can inform the application of five guiding principles: fair-share community support, prevention, providing housing, correcting the structural drivers that cause homelessness, and building programs that are responsive to the distinctive attributes of homeless individuals and the communities where they reside.
ACUTE POVERTY

The most powerful predictor of homelessness is acute poverty. The greatest concentration of residents in acute poverty, that is with annual incomes that are less than half of the poverty threshold, is in a corridor extending from downtown Los Angeles through South Los Angeles, as shown in Map 1. The 2000 Census identified 749,700 residents of Los Angeles County with annual incomes that were less than half of the poverty threshold – currently less than $4,680 for a single adult or $7,247 for a single mother with two children. Among persons below the poverty threshold, this population in acute poverty has the highest risk of homelessness.

Los Angeles County residents in acute poverty are broken out by Service Planning Area in Table 1. The county’s annual homeless population represents 34 percent of this population in acute poverty. The urban core of the region made up of the Metro and South Service Planning Areas accounts for 22 percent of the county’s population but 37 percent of residents who are in acute poverty. The other six planning areas all have below-average concentrations of residents in acute poverty. Areas with high concentrations of acute poverty can be expected to also have high rates of homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Planning Area (SPA)</th>
<th>Percent of LA County Population Below 50% of Poverty Threshold in SPA</th>
<th>Percent of LA County Total Population in SPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Antelope Valley</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - San Fernando</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - San Gabriel</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Metro</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - West</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - South</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - East</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - South Bay</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Of the 254,000 people who were estimated to have been homeless in 2002, 217,000 received public assistance for at least part of the year. This represents 85 percent of all homeless residents. The percent of individuals in each of the four public assistance programs who experienced homelessness during the year is shown in Figure 1 and includes:

- General Relief: 53 percent
- Food Stamps: 15 percent
- CalWORKs: 11 percent
- Medi-Cal: 4 percent
Over half of General Relief recipients experience homelessness. This welfare program for impoverished single adults is the epicenter of long-term homelessness. The CalWORKs program, which aids impoverished families, has a lower rate of homelessness than General Relief, but because it is a much larger program it includes more people who experience homelessness.

The make-up of homeless public assistance recipients varies in different parts of the county, indicating that different intervention and prevention strategies are needed in different areas.

In the Antelope Valley, East, and South Bay planning areas most homeless public assistance recipients are family members; in the Metro area most are single adults. Initiatives to develop needed shelter beds and housing for homeless residents in the Antelope and San Gabriel Valleys should ensure that the needs of families are met.

The geographic distribution of the population in acute poverty reappears as we look at the location of homeless public assistance recipients. The share of homeless recipients in each Service Planning Area is shown in Figure 2. South Los Angeles has the largest share, 33 percent, and the Metro area the second largest, 15 percent.

It appears that people drop into homelessness far more easily in some parts of the county than others. Figure 3 shows that homeless public assistance recipi-
ents make up a far larger share of the poverty population in the Antelope Valley and South Los Angeles than in the rest of the county. These homeless residents are equivalent to 34 percent of the poverty population in the Antelope Valley, 23 percent in South Los Angeles, and 9 percent in the rest of the county.

The last know addresses of homeless public assistance recipients together with the location of shelter beds are shown in Map 2, and the ratio of people to beds is shown in Table 2. This information identifies areas with the greatest deficits in emergency
shelter resources for homeless residents, and with the greatest need for new program sites. Given current rates of homelessness, a total of 7,000 additional shelter beds are needed to bring each Service Planning Area up to the countywide average of 13 annual homeless public assistance recipients per shelter bed. This demand will decrease as homelessness decreases, but the current deficit is estimated to be:

South LA 3,800  
S. Gabriel Valley 2,000  
South Bay 600  
Antelope Valley 500  
East LA 100  
Total 7,000

The scarcity of shelter beds in the San Gabriel Valley is especially acute because of the virtual absence of shelter resources in this area of the county. This shortfall as well as those in South Los Angeles and the Antelope Valley need to be corrected so that homeless residents will not have to migrate to other areas of the county to receive emergency services.

**YOUTH**

Many homeless youth are burdened by abusive or neglectful families in their past, and covert lives in the present - covert because they are considered too young to be on their own or because their survival strategies fall outside the law. This makes it harder to obtain information about homeless youth than about any other segment of the homeless population. We have used information about foster youth as a proxy for the overall homeless youth population because foster youth have a very high rate of homelessness and make up a large share of homeless youth.

Young people in the county’s foster care system typically lack adequate family support, roughly one-fifth have significant disabilities or developmental problems, many have not completed high school, and yet current law “emancipates” these youth at 18, or in some cases 19, years of age. Emancipation means leaving the
foster care system and making their own way in life. Roughly half become homeless. A strong service provider network for homeless youth has been built in Hollywood, but services for homeless youth are virtually nonexistent in all other areas of the county. Testimony from community members in the Antelope Valley described foster youth living in foxholes they dig in fields. Inadequacies in the foster care system that result in homelessness among emancipated youth along with the absence of homeless services for youth in most communities other than Hollywood lead to at least three undesirable outcomes: (1) critical needs remain unmet, (2) youth are forced to join homeless adults to obtain services, (3) youth leave their communities and migrate to Hollywood to obtain services.

The greatest number of foster youth nearing emancipation is in South Los Angeles, with the next largest number in the San Gabriel Valley (Figure 4 and Map 3). As shown in Figure 4, these youth are nearly evenly divided between males and females. Half are African American, a third are Latino, one-seventh are European American, and 2 percent are other ethnicities. Seventeen percent of foster youth have special needs, which means that they are disabled or have other serious limitations on their ability to live independently.

At least half of homeless youth are estimated to become involved with the justice system. A review of arrest data for homeless youth in Hollywood showed that as they grow older, many homeless youth become progressively more entangled in the criminal justice system. In this progression youth move from being neglected to
being incorrigible, to theft and possession of drugs, to prostitution, to sales of drugs and violent crimes, and to further cycles of recidivism. The most frequent reason for arrest is prostitution, accounting for 46 percent of all female arrests and 17 percent of all male arrests.

**MENTAL ILLNESS**

Mental disorders prevent people from carrying out essential aspects of daily life, including caring for themselves and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Homeless people with mental disorders remain homeless for longer periods of time and have less contact with family and friends. They encounter more barriers to employment, tend to be in poorer physical health, and have more contact with the legal system than homeless people who do not suffer from a mental disorder.
Mentally ill homeless residents who are receiving services from the county Department of Mental Health are highly concentrated in the downtown area, as shown in Map 4. The lack of stable, supportive housing in their own communities appears to cause many mentally ill and indigent residents to migrate to the anonymous public spaces and emergency service available downtown.

**JAIL INMATES AND PROBATIONERS**

We have only limited information about the location of homeless residents with justice system linkages. By combining information about 246 homeless adults who are on probation and have identifiable locations (out of a reported total of 1,202 homeless probationers) with information about the last address of 376 homeless jail
inmates we can begin to see the geographic distribution of homeless adults who are involved with the justice system. This data is shown in Map 5. It suggests that the highest concentrations of homeless residents charged with breaking the law is around the urban centers of Los Angeles and Long Beach, with secondary concentrations in South Los Angeles, East San Gabriel Valley, and Pomona. The justice system has a particularly important role to play, not only in preventing the harm done by crime but also in ensuring that services are provided to restore homeless residents as whole, contributing members of society.

**GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY**

- The greatest number of unserved homeless residents is in South Los Angeles.
- Although the absolute need is smaller, the greatest scarcity of services is in the San Gabriel and Antelope valleys.
- The social infrastructure for preventing homelessness appears weakest in the Antelope Valley and South Los Angeles.
- The greatest number of foster youth nearing emancipation is in South Los Angeles.
- The Department of Public Social Services has the largest institutional role to play in preventing and ending homelessness. The General Relief population is predominantly comprised of homeless residents, with the greatest concentration in Central Los Angeles. In the Antelope Valley, East, and South Bay planning areas most homeless public assistance recipients are family members.
- The Department of Children and Family Services is responsible for foster youth, who are at especially high risk of becoming long-term homeless. The greatest number of foster youth nearing emancipation is in South Los Angeles, with the next largest number in the San Gabriel Valley.
- The Department of Mental Health has identified 8,412 homeless residents in its caseload. These residents are significantly over-concentrated in the downtown area.
- Justice system institutions including the Superior Courts, Department of Probation, Department of Corrections, Youth Authority, and Sheriff’s Department jail system have daily jurisdiction over an estimated _____ homeless residents. The high level of control these institutions have over individuals in their charge uniquely empowers them to bring about restorative justice through community courts and other mechanisms for ensuring that needed services are available to, and fully utilized by, homeless residents.
OVERVIEW

Homelessness in Los Angeles has emerged out a powerful convergence of forces: population growth that far outstripped housing production, industrial restructuring that eliminated blue collar jobs, and under-funding of public services that left critical human needs unmet. But these forces are not as powerful as the determination, resourcefulness and collective capabilities of the Los Angeles community. **Homelessness can and will be ended throughout Los Angeles in 10 years.**

The guiding principles of this strategy provide a framework for mapping the range of initiatives that must be undertaken to end homelessness. These principles address both material and social problems underlying homelessness. The seven guiding principles that will shape operational actions as this strategy is implemented, and an eighth pragmatic principle to ensure that the strategy is successful are:

1. Prevent homelessness.
2. Maintain the existing capacity to serve homeless residents and build new capacity where it is needed.
3. Address the structural causes of homelessness.
4. Ensure rapid reconnection with housing for people who become homeless.
5. Bring homeless residents into the mainstream of society.
6. Respect the individualized nature of problems that make people homeless and the need for individual solutions.
7. Call on all communities to participate fairly in funding and hosting homeless services and affordable housing.
8. Build capacity to follow through with informed and effective action.

This chapter identifies 25 strategic actions that put these guiding principles into practice. These steps will move people who are homeless into housing and ultimately prevent new homelessness.

Each strategic action both identifies the organization responsible for carrying out the action and presents a timeline describing when the action should be completed. Later in this chapter we identify the actions that focus on people who meet the federal definition of “chronically homeless,” as well as early action items that can be accomplished in whole or part within one year.
Accompanying the steps are detailed “tools for action.” The tools are recommendations collected through the Bring LA Home planning process. These recommendations come from the general public, subject matter experts, Blue Ribbon Panel members, focus group participants, homeless residents, and community stakeholders. The organizations that are responsible for each action step are charged with developing carefully tailored programs and policies that draw on these tools for action to successfully complete each step.

