



Measure H Public Comments on
Funding Requests from the Lead County Departments and Agencies

Submitted April 26 – May 1, 2017

Table of Contents

Strategy A1: Homeless Prevention Program for Families	1
Strategy A5: Homeless Prevention Program for Individuals.....	6
Strategy B1: Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing Supplemental Security Income	9
Strategy B3: Partner with Cities to Expand Rapid Rehousing	13
Strategy B4: Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies.....	19
Strategy B6: Family Reunification Housing Subsidies	20
Strategy B7: Interim/Bridge Housing for Those Exiting Institutions.....	22
Strategy C2: Increase Employment for Homeless Adults by Supporting Social Enterprise	24
Strategies C4, C5, C6: Countywide Supplemental Security/Social Security Disability Income and Veterans Benefits Advocacy	27
Strategy C7: Subsidized Employment for Homeless Adults.....	28
Strategy D2: Expand Jail In-Reach.....	31
Strategy D4: Regional Integrated Re-entry Networks- Homeless Focus	33
Strategy D6: Criminal Record Clearing Project	34
Strategy D7: Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for Permanent Supportive Housing	35
Strategy E6: Countywide Outreach System	40
Strategy E7: Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System.....	42
Strategy E8: Enhance the Emergency Shelter System	47
Strategy E14: Enhance Services for Transition Age Youth	58
Strategy F7: Preserve Current Affordable Housing and Promote the Development of Affordable Housing for Homeless Families and Individuals.....	62
General Comments.....	66

Strategy A1: Homeless Prevention Program for Families

- Make more current apartment buildings eligible for section 8 housing and redevelopment of Paloma Verdes housing in San Pedro.
- This doesn't tackle the main issue. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- Keep funding more and still more family friendly shelters giving folks born in the USA and our guests places for safe sleeping, clean showers, healthy food, forever friends, and pathways to education and work, especially in country by country legal arts exchange support.
- Yes, please. What does this look like? (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- Support. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- Evaluations of each family. Identify the background, what are the comforts level, medical needs, education for children and parents. Counseling by peers who truly know to ladder programs that will reduce the percentage of those returning to the streets.
- Does this include financial counseling? What part does poor money management and choice of priorities lead to debt?
- Appropriate. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- How is this defined and framed? It could theoretically take up all the funding without showing impact. When you create a stand-alone program for prevention, you will create a way for people to forestall hard decisions, hoping that "this time" something will go better. If, however, a center serving homeless people had funding that could be used for prevention, and have these funds be an allowable use as part of an overall case management strategy, you might have better impact. So, for example, a family asks for help to pay rent for two months, they are connected to a case manager and other services (job placement/support, benefits advocacy, legal services) to help get them stabilized. Money certainly helps, but usually there is more need than just financial. Regarding the comments related to diversion, please note that we were informed by our funder that we could only serve "literally homeless" people. There needs to be clarity about who and how we can talk to people who might benefit from diversion services. Flexibility is important because we cannot fully predict every circumstance that comes our way. The more we can empower our staff with solutions (and the training needed to judiciously offer them), the more effective we will be.
- There must be measurable outcomes from year to year that provides information as to how effective and beneficial program is. There is a great need for quantitative data analysis as well as qualitative data. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)

- This should be one of the first priorities for using the money. Otherwise, these kids will be the next generation of youth homeless on the streets if their families can't take care of them. Or if they are put into foster care. This catastrophe must be avoid at all costs.
- There are. 80 cities in LA COUNTY. Santa Monica has more services for the homeless, than Santa Monica residents who became homeless while living here. Rancho Palos Verdes, Redondo beach, Manhattan beach, san Marino, Bradbury so. Pasadena, Monterey Park etc. Need homeless shelters and to build low income housing.
- It should require random drug and alcohol testing for each category.
- Not accessible services for victim/survivors of violence.
- Yes (Response indicated two times in Strategy A1)
- Where is the money for a Safe Parking Program? We need to immediately start separating the RVers on our streets who need housing assistance from the rolling criminal enterprises. This is critical and glaringly absent from what I see above. Please, please allocate some of the Measure H money to this important initiative. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- Home and affordable health care.
- Please remove Homeless RVs from Manchester West of Sepulveda. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)
- Subsidized housekeepers to help with cooking, cleaning, light child care supervision to help keep the family together in home. Good for single parent households.
- Consideration needs to be given to fund activities for Cities. Each City in the County experiences issues related to the homeless and, therefore, has to expend City General Funds to address the issues. The City of Carson took action to support the passage of Measure H due to understanding the need. Additionally, the City will be a large contributor to the program by contribution sales tax revenues of approximately \$6 Million to the Measure. We feel there needs to be focused consideration on providing funding to Cities to assist in combating the negative impact homelessness has on the community.
- Seems like homeless families increasing, particularly with young children. consider increased allocation vs prevention for individuals but may be strategic to increase overall funding towards prevention/upstream interventions versus costly acute intervention.
- Free tuition at occupational centers and trade programs in community college.
- There is a profound need for Legal services and holistic family fortification services to prevent evictions and the profound traumatizing effects of displacement. Neuroscience is revealing that an infant's brain can be warped during this distressing process leading to long term emotional, psychological and overall

'whole person' deficits. This warped brain development in turn translates to poor educational outcomes, poor self-esteem, anger management problems, attention deficit disorders, depression, defiance disorders and heightened risk for homelessness and all the risk factors that manifest ultimately in cyclical marginalization. In addition, if a woman is pregnant during the eviction process and experience of displacement, her baby is more likely to manifest developmental delays that can create havoc for the family entity and their long term capacity to remain resilient and intact.

- I strongly support prevention.
- There are many women with children and absent dads, and then there are cases I find with dads with custody of kids, with absent mothers who have no where to live.
- Develop a way to identify as-risk individuals before homelessness.
- The premise behind voters approving a city property tax hike and county sales tax hike to fund homeless housing/services was that we are in a crisis. Voters believe that the current degree of homelessness in our communities is a humanitarian crisis and one that reflects badly on our reputation as a good place to live and work. Therefore, the highest priority should be placed on getting people off the streets. The perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. We cannot wait the three to five years it is likely to take for costly permanent housing to be sited, constructed and occupied. We need to get everyone, who is willing, off the streets within the next year. We should treat this crisis similar to a natural disaster where we provide emergency shelter, food and medical care.

In order to do this we need to direct Measure H funds into available resources including:
- government buildings and properties and the city of L.A. owns 9,000 properties, including about 240 commercial buildings identified as "underutilized," and situated on land whose zoning allows housing as a use.
- existing motels, some of which could be purchased much more quickly, and for less, than new construction.
- publicly owned-land suitable for erecting pre-fabricated structures.

In addition, the L.A. City Housing and Community Investment Department has reported a high 12%+ vacancy rate in LA's thousands of market-rate apartment units built in the past 10 years -- units sitting empty that people can't afford. We should use as much money as is available to tap these units for short-term rental.

We strongly agree with Measure H committee member and Shelter Partnership leader Ruth Schwartz, who several days ago publicly called for a very high share of the Measure H services funds to go to rental costs to get people housed as soon as possible. Ruth Schwartz's proposal stood out among many fine ideas that must take second priority to moving those who are willing into shelter within one year. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to multiple strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A1)

- We are in support of A-1 preventing homelessness for families.
- A portion of the funds allocated to Strategy A1 should be used to support families at risk of homelessness below 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI) as per the household's size for: job training and placement, temporary employer incentives for hiring homeless,