The guiding principles and action steps for carrying out each principle are listed below in the left column. An accompanying list of detailed tools for action that can be employed for carrying out the action steps is shown in the right column.

**STRATEGIC ACTIONS AND TOOLS FOR ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principles and Strategic Actions</th>
<th>Tools for Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREVENT HOMELESSNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When we help individuals avoid the destructive experience of homelessness we also save social costs for stabilizing and re-housing individuals who have become acutely impoverished, often uncreditworthy, and often disconnected from work and community as a result of being homeless. We prevent homelessness by preserving existing affordable housing units and by providing effective, holistic assistance that reconnects vulnerable individuals being cared for by major public institutions with sources of income and essential services. Action steps for preventing homelessness and the responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numerical goals that remain to be determined during the implementation phase are shown as TBD.
Strategic Actions

homelessness and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:

1. **Preserve [TBD\*] existing affordable housing units in the County of Los Angeles.**
   - Los Angeles County, Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county
   - Timeline: TBD

2. **Reduce the annual rate of homelessness among households with incomes below fifty percent of the poverty threshold from an estimated 34% to 0%.**
   - Los Angeles County, Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county
   - Timeline: TBD

3. **Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals receiving or eligible for General Relief or CalWORKs from an estimated 53% to 0%, and for CalWORKs from an estimated 11% to 0%.**
   - Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services
   - March 2005: Completion of Plan
   - FY 2005-6: Reduce General Relief rate to 35% and CalWORKs rate to 6%
   - FY 2006-7: Reduce General Relief rate to 18% and CalWORKs rate to 3%
   - FY 2009-10: Reduce General Relief and CalWORKs rates to 0%

4. **Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals discharged from the Los Angeles County jail and from State prison and youth facilities from an estimated 10% to 0%.**
   - Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department; California Department of Corrections
   - FY 2005-6: Reduce rate to 7%
   - FY 2006-7: Reduce rate to 3%

---

**Bipartisan Task Force on Homelessness for 2001.**

- c. Implement the recommendations of the LA Housing Crisis Taskforce.
- d. Make supportive services available to existing units of low-income housing. Strengthen existing and create new eviction prevention programs, including rent assistance programs.
- e. Enhance the availability of services to precariously housed individuals, linking them to ongoing community services.
- f. Enhance the availability of education and employment services to precariously housed individuals.
- g. Implement a system of professional, reliable assessments to determine the employability of General Relief recipients.
- h. Provide employment services to residents of city housing and recipients of section 8 certificates.
- i. Support the creation of a “211 hotline”, a social service referral telephone number.
- j. Develop a resource guide outlining services and subsidies available to assist households to staying housed, including cash aid, food banks, food stamps, Fair Housing services, and short and long-term rental subsidies.
- k. Stop the “28-day shuffle” in Los Angeles County hotels, which requires families to move out of a room for one day each month, and allow these units to become permanent housing.
- l. Fund prevention programs for families so they can take part in parenting classes, further their education, etc.
- m. Support the expansion at the state level of the Special Circumstances Program through which SSI, CAPI and IHSS recipients can apply for money to help with moving costs after an eviction or to move because of unsafe housing. Increase the amount of money that is available and remove the once in a lifetime restriction on receipt of Special Circumstances funding.
- o. Create a centralized housing and resource service.
- p. Use Employment Development Department checks to distribute information about utility cut-off warnings and services for people in fiscal crisis.
- q. Maximize participation rates in federal nutrition programs, including food stamps, WIC, school meals, out-of-school meals and senior congregate meals.
- r. Maximize participation rates in Veterans Administration programs.
- s. Lobby for improved and extended unemployment benefits.
- t. Maximize participation rates in the Earned Income Tax Credit program.
- u. Lobby to expand the federal Earned Income Tax Credit program and create a state program.
- v. Create out-stationed DPSS application sites for food stamps and CalWORKs.

---

**3 REDUCE THE RATE OF HOMELESSNESS AMONG INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING OR ELIGIBLE FOR GENERAL RELIEF OR CALWORKS**

- a. Develop a plan within DPSS with measurable objectives and a timeline to achieve this objective.
- b. Develop protocols within DPSS to identify clients threatened with homelessness, including assessment and prevention assistance for parents with domestic violence, mental health, substance abuse problems, parents with disabilities, and expectant mothers.
- c. Create a Homeless Prevention Unit in each DPSS office to train staff to identify people threatened with homelessness and provide...
FY 2009-10: Reduce rate to 0%

5 Reduce the rate of homelessness among youth leaving foster care and County youth facilities from an estimated 50% to 0%.

Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services; Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department; California Youth Authority; California Department of Corrections

Timeline: TBD

6 Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals discharged from state and county hospitals from an estimated ___% to 0%.

Los Angeles County Department of Health; Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

Timeline: TBD

MAINTAIN THE EXISTING CAPACITY TO SERVE HOMELESS RESIDENTS AND BUILD NEW CAPACITY WHERE IT IS NEEDED

Homeless services are highly concentrated in the urban center of Los Angeles but sparse in the area of greatest need – South Los Angeles, and acutely under-developed in the Antelope and San Gabriel valleys. Many cities have not acted on the reality that they are part of a regional social and economic fabric that gives rise to homelessness. To bring an end to homelessness the Los Angeles region must preserve its existing hard-won facilities and appropriate services and referrals to avoid homelessness.

d. Link every General Relief recipient who is classified as “Needs Special Assistance” (NSA, that is, unable to work) with appropriate social services, including SSI application assistance.
e. Raise the grant levels for General Relief to come closer to reflecting the real cost of housing.
f. Develop a Non-recurring Special Needs Program for General Relief recipients.
g. Create a new classification within General Relief for clients who are employable but have major functional barriers to employment. These clients would be considered administratively unemployable until the barriers are removed.
h. Waive General Relief time limits for employable recipients complying with program requirements and actively engaged in job search or related activities.
i. Expand the use of social workers within DPSS.
j. Eliminate the Shared Roommate Penalty, which reduces grants when General Relief recipients have roommates.
k. Publicize the Earned Income Disregard, which encourages welfare recipients to obtain employment.
l. Increase the housing component of the General Relief grant to cover the actual cost of housing.
m. Reinstate a year round benefit period for all General Relief recipients, rather than the current 9-month limit for employable recipients.
n. Stop deducting the cost of emergency housing vouchers to homeless individuals applying for General Relief.
o. Create an Immediate Need program for homeless individuals, rather than making them wait for benefits.
p. Develop a program for recipients with child support obligations to work and retain sufficient income to avoid homelessness without threatening the well being of the child.
q. Expand efforts to notify clients prior to termination or sanctions.
r. Increase outreach to potential General Relief recipients.
s. Reinstate Medi-Cal for General Relief recipients.
t. Ensure that reductions or terminations of benefits do not result in homelessness.
u. Strengthen the CalWORKs Eviction Prevention Program.
v. Strengthen the CalWORKs Non-recurring Special Needs Program.
w. Expand rent assistance programs.
x. Expand childcare services to families.
y. Raise the grant levels for CalWORKs to come closer to reflecting the real cost of housing.
z. Expand efforts to collect child support and encourage voluntary child support.

aa. Increase efforts to reunite families, when appropriate.
bb. Lobby to expand at the state and federal levels the allowances in CalWORKs, now limited to $600, for non-recurring special needs, when disasters make housing uninhabitable.
cc. Broaden the eligibility requirements for non-recurring special needs assistance.

dd. Grant housing relocation assistance if the client’s proposed move will require a commute of over one hour each way or there is no public transportation at the time of the client’s work shift.

ee. Exempt CalWORKs recipients who are working or in school from time limits.
ff. Improve and expand the Homeless Assistance Program – eliminate the once-in-a-lifetime rule and extend the time it may be used.

gg. Provide additional training regarding the Homeless Assistance Program to DPSS staff, including eligibility workers.
hh. Strengthen customer service culture among DPSS staff.
ii. Improve communications access at DPSS by having phones answered by trained staff rather than by answering machines.
programs, and create new facilities and programs where there are unmet needs. Every city and community in the county must recognize that it is part of this problem and that it must contribute fairly to providing the solutions to homelessness. This includes providing funding as well as sites for homeless programs and housing. Los Angeles has an exceptionally capable cadre of nonprofit housing developers, and with access to funding and sites the capacity to build the housing needed for homeless residents. The key action step for developing the capacity to serve homeless residents, the responsible entities, and the timeline are as follows:

7 Obtain a commitment from each of the 88 cities within Los Angeles County and each Los Angeles City Council member to:
   a. Maintain existing homeless shelters;
   b. Host, fund and construct a fair share allocation of new homeless shelters based on current and future needs;
   c. Host, fund and construct affordable housing and affordable supportive housing units, based upon the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG) Regional Housing Needs Assessment.
   d. Amend zoning and land use regulations to support housing, shelter and services needed to end homelessness.

Los Angeles County; Los

answered by trained staff rather than by answering machines.
jj. Eliminate the fingerprinting requirement.
kk. Extend welfare benefits to convicted drug felons.
ll. Initiate income or rent support for families in “doubled up” situations.
mm. Improve services to non- or limited-English speakers by increasing the number of bi-lingual staff at DPSS.
nn. Combine the CalWORKs, Food Stamp and Medi-Cal application to make it shorter, easier to fill out and eliminate redundancies.
oo. Include education as an option to satisfy the work requirements for CalWORKs.
pp. Reduce the DPSS CalWORKs sanction rate by increasing efforts to find families, developing additional strategies to overcome barriers and other measures.
qq. Improve services to CalWORKs clients facing domestic violence, mental health or substance abuse issues.
rr. Provide services, such as transportation assistance, language training, job skills training, employment referrals, childcare, and assistance with SSI applications to families who have time-limited off CalWORKs.
s. Expand the State Homeless Assistance Program.
tt. Lobby to amend CalWORKs regulations to permit use of homeless funds to assist families facing evictions rather than requiring counties to wait until after eviction occurs.
uu. Lobby to raise the Welfare Shelter Allowance at the state level for CalWORKs.
vv. Extend the Living Wage Ordinance to cover welfare-to-work participants.

4 REDUCE THE RATE OF HOMELESSNESS AMONG INDIVIDUALS DISCHARGED FROM THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY JAIL, FROM STATE PRISON AND YOUTH INCARCERATION FACILITIES
   a. Develop a plan, based upon the pilot work of the LA County Sheriff's Department, with measurable objectives and a timeline to achieve this objective.
b. Develop protocols to identify clients threatened with homelessness.
c. Implement the recommendations within the consent decree between the US Department of Justice and the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department.
e. Incorporate the goal of effective discharge planning into the overall mission of the relevant agencies.
f. Enhance assessment tools to evaluate inmate needs.
g. Expand involvement of community based service providers prior to discharge.
h. Train staff in resources available to inmates after being released.
i. Lobby the state to earmark funding to expand transitional programs for homeless parolees.
j. Expand California Department of Corrections programs for homeless parolees.

5 REDUCE THE RATE OF HOMELESSNESS AMONG YOUTH LEAVING FOSTER CARE AND COUNTY YOUTH FACILITIES
   a. Develop a plan with measurable objectives and a timeline to achieve this objective.
b. Develop protocols to identify clients threatened with homelessness.
c. Implement the recommendations of Home for Every Californian:
ADDRESS THE STRUCTURAL CAUSES OF HOMELESSNESS

Growing poverty in the Los Angeles region has disconnected increasing numbers of individuals and families from housing and stable ties to their communities. The collateral damage of poverty includes increasing numbers of inadequately nurtured children who are at risk of growing into homeless adults. Solutions to the structural causes of homelessness include raising the income floor under the working poor, creating living-wage jobs, providing job training and education that will enable low-wage workers to obtain living-wage jobs, and building affordable housing. Some of the most insightful initiatives for increasing the earnings of LA’s working poor are emerging from grassroots community development organizations and offer promising approaches for reducing the number of residents in acute poverty. Action steps for addressing the structural causes of homelessness and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:

8 Establish an annual goal for the reduction of the number of
9 Place employable homeless individuals in jobs.

Workforce Investment Boards; Carson/Lomita/Torrance Consortium; Foothill Employment and Training Consortium; Long Beach City; Los Angeles City; Los Angeles County; SELACO (Southeast Los Angeles County Consortium); South Bay Consortium; Verdugo Consortium; DPSS (GROW and GAIN); Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA); private sector employers

FY 2005-6: Training and placement for 10% of employable homeless; placement assistance only for another 10%; unassisted placement for 10%

FY 2006-7: Training and placement for 20%; placement assistance only for another 20%; unassisted placement for 20%

10 Strengthen the job readiness, job retention, and earnings level of public benefits recipients (GROW and GAIN), through skill development and job placement programs that result in quarterly earnings that are above the poverty threshold for 75% of recipients.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services

Timeline: TBD

11 Enroll individuals representing 33% of annual homeless households, into the Supplemental Security Income Program (SSI) and support efforts to ease and rationalize the enrollment process for SSI. Expand enrollment of food stamps, Medi-Cal, and WIC.
10-Year Strategy to End Homelessness

County of Los Angeles
Timeline: TBD

12 Implement ‘high road’ job creation strategies to provide living wages for LA’s labor force, invest in education and training, and encourage adoption of living wage ordinances.

Los Angeles County, Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county
Timeline: TBD

ENSURE RAPID RECONNECTION WITH HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WHO BECOME HOMELESS

The condition that all homeless people share is that there is no place meant for human habitation that they can call their own. The reason typically is inability to pay for shelter. Often homeless residents have problems other than lack of housing and money, but the longer they are without housing, the worse these problems become. The path out of homelessness begins with obtaining shelter and establishing a feasible plan for obtaining permanent housing. Action steps for reconnecting homeless residents with housing and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:

- homeless mentally ill adding 10 Safe Havens [20-30 people each] in each Service Planning Area.
- Create assisted, dorm-style living spaces with a “house parent” for youth aged 18-22 so they can learn necessary skills while they attend community college or other training.
- Encourage but do not require residents to participate in program services.
- Maintain strong community based organizations and units of law enforcement to enforce existing anti-discrimination “fair housing” laws.
- Inventory and assess vacant industrial and commercial parcels in each community as potential sites for homeless services and housing.
- Inventory and assess vacant or unused publicly owned parcels in each community as potential sites for homeless services and housing.
- Distribute shelter beds in the county in proportion to the distribution of homeless people.
- Make beds available to serve subpopulations and homeless people with specialized needs, such as unaccompanied youth, two parent families, families with teenage male children, persons with physical disabilities, people with pets and women in advanced pregnancy or with very young children.
- Provide safe, low-barrier housing for homeless youth.
- Extend the winter shelter program into a year-round emergency shelter program funded by the City and the County with a major focus on case management and permanent housing.
- Increase number of domestic violence shelters.
- Extend program stays in domestic violence shelters beyond 30 days.
- Create more high tolerance shelter facilities.
- Use government owned property for shelter construction.
- Fund more “no fail” programs for youth.
- Consider “dome village” style self-governing homeless communities as an alternative approach for providing housing.
- Create shelters that serve families with older male children
- Create “safe haven” shelters for mentally ill people.
- Expand Los Angeles County’s pilot program for providing intensive case management, holistic, multi-departmental services and housing for homeless CalWORKs families.
- Provide parking and appropriate utility hook-ups, or amnesty from parking restrictions, for homeless residents living in recreational vehicles, vans and cars.
- Increase the number of beds permitted by the Los Angeles City shelter ordinance to 100 and encourage other jurisdictions to adopt similar ordinances.
- Permit service hubs to be established “by right” throughout the County.

8 ESTABLISH AN ANNUAL GOAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE.

9 PLACE EMPLOYABLE HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS IN JOBS.

- Require employers receiving public funds to create a job set-aside program for homeless persons.
- Provide public sector employment positions for homeless job seekers.
- Create and expand Workforce Investment Act (federal legislation that provides local job training funds) programs targeting the homeless.
- Implement a method of reimbursement for homeless training providers outside of the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL), as
13 Ensure that individuals and families who are homeless or are threatened with homelessness have access to appropriate programs and service

a. Expand outreach and access services, and establish performance standards for comprehensiveness and extent of services.

b. Adopt a countywide “housing first” approach to service delivery.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health, Los Angeles City Police Department

FY 2004-5

14 Obtain 9,500 new federal Section 8 certificates or vouchers per year for housing authorities in Los Angeles County.

Los Angeles County; Los Angeles City and Cities within the county that are eligible to receive section 8 certificates or vouchers

Timeline: TBD

**BRING HOMELESS RESIDENTS INTO THE MAINSTREAM OF SOCIETY**

Exclusion from society is one of the most tragic dimensions of homelessness. Individual unable to claim their own place or provide for their own survival while living in a society of abundance are profoundly marginalized. Homeless residents must have genuine opportunities to fulfill their

allowed by the Workforce Investment Act.

e. Develop a streamlined process for referring homeless people to appropriate and reputable training programs.

f. Utilize Workforce Investment Act funds to support paid work-experience programs for homeless people, as allowed by this legislation.

g. Provide training and resources that assist One-Stops (employment centers funded by the Workforce Investment Act) in serving homeless people appropriately and increase coordination between One-Stops and homeless service providers to ensure that homeless people have access to comprehensive, quality services.

h. Provide staff resources for initiating and sustaining a joint effort between representatives of government agencies that administer Workforce Investment Act, One-Stop providers, and the homeless community, similar to the City of Los Angeles’ existing Disability Network.

i. Establish employment goals for homeless service providers.

j. Expand public-private job creation initiatives.

k. Support business community efforts to create training programs for homeless people.

l. Incorporate flexibility into One-Stop policies and encourage innovative partnerships between One-Stops and homeless service providers.

m. Develop accountability standards that ensure that homeless participants are assisted in obtaining living wage jobs in growth industries, yet also allow for flexibility in outcomes over the first two years. Workforce Investment Boards should publicly support and encourage the adoption of comprehensive living wage ordinances in their jurisdictions.

n. Workforce Investment Boards should publicly support and encourage the adoption of comprehensive living wage ordinances in their jurisdictions.

o. All Workforce Investment Boards should appoint a homeless advocate to their Board.

p. Limit sub-living wage positions for individuals with serious barriers to employment to two years.

q. Create a short term, high tolerance day labor exchange program, providing one day’s housing and food in exchange for one day’s work.

r. Create subsidized employment programs for homeless youth.

s. Create long term, supported employment positions for disabled homeless persons.

t. Create public works employment program.

u. Provide high-tolerance, “fail-proof” trial employment for homeless youth.

10 STRENGTHEN THE JOB READINESS, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT RATES FOR PUBLIC BENEFITS RECIPIENTS

a. Encourage education and training in welfare employment programs, rather than taking a strict work-first approach.

b. Encourage CalWORKs recipients to use their community service period (after their 18/24 month welfare to work period) to get more training and education necessary to accomplish their employment goals, rather than assigning recipients to community services that have nothing to do with what the recipients have been working towards during the 18/24 month period.

c. Include all General Relief and CalWORKs workfare participants under living wage ordinance.

d. Build a culture within the welfare department that values learning as well as work.

e. Provide open access for all certified education and training providers that provide free skill development to recruit and train welfare parents within the constraints of TANF and CalWORKs.
potential as human beings, and must also assume responsibility for public standards of civil and law abiding conduct. This includes ensuring that adequate substance abuse and mental health services are available, and using the power of the justice system affirmatively to ensure that homeless residents who have violated the law have access to, and make use of, these services. Action steps for reconnecting homeless residents with society and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:


Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health
Timeline: TBD

16 Provide comprehensive and effective mental health services for mentally ill homeless individuals.
   b. Lobby for Expansion of Mental Health Programs (AB 34/2034) that Use an Integrated Services Approach to serve all mentally ill homeless residents in Los Angeles County.
   c. Create a County-wide, Integrated Services Network, based upon the Institute of Co-occurring Disorders, which integrates and coordinates mental health, substance abuse

11 ENROLL [TBD] DISABLED HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS INTO THE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM (SSI), AND INTO OTHER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
   a. Implement an expedited SSI/SSDI enrollment program for potentially eligible General Relief and CalWORKs recipients.
   b. Lobby to permit people to receive SSI due to substance abuse if they are in active treatment.
   c. Lobby for the use of presumptive eligibility for long-term mentally ill individuals rather than requiring a demonstration of 12 months without work.
   d. Allow jail data to be used by mental health advocates for SSI and SSDI applications and counseling.
   e. Provide assistance in dealing with Social Security Administration to SSI recipients who are facing a continuing disability review, so that the SSI recipients are able to exercise all of their rights in that review process.
   f. Systematize communications process between community case managers and the Social Security Administration.
   g. Adjust the State Supplemental portion of SSI for each SSI recipient depending on the person’s housing costs to allow SSI recipients who are eligible to receive federal Food Stamps.
   h. Create stronger and more positive relationships between advocates and the Social Security Administration, Disability and Adult Programs Division (DAPD).
   i. Initiate proactive participation of mental health clinics in aggregating data for individual patients who visit multiple clinics to provide longitudinal documentation of persistent mental health problems.