family planning services, basic financial planning services to encourage saving for emergencies, and relocation assistance to other parts of the state or nation where homeless may have family/friends or where jobs are available. streamlining the building and permitting process to reduce building cost, and ending rent stabilization ordinances to encourage landowners to build more housing. Job training and placement is a critical to preventing homelessness. The job training and placement should be for jobs of the future. These jobs include skilled jobs requiring manual dexterity such as agricultural work (e.g. picking fruit), landscaping, and janitorial services; or highly skilled jobs such as robotics, big data, and artificial intelligence. Employers should be incentivized to hire homeless by providing a temporary subsidy (e.g. \$3/hr for 3 months) to the employer to help the person become accustomed to their new job. Please help support eliminating RSO to help encourage RSO landlords to invest in our community. Los Angeles' s Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) was enacted in 1979 in Los Angeles and has not kept cost down for most tenants. Over the last 40 years, it has taken and prevented units from being available in the rental market. Providing stable housing availability helps prevent homelessness by keeping rental prices low for everyone in Los Angeles. RSO has not helped with the availability of housing and create[s] financial disincentives for owners to invest in maintenance and capital improvement of their units as per the Economic Study of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance and the Los Angeles Housing Market as prepared for the City of Los Angeles Housing Department (HCIDLA). Only a third of RSO owners say they would still acquire their rent- stabilized property today, a plurality say they would not buy it again, while a quarter are uncertain. RSO owners are a disenfranchised minority. If we do not support RSO landlords, our communities investors, they will continue to appropriate their resources and funds on other non-Los Angeles housing endeavors further exacerbating the housing crisis.

- Increase funding for families especially with young children for education regarding renters rights and threats of eviction and for targeted eviction defense. Create a fund for those near eviction because of unexpected expenses. Provide rental and utilities assistance. Thank you for focusing on this.
- Domestic violence (DV) services are homeless prevention services. Domestic violence is not just a public safety issue, it is a housing issue. Fleeing DV is included in the HUD definition of homelessness. However, Los Angeles homeless services do not meet the needs of victims of domestic violence as they are not designed to address the unique trauma DV survivors experience. Legal and supportive services for domestic violence survivors prevent homelessness. Helping a domestic violence survivor remain safe in their own home by obtaining a residence exclusion order against an abuser prevents the DV survivor from becoming homeless. DV legal services should be considered along with eviction defense as legal services necessary to prevent homelessness.
- All support staff/program staff should be trained on sex and labor trafficking and should be able to identify those who have been trafficked or may be at risk of being trafficked. Also many trafficking victims of sex and labor trafficking are recruited into trafficking or stay with their traffickers longer because the trafficker provides access to shelter. Having specialized programs that identify those at highest risk for trafficking and provide them specialized prevention assistance should be considered with this funding.
- The more detailed strategy letter to the CEO's office, dated 1/11/17 includes reference to hiring employment navigators. We are recommending that the A1 funds include a minimum of 2 Employment Specialists per SPA, to be staffed by the CBO, to support increases and maintenance of income. Certain SPAs cover a large geographic area, or include a high number of families that may seek assistance. An additional employment specialist provides the opportunity for increased capacity and regionalization

of services. Also, we are recommending that the strategy include the option for a shallow rental subsidy, on a limited basis (similar to strategy B3), in the event that the short term prevention assistance does not bring about financial sustainability.

- Domestic Violence providers in the County are doing homelessness prevention. With every family that we accept into our emergency or transitional programs, we are giving them an option other than to live on the streets when they choose to leave their batterers. However, the important thing about DV victims is that they have been traumatized by months, years, sometimes decades of abuse and they cannot overcome that trauma merely by receiving rental assistance. They need help to overcome psychological and physical trauma. While some families will benefit from rental assistance, they need other wrap-around services so that they will not become homeless. (case management, job placement assistance, ESL classes, counseling, legal and medical services, etc.).
- Are the homeless prevention programs demonstrating success in preventing homelessness for families and sustaining housing? Do the programs demonstrate a thorough understanding of the root-causes and factors families who are homeless or at risk for homelessness experience & do they continue working with families to sustain housing, healthcare, childcare, transportation, unexpected emergencies and expenses. Do they work with families to create and work on a long-term individualized needs assessment and development plan for each family. Or do they abandon the family after homelessness is "prevented"? Abandonment and refusal to address individual needs and development for increased support and income increases the probability for another homeless "prevention" crisis when the financial contribution to rent is stopped in 6 mos or one year and the family is dropped from the prevention program, still left to fend for themselves to meet the most basic needs. This begs the questions, how much do prevention agency programs understand and address the lived experience of people who find themselves homeless or on the brink of homelessness. How many hoops and cycles of homelessness LA county residents required to experience until they either actually stabilized? Do these programs have the resources, infrastructure, heart and long-term commitment to work with/meet needs of families until the family can sustain itself? To date I would say no. Show me successes or create an infrastructure that supports the people who actually have the need vs. the organization that delivers the service.
- For underserved victims of domestic violence who are fleeing DV but not literally homeless yet, homeless prevention would be a critical resource for diversion into shelter and provide transition into long-term safety. Will prevention assistance be available for those with eviction notices to remain in their units to prevent becoming homeless?
- Systems need to be established so victims/survivors can be eligible for assistance and given priority to housing resources.
- How will families who have experienced DV be properly served through the FSC system? Is it possible to consider amending current contracts with DV providers to extend the services they are providing? While we remain hopeful that families will be properly served through enhancing this system, there is also systems in place supporting these families. Organizations with whom these families feel SAFE. Organizations who understand the experience of trauma and who have adopted trauma informed care practices that put the individuals and family's needs first.