12 IMPLEMENT ‘HIGH ROAD’ JOB CREATION, TRAINING AND WAGE STRATEGIES TO PROVIDE LIVING WAGES FOR LA’S LABOR FORCE.

13 ENSURE THAT INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES WHO ARE HOMELESS OR ARE THREATENED WITH HOMELESSNESS HAVE ACCESS TO APPROPRIATE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.
   a. Create outreach teams in each Service Planning Area to conduct
and other services among County Departments as well as other service providers in the community. Fully implement the Los Angeles County, Department of Mental Health Community Care Plan.

Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

Timeline: TBD

17 Increase access to county provided and funded health care services in order to serve an additional [TBD] patients.

Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

Timeline: TBD

18 Ensure homeless families and children are given the education related services and special assistance required by McKinney-Vento Act and emphasize coordination among school districts and the county office of education and other pertinent county departments.

Los Angeles County Office of Education and All School District in Los Angeles County

Timeline: TBD

19 Increase access to Community/Homeless/Drug/Mental Health Courts in the County to provide restorative justice for homeless residents who are involved with the justice system.

Los Angeles County Superior Court

Timeline: TBD

20 Enforce local laws and ordinances regarding standards for public conduct once appropriate services are available, while respecting the civil rights of homeless residents.
Los Angeles City and County Law Enforcement Agencies

Timeline: TBD

RESPECT THE INDIVIDUALIZED NATURE OF PROBLEMS THAT MAKE PEOPLE HOMELESS AND THE NEED FOR INDIVIDUAL SOLUTIONS

Homeless residents reflect the broad human diversity of the larger Los Angeles community. Often, homelessness emerges out of life histories in which opportunities for trust, hope and growth have been thwarted. To find a path out of homelessness and toward social inclusion these complex and difficult problems must be addressed. Lasting solutions that keep individuals out of homelessness require competent, individualized assistance as well as opportunities for homeless residents to act on rebuilding their own lives. A key action step for providing individually appropriate help for homeless residents and the responsible entity and timeline for carrying out this step are as follows:

21 Develop standards and tools to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of homeless service providers in responding to the individual needs of homeless

outpatient treatment slots for mentally ill homeless individuals
b. Implement the County Department of Mental Health Community Care Plan to provide coordinated and comprehensive services throughout the county. Develop money management units within current County service structure.
c. Expand representative payee programs to manage money for persons with mental illness in Los Angeles County.
d. Create limited money management services that pay for rent and utilities and allow the recipient to use the rest of the grant as the recipient wishes.
e. Streamline County bureaucracy so that it parallels state AB 2034 funded programs, giving providers the ability to better tailor programs to meet community needs.
f. Target funding for AB2034 to address youth issues such as early and periodic screening diagnosis and treatment (EPSDT).
g. Develop AB 34 programs for dual diagnosed individuals.
h. Expand the direct, comprehensive services approach of the Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) program for high intensity users of the mental health system.
i. Permit US Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) funding to flow directly to community agencies.
j. Allow mental health and substance abuse services to be provided in one place as a treatment option.

17 INCREASE ACCESS TO COUNTY PROVIDED AND FUNDED HEALTH CARE SERVICES IN ORDER TO SERVE AN ADDITIONAL [TBD] PATIENTS.
a. Expand the use of mobile medical and mobile TB clinic vans.
b. Integrate homeless services within County health programs.
c. Encourage the California Primary Care Association to integrate a plan to end homelessness into their programs.
d. Expand dental and vision services for uninsured homeless people.
e. Provide Medi-Cal for homeless youth until 21 years of age.
f. Mandate hospital discharge planning for homeless individuals to avoid “discharge to the streets”.
g. Coordinate Health Care for the Homeless Network with LAHSA.
h. Stop hotels in downtown from charging homecare workers to enter.
i. Lobby for targeted Medi-Cal program for homeless people.
j. Restore Medi-Cal for General Relief recipients.
k. Restructure Medi-Cal to permit quick changes of providers.
l. Provide medical services at Access Centers.
m. Improve Los Angeles County telephone access to order prescriptions.
n. Lobby state legislature to reinstate Denti-Cal, to provide dental services to poor families.
o. Replaces Neighborhood Health Clinics.
p. Increase the availability of quality after-hours medical services within communities.
q. Expand prevention education and outreach services.
r. Support portability of Medi-Cal and/or HMO programs.
s. Increase the number of recuperative care facilities.
t. Reduce reliance on health care “silos” and increase the number of entry and service points throughout the county.	u. Expand transportation options to help people get to medical facilities.	v. Create more prescription eyeglass donation programs.
w. Site health clinics within emergency shelters.

18 ENSURE HOMELESS FAMILIES AND CHILDREN ARE GIVEN THE EDUCATION RELATED SERVICES AND SPECIAL ASSISTANCE REQUIRED BY MCKINNEY-VENTO ACT AND
residents, and use this performance data along with indices of community need in allocating funding for shelter and services throughout the County.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA)

Timeline: TBD

CALL ON ALL COMMUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE FAIRLY IN FUNDING AND HOSTING HOMELESS SERVICES AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Homeless residents are found in every community in the Los Angeles region, with the greatest concentrations in the poorest communities. While the results of poverty are most apparent in high-poverty neighborhoods, poverty itself represents a collective failure of the region’s residents and their economy. There are enormous disparities in the resources that different cities devote to addressing homelessness, and the willingness of different cities to provide sites for homeless services and housing. To end homelessness every community must contribute fairly to providing funding and sites to meet the needs of the region’s homeless residents. Action steps for ensuring that all communities participate fairly in funding and

EMPHASIZE COORDINATION AMONG SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND THE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND OTHER PERTINENT COUNTY DEPARTMENTS.

a. Educate local school administrators about the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

b. Expand school based counseling services, including after-hours and off-campus services.

c. Increase collaborations with the Department of Children and Family Services and City and County Departments of Recreation for after school and other programs.

d. Integrate life and social skills programs into school district curricula beginning in kindergarten.

e. Create specialized life and social skill programs for young parent(s) in high school.

f. Develop collaboration between school districts and MTA to provide increased and lower cost transportation to children and teens.

19 INCREASE ACCESS TO COMMUNITY, HOMELESS, DRUG, AND MENTAL HEALTH COURTS IN THE COUNTY TO PROVIDE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FOR HOMELESS RESIDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED WITH THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

a. Identify health, safety and other laws and ordinances commonly related to homelessness.

b. Identify barriers that prevent homeless individuals from complying with those ordinances.

c. Communicate the laws and barriers to LAHSA for inclusion in the planning process.

d. Adopt a “Service First” model for people on the streets and in encampments, providing genuine access to effective services before enforcement of laws related to standards of public conduct caused in part by the state of homelessness.

e. Discourage panhandling and improper public behavior and promote a message of recovery.

f. Increase homeless sensitivity training for police and BID security officers.

20 ENFORCE LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES REGARDING STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC CONDUCT ONCE APPROPRIATE SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE, WHILE RESPECTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF HOMELESS RESIDENTS.

a. Identify barriers that prevent homeless individuals from complying with those ordinances.

c. Communicate the laws and barriers to LAHSA for inclusion in the planning process.

d. Adopt a “Service First” model for people on the streets and in encampments, providing genuine access to effective services before enforcement of laws related to standards of public conduct caused in part by the state of homelessness.

e. Discourage panhandling and improper public behavior and promote a message of recovery.

f. Increase homeless sensitivity training for police and BID security officers.

21 DEVELOP STANDARDS AND TOOLS TO MEASURE AND EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF HOMELESS SERVICE PROVIDERS IN RESPONDING TO THE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS OF HOMELESS RESIDENTS, AND USE THIS OUTCOME DATA ALONG WITH INDICES OF COMMUNITY NEED IN ALLOCATING FUNDING FOR SHELTER AND SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY.

22 ADOPT THIS STRATEGIC PLAN: LOS ANGELES COUNTY, LOS ANGELES CITY AND THE 87 OTHER CITIES IN THE COUNTY

23 IDENTIFY, SEEK AND LEVERAGE ALL POTENTIAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FUNDS AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES FOR HOMELESS PROGRAMS WITH A FAIR SHARE COMMITMENT OF PUBLIC FUNDING FROM EACH JURISDICTION, AND DEVELOP A COORDINATED LOBBYING EFFORT FOCUSING ON STATE AND NATIONAL LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS AND POLICIES THAT IMPACT HOMELESSNESS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

a. Institutionalize the Bring LA Home Resource Development
participate fairly in funding and hosting homeless services and affordable housing and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:

22 Adopt this Strategic Plan.
Los Angeles County; Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county
November 2004

23 Identify, seek and leverage all potential public and private funds and volunteer resources for homeless programs with a fair share commitment of public funding from each jurisdiction, and develop a coordinated lobbying effort focusing on state and national legislation, regulations and policies that impact homelessness in Los Angeles County.
Los Angeles County; Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county
Timeline: TBD

BUILD CAPACITY TO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH INFORMED AND EFFECTIVE ACTION

To end homelessness in 10 years it will be necessary to make continuing improvements in the quality of information available for monitoring and refining the strategies in this plan, and for coordinating the efforts of roughly 100 public sector entities identified as responsible for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Lobby for both an increased allocation of federal tax credits for housing and an overall increase in the tax credit program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Establish a Homeless Assistance Trust Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Establish new public funding streams, such as “sin” or “penny” taxes, increased fines for fair housing law violations, increased recording document filing fees to support programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Increase marriage license fee and use for homeless services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Establish a coordinated public-private funders council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Support the Mental Health initiative on the November ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strengthen public service internship programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Support student loan community service repayment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Distribute this plan and foster dialogue and support regarding homelessness and its solutions among religious institutions, media, government, business, policy organizations, direct service providers, people who are homeless and others in Los Angeles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Develop an information and communications capacity within LAHSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Use local neighborhood councils or new human service councils to facilitate siting local services and inform city-wide policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Lobby HUD to make its funding more flexible. Allow it to support services such as substance abuse, emergency shelter, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Lobby the IRS to make the value of services provided to homeless programs or people tax deductible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Lobby the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) to permit seniors to include pensions and retirement pay as “earned income” in the food stamp calculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Develop a coordinated community response regarding combating poverty, increasing jobs, the level of the minimum wage, tax structure issues, ‘high road’ economic development strategies, universal health care access, investments in education and training to employment sectors with strong internal job ladders, and adequately funded public schools and community services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 IMPROVE THE COMPLETENESS, RELIABILITY AND USEFULNESS OF HOMELESS DATA BY CONDUCTING A BASELINE CENSUS AND SURVEY OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, AS WELL AS SUBSEQUENT PERIODIC COUNTYWIDE AND CITY LEVEL ENUMERATIONS, AND INTEGRATE THIS INFORMATION WITH OTHER SOURCES OF DATA ABOUT HOMELESS RESIDENTS.

| a. Conduct census of the homeless population in Los Angeles County. |
| b. Collect data that supports estimates of population dynamics and service needs among homeless residents. |
| c. Collect data from all institutions with significant direct linkages to homeless residents (including the county departments of Public Social Services, Children and Family Services, Mental Health, Probation, and Sheriff, and state departments of Corrections and Mental Health to provide information about the flow of residents into homelessness and the needs and attributes of these residents. |
| d. Integrate and analyze data about homeless residents to identify population trends, service needs, and outcomes from the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness, and provide corrective feedback for fine-tuning components of the plan. |
| e. Fully implement a Countywide Homeless Management Information System. |
| f. Collect data from service providers throughout the County. |
| g. Allow service providers to track clients between service sites. |

25 ESTABLISH LAHSA AS THE OVERSIGHT AGENCY FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION TO COORDINATE, SUPPORT, REFINE
carrying out different parts of this plan. Action steps for ensuring effective long-term follow through on this plan and the responsible entities and timeline for carrying out each step are as follows:

24 Improve the completeness, reliability and usefulness of homeless data by conducting a baseline census and survey of the homeless population in Los Angeles County, as well as subsequent periodic countywide and city level enumerations, and integrate this information with other sources of data about homeless residents.

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) - Countywide surveys; 34 Entitlement Cities - optional local surveys

October, 2005: First report
January, 2006: Full implementation of homeless management information system

25 Establish an oversight agency for plan implementation to coordinate, support, refine and report on plan implementation activities among the 88 cities, local school districts, other appropriate governmental entities and the County of Los Angeles.

Los Angeles County; Los Angeles City and the 87 other Cities within the county

Timeline: TBD

AND REPORT ON PLAN IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES AMONG THE 88 CITIES, LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, OTHER APPROPRIATE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

a. Develop a monitoring unit within LAHSA.
b. Identify new research as well as plans and programs in other jurisdictions relevant to homelessness in Los Angeles.
c. Establish a fulltime, homeless liaison in each County Department and each City within the County.
d. Develop a Countywide Coordinating Body that includes governmental, service and advocacy representatives.
e. Consider merging the four continuums.
f. Encourage experienced cities to help those without experience in siting and developing affordable housing, shelters and homeless services.
g. Appoint a homeless liaison, reporting to the Director, in each department.
h. Establish a homeless services coordinator in each city Entitlement City.
i. Fully implement the service implementation projects of local governments.
j. Develop a countywide system to identify homeless persons across County Departments and analyze their issues and characteristics.
k. Conduct an annual service and housing gaps analysis.
l. Publish an annual report on plan implementation.
m. Assemble a research and policy team to monitor, assess and recommend policies and programs.

n. Create a research advisory council.
o. Assess the quality of service provision by funded service providers.
p. Tailor funding decisions to documented needs and to effective service programs.
q. Provide technical assistance to service providers in order to increase service provision quality, provider accountability, and ability to attract diversified funding.
r. Collect and examine shelter and service standards enacted in other jurisdictions.
s. Ensure that standards take the special circumstances, such as the difficulty of serving a particular population, into account.
t. Ensure that standards focus on developing programs that move residents into permanent housing.
u. Provide technical assistance to under-performing service providers.
v. Base funding allocations upon performance.
w. Increase the permitted administrative and operating cost allocation within public grants.
x. Expand the portfolio of services provided by shelters based upon community need.
y. Develop long-term follow up service programs.
z. Revise this plan as needed.

CHRONICALLY HOMELESS RESIDENTS AND EARLY ACTION ITEMS

Ten of the 25 strategic actions address the needs of long-term homeless residents who meet HUD’s definition of chronically homeless. And 11 are early action items
that can be accomplished completely or in part during the first year of implementing this strategy to end homelessness. Actions that target the chronically homeless and early action items are highlighted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Action</th>
<th>Chronically Homeless</th>
<th>Early Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals receiving or eligible for</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public assistance from General Relief or CalWORKs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals discharged from Los Angeles</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County jail and from State prison and youth facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce the rate of homelessness among youth leaving foster care and County</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reduce the rate of homelessness among individuals discharged from state and</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county hospitals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Obtain a commitment from each of the 88 cities within Los Angeles County and</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each Los Angeles City Council member to provide services and housing for homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish an annual goal for reducing the number of homeless people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Increase enrollment of disabled homeless residents in the Supplemental</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Income Program (SSI) and other public assistance programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ensure that individuals and families who are homeless or are threatened with</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homelessness have access to appropriate services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Obtain 9,500 new federal Section 8 certificates or vouchers per year for</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing authorities in Los Angeles County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Create additional detoxification, inpatient and outpatient treatment slots</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for homeless individuals with substance abuse problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Provide comprehensive and effective mental health services for mentally ill</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeless individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Increase access to Community/ Homeless/Drug/Mental Health Courts to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restorative justice for homeless residents who are involved with the justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Enforce local laws and ordinances regarding standards for public conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once appropriate services are available, while respecting the civil rights of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeless residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Measure and evaluate the effectiveness of homeless service providers in</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responding to the individual needs of homeless residents, and use this data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along with indices of community need in allocating funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Adopt this Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Leverage all potential public and private resources for homeless programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with fair share commitments from each city, and develop coordinated lobbying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focusing on policies impacting homelessness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Improve the completeness, reliability and usefulness of homeless data by</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducting a homeless census and integrate this information with other sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of data about homeless residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Establish LAHSA as the oversight agency for plan implementation to coordinate,</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support, refine, and report on strategy implementation activities in the County of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRENGTHENING THE STRATEGY TO END HOMELESSNESS

This strategy will set in motion a dynamic initiative for ending homelessness that will be refined and updated based on new information as well as lessons learned from implementing the strategy. The strategy brings together the best information that is available and the best thinking of hundreds of stakeholders who have participated in developing the strategy. The strategy is not intended to be a static blueprint with a set of fixed answers because the factors that cause homelessness – including the economy, the housing market, welfare policies, and population structure – are continually changing. The opportunity to gather new information and learn new lessons as the strategy is implemented offers the prospect of continually strengthening this initiative and improving the effectiveness of actions to end homelessness over the next ten years.
Chapter 5
Scope of Services and Cost to End Homelessness

OVERVIEW

How many people must be helped and what will this help cost to end homelessness in Los Angeles? The preceding chapter identified crucial actions that include:

- Creating and preserving more affordable housing, including units with social service support, and helping homeless residents gain access to housing.
- Helping homeless residents obtain and keep jobs.
- Helping precariously housed residents remain housed.
- Connecting more eligible homeless residents with public benefits.
- Providing emergency, health, mental health, substance abuse, legal, credit counseling, life skills, education, and childcare services for homeless people.

In this chapter we provide estimates of the number of people who will need each type of housing and service over the next ten years and the local costs to meet these needs. These estimates are produced using a ten-year population model that has been developed based on homeless data developed for this plan, information from subject matter experts, and other research on homelessness in the region. In many instances this model relies on crude or estimated data that should be improved upon as the 10-Year Strategy is being implemented. Yet despite these inadequacies, currently available data is sufficiently reliable to provide a roadmap for beginning the work of ending homelessness – the task is sufficiently large that in the near future we do not risk over-shooting the mark in providing any type of needed housing or service.

It is costly to end homelessness because this requires providing incomes and housing for the region’s most acutely impoverished residents. An unfortunately large share of the region’s residents have episodes of acute poverty, and during this crisis many residents experience homelessness and become vulnerable to recurrent or protracted stints of homelessness. To eliminate these conditions that are the seedbed of homelessness the region must address long-neglected problems of inadequate job skills, lack of jobs, and insufficient affordable housing for its poorest residents.
FOUR KEY FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE SIZE OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION AND THE COST OF ENDING HOMELESSNESS

The size of the homeless population as well as the cost of ending homelessness hinge in large measure on four factors:

1. **How many additional people become homeless each year?**

   We estimate that currently, over the course of each year, unduplicated new homeless residents replace 65 percent of the previous year’s homeless population. The most important tool for ending homelessness is to reduce this level of new entrants into homelessness.

2. **How many adults return to the labor force after experiencing homelessness?**

   To the extent that people earn an income, particularly an income from steady employment in a living wage job, it becomes unnecessary to support them through public programs.

3. **How many people receive all of the public aid for which they are eligible?**

   Homeless residents will have an income floor that significantly reduces the gap between their needs and the funds available to meet those needs if they receive all of the benefits for which they are eligible, including: CalWORKs, General Relief, Supplemental Security Income, Social Security Disability Insurance, Social Security, Workers Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, Disability Insurance, Veterans Affairs Benefits, Food Stamps, Medi-Cal, and Earned Income Tax Credits.

4. **How much of their own spendable resources do homeless households contribute to paying for affordable or subsidized housing if they are unable to pay for market rate housing?**

   The scenarios that follow assume that residents in affordable or subsidized housing will contribute the equivalent of 40 percent of their spendable resources (the combined value of earned income, cash public assistance, and Food Stamps) to pay for rent. We also present a scenario with a sliding scale of subsidies for affordable housing, in which households with the potential to increase their income contribute an additional 5 percent of their spendable resources each year for rent. Estimates of the percent of homeless residents that will be able to afford each type of housing are shown in Table 3.
CREATING FOUR SCENARIOS FOR ENDING HOMELESSNESS

To estimate the cost of different strategies for ending homelessness we have developed four scenarios based on different combinations of the four key factors for determining the size of the homeless population, income levels, and the cost of housing discussed above. Many other scenarios are conceivable. These four were chosen because they represent a spectrum of realistic policy alternatives.

The assumptions about income and population size that underlie three of the four scenarios are shown in Figure 5. The number of homeless households projected to need each type of service under the three scenarios is shown in Figure 6.

- In the cautious scenario the flow of new entrants into homelessness remains unchanged (65 percent annual replacement rate); 30 percent of homeless residents are enrolled in CalWORKs, 20 percent in SSI, and 14 percent in General Relief; and 50 percent of adults join the labor force.
  - This results in the largest homeless population with the
In the semi-optimistic scenario there is no reduction in the flow of new entrants into homelessness but better service delivery outcomes are achieved: 34 percent of homeless residents are enrolled in CalWORKs, 33 percent in SSI, and 21 percent in General Relief; and 61 percent of adults join the labor force.