- Domestic Violence Shelter based programs are essential for keeping families safe and off the streets, when they are fleeing because of immediate danger posed to them and/or their children.
- Increase the availability of dollars allocated to hotel vouchers and transportation for emergency request through 211, such as after hours and weekends.
- The LAUSD Homeless Education Program has a fairly new partnership with LAHSA to provide assistance to Family Solutions Centers (FSCs) across the LA County Service Planning Areas in their Family Coordinated Entry System (CES) of care. The LAUSD would appreciate and welcome an opportunity to put in a request for funding to continue and strengthen our system of identification, support, and service delivery to families. I was a bit surprised to see that the work of LAUSD Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors at the FSCs was not mentioned in the Measure H revenue planning process. Much of the work we are currently doing in the FSCs directly supports HI Strategy A1- Homeless Prevention Program for Families. The LAUSD Homeless Education Program is currently providing the educational piece (i.e., identifying and connecting students and families to LAUSD educational resources, ensuring Mc Kinney-Vento Assistance Act enrollment rights and protections are being upheld, coordinating service delivery to LAUSD students, conducting initial assessments and intakes to determine the needs of students/families, etc.).

Our counselors are not only in LAUSD district offices and schools, but they are also co-located in 6 of the eight Family Solutions Centers (FSCs) in the LA County Service Planning Areas. Additionally, the Homeless Education Program was approached by LAHSA to assist them in providing our services to support HI Strategy E14- Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth. It would be unfortunate that the LAUSD would lose out on the opportunity to obtain funding to expand the services we are already providing to the Family Solutions Centers as we are only assigned to the FSCs 1-2 days a week. For 2016-17 school year we have identified 18,014 students who are experiencing homelessness. We have a very small staff of 1 Program Coordinator, 17 Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors (7 who are at the FSCs) and 9 PSA Aides, 1 Senior Parent Community Facilitator, and 1 Senior Office Technician. We have a great need with few resources to support the work that we do. LAUSD works closely with LACOE in matters concerning educational matters pertaining to students facing housing instability; however, it seems the services that the LAUSD can offer are more in alignment with the boundaries of SPAs 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 (1 and 6 are not in LAUSD boundaries and may be better served by a LACOE representative). Please consider working collaboratively with the LAUSD to help in the identification process and service delivery to our LAUSD students and families facing homelessness.

Strategy A5: Homeless Prevention Program for Individuals

- Please be sure to include considerations and funding for higher levels of care (board and care, skilled nursing, assisted living, etc.) for older adults and those dealing with major health issues.
- Make more current apartment buildings eligible for section 8 housing and redevelopment of Paloma Verdes housing in San Pedro.
- Keep matching lonely individuals with extra rooms with drug-free, nice people who will add to each other's happiness and quality of living like HIP Housing of San Mateo County, CA.

- I believe the same applies. However, those with families may have an initiative to find permanent shelter than those with children. Individuals require evaluation, seek to find those who may be veterans. Counseling and ladder individuals to the next level. The objective is to remove the wild life of the streets because the streets represents the wilderness. Having plans, goals, and knowing your place of shelter removes individuals from the streets along with the desire to stay off the streets.
- Work training and entry level jobs are needed.
- Prevention programs appear to be useless in LA County
- Another priority for those who are senior citizens and not disabled or severely mentally ill individuals. These people may not have another support network: family/friends, etc. to help them. So they end up on the streets.
- The paper process is entirely too long; we lose clients that have to wait so long for housing. Also mental health clients may be on probation/parole for non-violent offenses; most people do not want to rent to them.
- New post: As a senior who is paying more in rent than what I can afford PLEASE OPEN SEC 8 VOUCHERS for those of us who may be faced with NO HOUSING option in the future. Or do what is done in NYC (where I'm from)...They have what is called SCRIE (through the dept of aging) ...Rents for seniors are FROZEN and the city/state pays the difference to the landlord so it's a win/win situation. Something has to be done to help prevent SENIOR CITIZENS from becoming homeless if rents continue to soar and/or if they are EVICTED from their apt via THE ELLIS ACT.
- The Safe Parking Program is the solution we need. We in the 90045 are being inundated with RV's that are doing illegal activities in our community. LAPD is not enforcing the new law but if there were a SAFE PARKING PROGRAM then the LAPD could get rid of these people who are leaving human waste in our gutters and on our sidewalks.
- We need an immediate solution to the RV problem in Westchester/Playa del Rey. Many of the people living in them are not "homeless" they are criminals who do drugs, leave urine and human feces on our sidewalks and in our gutters. If we had a Safe Park program then the people who are homeless would be able to get the assistance they need and the rest could be arrested or force to leave and take their illegal activities with them.
- A place live and immediately medical care.
- Fund L.A. County Dept. of Mental Health; and Substance Abuse, Prevention and Control agencies to prevent individuals from becoming homeless. This includes expanding the Skid Row Service Team/Service Area 4 Clinics where the most mentally ill homeless people are found on the streets. Also, expand the capacity of the L.A. County/USC Medical Center Psychiatric facilities to evaluate and treat people who are homeless. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy A5)
- Subsidized jobs. Apprenticeships.

- Many individuals that do not close knitted family on the streets due to not able to afford rent due to the cost of living exceeding their income.
- Thank you for prioritizing prevention. We hope these services will prioritize people in rent stabilized/affordable/below market units and people on fixed incomes (seniors, people with disabilities) who face the most barriers to finding alternate housing.
- June 2011, I became homeless, I soon found myself at Olive View Hospital on a 72 hour hold, that stay turned into a 6 week stay at a county mental hospital, if I had meet the criteria as chronically homeless, I would have been placed sooner, that cost was passed on to the taxpayers, if there are some homeless prevention programs available, I know that tax dollars would better spent.
- We are in support of A5 in preventing homelessness for individuals, many of our clients are justice-system involved youth who are at severe risk of homelessness or are being released to shelters when their sentence is complete.
- It would be wonderful if housing prevention services outlined in this strategy started before a person reaches a stage of complete crisis (where they need immediate financial support). Perhaps this is where strategy D7 comes in, however, D7 is only focusing on individuals who will be housed before 7/1/17.
- Similar to above with financial assistance to prevent homelessness.
- Although we greatly appreciate the specific dollars that will be allocated to TAY-focused programming under Strategy E14, we recommend that all strategies have a specific lens to ensure that they are meeting the needs of our County's homeless population, including those who identify as LGBT. Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers as their needs are significantly different, so we would like to stress the importance of fully funding E14 and, also, other strategies where funding for TAY is set aside. Further, we request that for each strategy that has services targeted for youth including creating prevention resources (A5), the specific details of that focus, including what funds will be allocated towards youth populations be specified and provided to the public. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to several strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed here)
- The Strategy summary does not current indicate a plan to fund employment based services as part of the prevention strategy. Following the request identified, in A1, we are recommending that the A5 funds include a minimum of 2 Employment Specialists per SPA, to be staffed by the CBO, to support increases and maintenance of income. Also, we are recommending that the strategy include the option for a shallow rental subsidy, on a limited basis (similar to strategy B3), in the event that the short term prevention assistance does not bring about financial sustainability.
- In December 2016, HACLA in collaboration with Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County convened a roundtable discussion with LAHSA, SPA coordinators of CES, DMH, and tenants' rights organizations to find a solution to the services gap for single-individual, disabled Section 8 voucher holders who come off of the Section 8 waitlist, or are being evicted from their units. No supportive services are available because these voucher holders are often not considered homeless under CES definition. Currently, a disabled voucher holder" who must leave her apartment in 30 days per a court

judgment, or who is living on a friends couch” cannot receive supportive services to locate housing and place her voucher until she is on the streets. Without support she is at risk of having her voucher expire before locating housing, losing it forever. If she becomes homeless the services she will receive will cost much more than if she had received short-term housing location assistance to preserve her (extra space in this line) voucher.