- This results in a population that is still as large as the cautious scenario but with more income to use in paying for their own living costs.

The optimistic scenario retains these improved service delivery outcomes, but it adds the assumption that the flow of new entrants into homelessness is reduced to a 30 percent annual replacement rate.

- This results in a much smaller homeless population that continues to have the comparatively high income levels shown in the semi-optimistic scenario.

The fourth scenario, called modified optimistic, is not shown in Figures 5 or 6, but is discussed later. This scenario (which has a sliding scale of rent for some tenants) does not change the size or income level of the homeless population; by these measures it is the same as the optimistic scenario. However, the amount of housing subsidies decreases over time as service programs help clients increase their earnings and move into market rate housing.

Highlights about the annual number of new households projected in Figure 6 to need each type of service include:
In contrast to the cautious scenario, the semi-optimistic scenario has the effect of shifting homeless residents into less heavily subsidized housing because they have higher incomes as a result of higher rates of employment and enrollment in public assistance programs.

The optimistic scenario has the most dramatic impact, reducing the number of people needing housing subsidies and services by more than half. The key to ending homelessness is reducing the number of new people who become homeless.

Under all scenarios, training and job placement for adults re-entering the labor force is the service needed by the greatest number of persons. Information about current service levels shown later in this chapter suggests that there is a very large shortfall in the availability of employment services for homeless residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Local Cost per Household</th>
<th>Percent of Homeless Population Receiving Each Type of Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach, Access Centers</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, &amp; Linked Services</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, Dental, Life Skills, Education, Food, Clothing, Childcare, Other</td>
<td>Average of $1,500</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Relief</td>
<td>$1,667 per year average</td>
<td>14% to 21% depending on scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>No local cost</td>
<td>30% to 34% depending on scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income (SSI)</td>
<td>No local cost</td>
<td>20% to 33% depending on scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Employment</td>
<td>$1,917 per labor force entrant</td>
<td>50% to 61% enter labor force, depending on scenario, 2/3 need training or job placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Entry into Housing</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Family Housing</td>
<td>No subsidy</td>
<td>22% to 30% depending on scenario: families with $16,000+ in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Individual Housing</td>
<td>No subsidy</td>
<td>25% to 39% depending on scenario: single adults with $12,000+ in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Family Housing</td>
<td>$5,150 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>3% to 8% depending on scenario: families with $10,000 to $15,999 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Individual Housing</td>
<td>$3,155 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>14% to 28% depending on scenario: single adults w/ $7,000-$11,999 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Family Housing</td>
<td>$7,726 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>0.3% to 1% depending on scenario: 1/2 of families with &lt;$10,000 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Individual Housing</td>
<td>$5,160 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>6% to 8% depending on scenario: 1/2 of single adults with &lt;$7,000 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Family Housing</td>
<td>$12,726 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>0.3% to 1% depending on scenario: 1/2 of families with &lt;$7,000 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Individual Housing</td>
<td>$10,160 yearly after tenant rent contribution</td>
<td>6% to 8% depending on scenario: 1/2 of single adults w/ &lt;$7,000 in annual spendable resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlights about the projected annual cost of each type of service for each household that uses the service, as shown in Figure 7, include:

- By far the most expensive service is supportive housing, which includes both deeply subsidized rents and on-site social services. The average cost is estimated to be $10,275 per year after the tenant’s contribution to rent.
- The second most expensive service is subsidized housing for very low income homeless residents. The average cost is estimated to be $5,275 per year after the tenant’s contribution to rent.
- The fact that households in these deeply subsidized housing units are likely to continue to need these subsidies indefinitely has major budget implications as new cycles of homelessness continue to occur, bringing in additional households that also need these subsidies.

The elements of the equation for estimating the budget for ending homelessness are the cost of each service component and the number of people who will need and use each service component. These cost and service level estimates are summarized in Table 3. The four scenarios that follow build on these population and cost assumptions.

**FOUR SCENARIOS OF 10-YEAR COSTS TO END HOMELESSNESS**

**CAUTIOUS SCENARIO**

In the cautious scenario, shown in Figure 8, the flow of new entrants into homelessness is not reduced and the level of income received by homeless residents is not substantially increased over current levels. The result is large and steadily growing costs to house a steadily increasing population of residents in housing that requires rent subsidies, plus costs for services.

- Total costs in the first year are projected to be about $1.47 billion, with $920 million for services and $550 million for housing.
- By the tenth year annual costs are projected to reach $4.3 billion, with $600 million for services and $3.7 billion for housing. The growing number of people in subsidized housing results in growing housing costs.

**SEMI-OPTIMISTIC SCENARIO**

In the semi-optimistic scenario, shown in Figure 9, the flow of new entrants into homelessness is not reduced, but the level of income received by homeless residents is increased over current levels as a result of higher earned income and greater enrollment in public assistance programs. The result is somewhat smaller
Figure 8
Annual Costs Under CAUTIOUS SCENARIO: Current Rate of New Homeless, Same Service Outcomes

Figure 9
Annual Costs Under SEMI-OPTIMISTIC Scenario: Current rate of New Homeless, Improved Service Outcomes
but still steadily growing costs to house the increasing population of residents receiving housing subsidies, plus costs for services.

- Total costs in the first year are projected to be about $1.45 billion, with $1 billion for services and $450 million for housing.
- By the tenth year annual costs are projected to reach $3.6 billion, with $670 million for services and $2.9 billion for housing.
- An important finding from this scenario is that improving services to help homeless residents obtain higher incomes from employment as well as public benefits is important, but by the tenth year this achieves only a 16 percent reduction in annual costs compared to the cautious scenario.
- The steady annual growth in the number of households needing long-term housing subsidies, even though they have higher incomes than in the cautious scenario, drives long-term housing costs to a high level.

**OPTIMISTIC SCENARIO**

In the optimistic scenario, shown in Figure 10, the annual replacement rate of currently homeless residents by newly homeless residents drops from 65 percent to 30 percent, the labor force participation rate increases from 50 to 61 percent, and the percent of the population enrolled in CalWORKs, SSI and General Relief bumps up to 34, 33, and 21 percent, respectively. The result is a much smaller population receiving services and housing subsidies.

- Total costs in the first year are projected to be about $1.45 billion, with $1 billion for services and $450 million for housing.
- The drop in expenditures in the second year shown in Figure 10 corresponds with a drop in the homeless population after homeless prevention measures take effect.
- By the tenth year annual costs are projected to reach $1.9 billion, with $300 million for services and $1.6 billion for housing.
- An important finding from this scenario is that effective actions to reduce the number of people entering homelessness, for example by eliminating the flow of people from major public institutions into homelessness, will reduce the tenth year outlay for homeless residents by 47 percent. Preventing homelessness has a very powerful impact on reducing costs.
- Even with greatly improved prevention there is still roughly 10 percent annual growth the number of households receiving housing subsidies projected under this optimistic scenario.
Figure 10
Annual Costs Under OPTIMISTIC Scenario: Reduced Rate of New Homeless, Improved Service Outcomes

Figure 11
Annual Costs Under MODIFIED OPTIMISTIC Scenario: Reduced new Homeless, Improved Outcomes, Some Housing Subsidies Decline
MODIFIED OPTIMISTIC SCENARIO

In the modified optimistic scenario, shown in Figure 11, all of the assumptions from the optimistic scenario about the rate of new entrants into homelessness, labor force participation rate, and enrollment in public assistance remain the same, but the subsidies for affordable housing decrease over time. These households with modest but still significant spendable resources (single adults with $7,000 to $11,999 and families with $10,000 to $15,999) are expected to increase their contribution to rent costs each year. In the first year they would contribute 40 percent of spendable resources, in the second year the contribution would be five percentage points higher, with the same increase again in each following year. This scenario assumes that these households will be able to increase their earned income and achieve a transition into market rate housing. The result is that a smaller population receives services and housing subsidies, with only about 5 percent annual growth the number of households receiving housing subsidies. By the tenth year of the modified optimistic scenario the annual costs to end homelessness are projected to reach roughly $1.3 billion, with roughly $1 billion of it for housing subsidies.

The estimated annual demand for additional housing units of each type in the four scenarios is shown in Figure 12. The average number of additional units needed each year during the first ten years is estimated to be:

- Cautious scenario: 133,300 units, 71,300 of them with subsidies
- Semi-optimistic scenario: 133,300 units, 61,800 of them with subsidies
- Optimistic scenario: 71,200 units, 33,800 of them with subsidies
- Modified optimistic scenario: 71,200 units, 22,200 of them with subsidies

Even under the most favorable scenario that is currently foreseeable, the costs to end homelessness are substantial. In the following sections we look at how to pay for the costs of housing and services.
**SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR HOMELESS HOUSING**

When we look at how LA’s highly skilled cadre of nonprofit housing developers assemble financing packages to pay for building housing for homeless residents we are likely to see a combination of funding sources somewhat like what is shown in Figure 13. Figure 13 shows a typical budget for developing Single Room Occupancy (SRO) housing for homeless single adults in downtown Los Angeles. Other types of homeless housing in other communities use different combinations of funding, but for all types of homeless housing, most of the funding does not originate from local government or local organizations. Major funding sources for SRO housing and their constraints are as follows:

- Over 60 percent of the funding is likely to be obtained by syndicating tax credits and depreciation for the housing and selling it in the commercial market. The federal government has an annual cap on these financial instruments, and divides this allocation among states. In California the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) decides on how to allocate this resource among housing projects. These funds can be increased by raising the federal cap or by increasing the share that the State of California allocates to homeless housing.

- In Los Angeles at least 10 percent is likely to come from tax increment funds that the Community Redevelopment Agency sets aside for affordable housing. State law requires that 20 percent of tax increment receipts from redevelopment projects be set aside for affordable housing; Los Angeles sets aside 25 percent. The amount of these funds that is available for homeless housing can be increased if more cities use their “housing set aside” for homeless housing.

- Funds that cities and counties receive from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in the form of Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and Home Investments Partnership...
(HOME) grants are likely to make up at least 10 percent of the financing. The amount of these funds available for homeless housing can be increased if more cities allocate them for such projects, or if the federal government increases the level of funding for these grants.

- Several percent of the funds may come from three HUD programs that are often referred to as HUD McKinney funding or Targeted Homeless Assistance Programs. These funds can be increased through increased federal allocations.
- The Affordable Housing Program (AHP) administered by banks might provide another 5 percent of the funding. These funds come as a loan that converts to a grant in 15 years.
- Rent from tenants might provide a revenue stream that repays a commercial loan for 5 to 10 percent of the project cost. In addition, rent revenue equal to 6 percent of the total project cost is likely to be set aside each year to pay operating and maintenance costs. The amount of these funds can be increased if homeless tenants have higher incomes from working or receiving public benefits.

In addition to SRO housing it is also necessary to develop housing linked to social services, housing for families, housing for youth, and affordable housing for homeless residents who are able to pay a significant portion, but not all, of their rent. Assembling funding for deeply subsidized and affordable housing is a complex undertaking that is subject to a large number of local, state and national legislative actions. Future funding mixes may change substantially based on changes in those government programs. A partial list of funding sources that are currently being mixed and matched for different types of homeless housing in different communities includes:

**FEDERAL**
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME)
- Homeownership Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE)
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)
- HUD 202/HUD 811 Program Funds
- HUD Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation
- Low-Income Housing Preservation Program (LIHPP)
- McKinney Act Funds, including Shelter Plus Care and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits
- Public land donations

**STATE**
- California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)
- Housing Loan Insurance Fund (CaHLIF)
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits – State
In addition to building new affordable housing units, a critical tool for housing low-income residents is subsidizing the rent for existing housing. The principle federal program for helping lower income residents secure decent, affordable housing is Section 8. Under this program eligible households pay approximately 30 percent of their income towards renting privately owned housing and Section 8 funds pay the remainder of the rental cost, within a rent ceiling set by HUD. Any household with an income less than 50 percent of the HUD determined median family income for the Los Angeles County is potentially eligible to have their rent subsidized under this program. For a single person the maximum income is $20,850; for a family of three it is $26,800.

Forty-four thousand (44,000) households currently participate in the Section 8 program in the City of Los Angeles. This represents nearly 5 percent of the City’s rental housing market. Unfortunately, there are very long waiting lists – with most housing authorities at least several years - for receiving Section 8 assistance. In recent years, Congress has limited funding for Section 8 and adjusted the rules resulting in local housing authorities helping fewer needy households. In the budget proposal submitted to Congress for next year, the administration seeks to cut the Section 8 program by 40 percent over the next five years. This will result in a loss of 250,000 rent subsidy vouchers nationwide in the first year, including over 35,000 fewer vouchers in California.

Preserving and expanding the Section 8 program is critically important for ending homelessness in Los Angeles County. This program provides the bridge between families of modest means and the available stock of rental housing in the region.
In summary, even though the federal government controls most of the funding used to build homeless housing and subsidize the rent of existing housing, local government still has significant discretion in deciding whether or not to use available grant programs for these projects. Local governmental jurisdictions in Los Angeles County receive a total of $220 million each year from HUD (through Community Development Block Grants, HUD Home Investments Partnership or “HOME” grants, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with HIV/AIDS or “HOPWA” grants) that can be used to build homeless housing, along with meeting other community development, housing and social service needs. At this time only a handful of cities in the county are using any of their HUD block grant funds or housing funds generated by redevelopment projects to build housing for their homeless residents. **To house LA’s homeless residents it is essential that:**

1. All cities participate actively and equitably in allocating local revenues such as tax increment funds from redevelopment areas for homeless housing.
2. All cities participate actively and equitably in ensuring that all new housing developments include affordable housing.
3. All cities make increasing use of block grant funds and state and federal financing tools for developing affordable housing.
4. State and federal agencies increase the level of financing that is available to local government and nonprofit developers to build homeless housing.
5. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development expand the Section 8 rent subsidy program.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ENGAGEMENT IN ADDRESSING HOMELESSNESS**

Forty-eight cities, 14 county departments, and 2 job training jurisdiction responded to a letter of inquiry from the Blue Ribbon Panel about homeless residents in their jurisdiction, and their services and recommendations for helping those residents. Several elements of these responses are summarized in Table 5 – each jurisdiction’s estimate of the size of its homeless population, and its expenditures for police services and well as housing and human services for homeless residents.

Based on the information assembled in Table 5 it appears that local public sector entities in Los Angeles County spend approximately $405 million each year on homeless services and housing. We estimate that this represents approximately 80 percent of local expenditures on homelessness, with another 10 percent coming from private donations and 10 percent from foundations. Altogether, an estimated $506 million is being spent on homelessness by city, county and private agencies each year in Los Angeles County.
There is great unevenness in the amount local jurisdictions spend on homelessness. In Table 5, each jurisdiction’s expenditure is shown as a percent of aggregate household income – a measure of total financial resources in a community. Based on available information it appears that 77 cities are spending less that 0.02 percent of household income to address homelessness. This includes a number of cities that report they do not spend anything to meet the needs of homeless residents. Eleven cities along with the county and LA’s Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) report annual expenditures for homeless services and housing that equal at least one-twentieth of one percent of aggregate household income. The county leads this list, spending $294 million a year. These 11 jurisdictions are shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>% of Aggregate Household Income Spent on Homelessness</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>% of Aggregate Household Income Spent on Homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>0.15204%</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>0.03108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>0.09348%</td>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>0.02857%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>0.07724%</td>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td>0.02584%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>0.05947%</td>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>0.02493%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>0.05059%</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>0.02309%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>0.04917%</td>
<td>LAHSA</td>
<td>0.02089%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>0.03528%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about current local outlays to address the problem of homelessness supports the following conclusions:

1. Cities demonstrated widespread cooperation in collecting and sharing information about homeless issues.

2. There are greatly varying perceptions about the presence of homeless residents. There are a number of instances in which cities with similar population sizes and socio-economic profiles report staggeringly different estimates of the number of homeless residents in their community. Many cities are unable to provide information from any source about the number of homeless residents or how much is spent on those residents.

3. A substantial amount is already being spent on homelessness - $505 million annually. As the region moves forward on implementing the 10-Year Strategy to End Homelessness it is important to examine what is being
accomplished with the dollars currently being spent on homeless needs, and how these funds can be used more effectively. The detailed action agenda to end homelessness laid out in the previous chapter will require accomplishing more with existing funds, ensuring that all communities contribute equitably to the costs of ending homelessness, as well as finding ways to augment currently available local resources.

4. Los Angeles County is providing an estimated 58 percent of all public and private funds spent locally on homelessness. It will be critical for the success of the strategic plan that the greatest possible impact be achieved through these resources.

5. Out of two direct responses from Workforce Investment Boards (eight of these local entities are responsible for allocating federal employment and training block grants) as well as four additional responses from parent governmental agencies of other Workforce Investment Boards, an annual total of only $202,956 was identified as being expended on employment services for homeless residents. The scenarios presented in this chapter suggest that from $90 to $200 million will need to be spent annually to bring employable homeless adults back into the labor force. Some of this human capital investment can come through welfare-to-work programs, but it will also require workforce investment boards to assign a much higher priority to serving homeless residents.

6. Money that cities are likely to be able to allocate for homelessness will probably meet only part of the necessary total cost of ending homelessness. Cities must also become actively and equitably engaged in contributing land and affordable housing for homeless residents as well as sites for services. This includes using local physical assets as well as the financial assets to:
   a. Establish inclusionary zoning ordinances that provide mandates as well as effective incentives for building housing that is affordable to people with incomes as low as 10 percent of the median income.
   b. Establish affordable housing requirements for housing developers to offer below-market units.
   c. Provide publicly owned sites for development of low-income housing and homeless service delivery facilities.

7. Additional federal and state funding is essential for providing adequate housing and social services to end homelessness. The county and all cities must become actively engaged in a unified lobbying effort to obtain adequate resources from other levels of government to address homelessness.
8. Additional charitable and philanthropic funding is essential for ending homelessness. Foundations, religious organizations, community organizations, and private citizens must be called upon to give more generously to programs that will prevent and end homelessness.

9. Expenditures already being made for homelessness in Los Angeles County equal from 35 percent to 59 percent of the estimated annual cost of an effective strategy to end homelessness over the next ten years (the modified optimistic scenario, depending on the year). With full participation from the county, all cities, private donors, and federal and state agencies there are adequate resources to end homelessness in 10 years.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Homeless Population City’s Estimate</th>
<th>Homeless Expenditures Interval</th>
<th>Aggregate Household Income in 1999 Services &amp; Housing as % of Aggregate Income</th>
<th>Services &amp; Housing Reporting Expenditures Rank among Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>806,262,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,445,060,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>100 day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,477,634,000 0.00000%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>12 day</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>579,415,200 0.00000%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>928 6 month</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>867,069,400 0.00185%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>368,896,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>75 year</td>
<td>165,150</td>
<td>1,150,717,000 0.00004%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>49,012,000 0.00306%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>100 day</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>2,555,107,500 0.02493%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,515,714,600 0.00990%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>452 year</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>1,291,480,000 0.00542%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>7 year</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>954,570,500 0.00031%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>100 year</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>936,758,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,116,278,100 0.00000%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,424,037,700 0.00000%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>75 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,943,344,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>432 year</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1,193,103,300 0.01341%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>985,017,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>500 day</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>4,271,322,600 0.04917%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>190 year</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,276,329,400 0.00133%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,245,626,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>991,375,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>50 year</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,644,868,200 0.00152%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td>69 year</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>19,348,300 0.02584%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252,149,500 0.00000%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>36 year</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>843,721,700 0.00237%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>2 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,736,374,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>787 year</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>9,194,054,000 0.02309%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>5,845 day</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,650,652,600 0.05059%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Homeless Population</th>
<th>Homeless Expenditures</th>
<th>Aggregate Household Income in 1999</th>
<th>Services &amp; Housing as % of Aggregate Income</th>
<th>Rank among Jurisdictions Reporting Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City’s Estimate</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Police and Housing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Community Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>17,003,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Housing Department</td>
<td>10,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Housing Authority</td>
<td>30,455,444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Total</td>
<td>42,000 day</td>
<td>57,858,944</td>
<td>74,907,266,300</td>
<td>0.07724%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>21 year</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>797,234,400</td>
<td>0.00006%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>20 year 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>1,423,800,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00421%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>752 day</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,744,173,900</td>
<td>0.09348%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>1,400 month</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>1,946,471,700</td>
<td>0.03108%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,893,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209,421,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>975,932,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>50 day 20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266,354,900</td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>8 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>651,290,200</td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>764,345,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>70 year</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>255,094,500</td>
<td>0.03528%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1,037 day</td>
<td>2,119,420</td>
<td>3,563,732,700</td>
<td>0.05947%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>433,237,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>103,000</td>
<td>1,014,469,500</td>
<td>0.01015%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>10 day</td>
<td>789,554,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>175 year</td>
<td>389,366</td>
<td>1,363,052,100</td>
<td>0.02857%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,778,019,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR CITIES REPORTING OUTLAYS</strong></td>
<td>72,757,205</td>
<td>141,001,804,000</td>
<td>0.05160%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Name</th>
<th>Number of Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>202,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Child Support Services</td>
<td>6,894,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Children and Family Services</td>
<td>912,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community and Senior Services</td>
<td>8,844,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community Development Commission</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co District Attorney</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Emergency Shelter grants</td>
<td>1,854,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Health Services</td>
<td>49,140,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Mental Health</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Probation</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Defender</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Social Services</td>
<td>189,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Sheriff</td>
<td>9,362,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LA County Departments</strong></td>
<td>294,750,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Child Support Services</td>
<td>6,894,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Children and Family Services</td>
<td>912,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community and Senior Services</td>
<td>8,844,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community Development Commission</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co District Attorney</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Emergency Shelter grants</td>
<td>1,854,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Health Services</td>
<td>49,140,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Mental Health</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Probation</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Defender</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Social Services</td>
<td>189,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Sheriff</td>
<td>9,362,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LA County Departments</strong></td>
<td>294,750,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Child Support Services</td>
<td>6,894,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Children and Family Services</td>
<td>912,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community and Senior Services</td>
<td>8,844,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Community Development Commission</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co District Attorney</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Emergency Shelter grants</td>
<td>1,854,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Health Services</td>
<td>49,140,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Mental Health</td>
<td>25,326,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Probation</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Defender</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Public Social Services</td>
<td>189,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Sheriff</td>
<td>9,362,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Co Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LA County Departments</strong></td>
<td>294,750,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Homeless Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY (LAHSA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency and Transitional Housing</td>
<td>19,964,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Services</td>
<td>6,124,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>4,930,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHSA Total</td>
<td>37,011,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL JURISDICTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>404,722,514</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Private Donations</td>
<td><strong>50,590,314</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Foundation Grants</td>
<td><strong>50,590,314</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Public &amp; Private Local Outlays</td>
<td><strong>505,903,142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Conclusion

Homelessness is the most extreme manifestation of poverty. The acute deprivation, desperation, and chaos inherent in homelessness destabilize the lives of individuals and also communities. In restoring shelter and intactness to the lives of placeless residents we also restore the health of our communities. The crisis of homelessness in Los Angeles is not limited to pockets of concentration in a few areas. While homeless residents are most obvious in “Skid Row,” they are also found in every community throughout Los Angeles County. This is a crisis that truly confronts every neighborhood from the beaches of Santa Monica and Long Beach to the suburban valleys.

Many Los Angeles residents are vulnerable to homelessness. This includes 12 percent of all children and 9 percent of all adults who live in acute poverty (income less than half of the poverty threshold), mentally ill residents, and individuals who are cared for by institutions such as jails and the foster care system. The number of people that we estimate to be homeless over the course of a year is equivalent to one-quarter of the population in acute poverty. The practical implications of the information assembled for this strategy to prevent and eliminate homelessness are summarized below.

1. **HIGH RISK POPULATIONS**

   - Homeless residents are younger than the overall population. Many are children under 5 and young mothers 18 to 29 years of age.
   - Roughly one-quarter of residents in acute poverty (income less than half of the poverty threshold) experience homelessness over the course of a year.
   - Over one-third of the county’s residents in acute poverty are in the Metro and South Los Angeles area.
   - Over half of General Relief recipients are homeless.
   - African Americans are over-represented by a factor of 5 among homeless residents.

---

1 This chapter was not part of the original strategic plan completed in 2004. It is the concluding chapter from the Economic Roundtable report, *Homeless in LA: Final Research Report for the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness in Los Angeles County*. It has been copied into this publicly released version of the strategy to provide a summary of key findings and the policy implications of those findings.
Implications

The best solution for homelessness is to prevent it. This can be achieved in part by paying particularly careful attention to the most vulnerable populations, including foster youth, mentally ill low-income residents, acutely impoverished welfare families, and individuals being released from incarceration. Mainstream human service institutions must meet the basic needs of people entrusted to their care. Homeless programs must use their limited resources to fill gaps in the service delivery mandates of mainstream human service institutions rather than to stand-in for those institutions.

2. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- One-third of all homeless residents, but only one-tenth of all shelter beds, are in South Los Angeles.
- Over one-quarter of all foster youth approaching emancipation are in South Los Angeles.
- The San Gabriel Valley has almost no shelter beds; over the course of a year there are 134 homeless public assistance recipients for every shelter bed in this area of the county.
- The social safety net for preventing homelessness appears weakest in the Antelope Valley. The number of public assistance recipients who are homeless over the course of a year is equivalent to 78 percent of the valley’s population living in acute poverty.
- Mentally ill homeless residents are over-concentrated in downtown Los Angeles.

Implications

Homeless services are highly concentrated in the urban center of Los Angeles but sparse in the area of greatest need – South Los Angeles, and acutely under-developed in the Antelope and San Gabriel valleys. Many cities have not acted on the reality that they are part of a regional social and economic fabric that gives rise to homelessness. To bring an end to homelessness the Los Angeles region must preserve its existing hard-won facilities and programs, and create new facilities and programs where there are unmet needs. Key steps include: (1) vastly increase the availability of homeless shelter beds and services in South Los Angeles, (2) initiate focused efforts to prevent homelessness among emancipated foster youth in South Los Angeles, (3) bring the San Gabriel and Antelope valleys up to parity with the rest of the county in the availability of beds for homeless residents, and (4) increase the availability of mental health services for homeless residents in areas outside of downtown Los Angeles.
3. INSTITUTIONAL LINKAGES

- More than four-fifths of the people who experience homelessness over the course of a year also receive some type of public assistance during the year.
- Over half of General Relief recipients experience homelessness. These impoverished adults are the epicenter of long-term homelessness.
- Over 1,000 foster youth are emancipated each year and roughly half become homeless.
- Roughly half of homeless youth are estimated to become involved with the justice system.
- Over 12,000 people are released from county jail each year only to enter homelessness.
- One-in-ten of the individuals on parole in Los Angeles County are homeless.
- Forty-two percent of homeless residents report having a disability, but only 6 percent receives Supplemental Security Income benefits.
- Twenty-seven percent of homeless residents report that they have a mental disability.
- Sixty percent of homeless single adults and 53 percent of families who seek last-resort refuge in Winter Shelter have just left the care of another organization that failed to solve their problem of homelessness.

Implications

There are solutions to the problems that make people homeless, but there is no single mass solution. Often, homelessness emerges out of life histories in which opportunities for trust, hope and growth have been thwarted. Lasting solutions that keep individuals out of homelessness require competent, individualized assistance as well as opportunities for homeless residents to act on rebuilding their own lives. This includes establishing performance standards for all organizations that care for homeless residents and using performance outcomes along with indices of community need in determining how public funds are allocated among these organizations.

4. SERVICE NEEDS

- Families that experience homeless report problems of domestic violence, mental health or substance abuse three times more often than other families receiving public assistance.
- Drug and alcohol abuse is the most frequently reported cause of homelessness for both families and individuals.
Implications

Homeless residents must have genuine opportunities to fulfill their potential as human beings, and must also assume responsibility for public standards of civil and law abiding conduct. Increased services are required to achieve this goal, including more in-patient and outpatient substance abuse rehabilitation slots for homeless residents throughout the county; increased availability of, and take-up rate for, domestic violence, substance abuse and mental health services for public assistance recipients; and greater use of the restorative power of the justice system to ensure that homeless residents who have violated the law have access to, and make use of, these services.

5. EMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITIES

- Two-thirds of homeless residents are working age adults.
- Over two-thirds have been employed in the past five years.
- The most frequent source of income before the onset of homelessness was a job.
- Most homeless adults have histories of work, but not of sustainable earnings.
- Homeless residents are 50 percent more likely to lack a high school diploma and 50 percent less likely to have attended college than the overall population of the county.
- Workforce Investment Boards report spending only $200,000 annually on job training and placement for homeless residents, but an adequate employment program is estimated to cost $90 million or more a year.
- Forty-two percent of homeless residents report some type of disability - double the disability rate for the county.

Implications

Homeless residents have the potential to earn a significant share of their overall housing and living costs. However, investments in employment and training services must be increased by several orders of magnitude to build lasting connections with the labor force for most employable homeless adults. Given that 42 percent of homeless residents report a disability but only 6 percent appear to be receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), it is necessary to greatly increase the number of homeless residents enrolled in SSI.

6. HOUSING

- Only one out of seven homeless adults is able to gain access to subsidized public housing over an eight-year period.
• Providing housing is by far the greatest cost in ending homelessness – accounting for two-thirds to three-quarters of total costs in the four scenarios presented in this report.
• Only a handful of cities are actively involved in facilitating the development of affordable housing for low-income residents.
• At least two thirds of the funds for a typical affordable housing project come from the state and federal governments.

Implications

The condition that all homeless people share is that there is no place meant for human habitation that they can call their own. The reason typically is inability to pay for shelter. The path out of homelessness begins with obtaining shelter and establishing a feasible plan for obtaining permanent housing. Key steps for developing a sufficient supply of housing for homeless residents include: (1) active and equitable participation of all cities in allocating local revenues for affordable housing and ensuring that all new housing developments include affordable housing, (2) increased financing from state and federal agencies, and (3) expansion of the federal Section 8 rent subsidy program.

8. COST

• It is not financially feasible to end homelessness unless the flow of new entrants into homelessness is dramatically curtailed.
• More effective efforts to help homeless residents re-enter the labor force and obtain public benefits will reduce costs by an estimated 16 percent.
• Reducing the flow of people being cared for by major social institutions into homelessness will reduce costs by an estimated 47 percent.
• Facilitating the transition of some homeless residents out of subsidized housing and into market rate housing will reduce costs still further.
• Public jurisdictions within Los Angeles County currently spend about $407 million a year on housing and services for homeless residents. With private contributions added in the total comes to an estimated $506 million a year. These expenditures equal 35 to 59 percent (depending on the year) of the estimated annual cost of an effective strategy to end homelessness.

Implications

With full participation of all local, state and national stakeholders there are adequate resources to end homelessness in ten years. Homeless residents are found in every community in the Los Angeles region, with the greatest concentrations in the poorest communities. While the results of poverty are most apparent in high-
poverty neighborhoods, poverty itself represents a collective failure of the region’s residents and their economy. There are enormous disparities in the resources that different cities devote to addressing homelessness, and the willingness of different cities to provide sites for homeless services and housing. To end homelessness: (1) every community must contribute fairly to providing funding and sites to meet the needs of the region’s homeless residents, (2) funds for homeless services and housing must be used more effectively and achieve greater results, and (3) additional funding, particularly for housing, must be obtained from the state and federal governments.