With a 2.7% vacancy rate, and only a 70% lease-up rate for voucher holders coming off of the waitlist, disabled voucher holders are particularly at risk of losing their vouchers because many cannot search for housing on their own. Often, disabled voucher holders who come off of the waitlist, or who are forced to move because of bad conditions or disagreements with landlords, are losing vouchers due to a failed housing search and are becoming homeless long-term. CES already has a fine-tuned system of landlord engagement, location services, and case management, to help this population. Thus, the Homelessness Initiative should allocate A5 prevention dollars to CES to expand their services to single-individual, disabled voucher holders who currently are excluded from CES services. The population in need is likely not very large according to HACLA, since 2015, only 4,238 Section 8 voucher holders that self-identified as disabled requested a voucher to move. Thus, this proposal should not place an extreme burden on the CES system.

- This is concerning, here it states using a "light touch" to help people find "other options" before services are offered. This puts women in compromised, unsafe and often violent positions. "Through diversion, providers help people connect with other resources they have in order to resolve their housing crisis before accessing the homeless service system. This sometimes requires light touch case management and limited financial assistance to facilitate use of other options." If homeless people had "other options" they would not be homeless or at risk for homelessness. Understand the demographics, review the DWAC Needs Assessment for 2016. Racism, gender inequality and zero access to resources or financial support in times of crisis are the root cause of homelessness. Continuing the pattern of withholding resources to individuals and families in need does not make residents safer. Why make people beg? This section further states "Another way of preventing future homelessness is to provide retention services for people who have previously accessed homeless services and are at risk of losing current housing." This sets a ridiculous cycle! It is expensive administratively and puts people who are already vulnerable into more crisis! JUST help people! work with folks to get their needs met without creating unnecessary distress. When people ask for help they actually need it and have exhausted their own resources and have experienced loss and trauma, why is it okay for prevention programs to play games with lives at risk of, or currently homeless? No one should be turned away - build trust, build relationships so residents find the help and support they need. Innovate, create and cut the red tape.
- Portion of funding should also go to DHS and DMH.

Strategy B1: Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing Supplemental Security Income

- Please be sure to include considerations and funding for higher levels of care (board and care, skilled nursing, assisted living, etc.) for older adults and those dealing with major health issues.
- Copy Harbor area.

- Stabilize homeless disabled individual needing to visit the nearest Social Security Office to go through the application process to obtain a basic amount of regular income, with extra attention to helping them spend their money wisely, returning to education, family, church family support and individual work.
- This is high on my list of priorities. I see disabled people on the streets all the time. How are they supposed to get themselves out of that hole? They can't work... and even if they could, homelessness prevents obtaining one.
- Pursuing is not the same as those who are receiving SSI. Also, consideration must be provided to those who are receiving SSD. In doing so an interviewing process should take place and for security, ensure those seeking housing falls within guidelines designed to provide suitable housing. Some people may have jobs, but the income still reach or less than the poverty rate. Those pursuing SSI should provide proof.
- Please ensure that 'disabilities' are not fraudulent. There is currently too much fraud that has not been prosecuted.
- MUST be a PRIORITY. I know an elderly homeless wheelchair bound woman in Hollywood on Selma (by Salvation Army) youth center who is in DESPERATE need of housing. GOT EVICTED FROM HER SEC. 8 APT BY HER GREEDY LANDLORD. And no other landlord will take her housing voucher that is only good for the city of L.A. and not the country. So she can't go anywhere. Contact me for her telephone number.
- All the supervisors have to develop an accessory unit on their lot and rent it to a section 8 voucher holder.
- I'm not an expert but based on my anecdotal observations as well as my readings I think that the numbers for interim housing beds are far, far too low. Think about doing something like adapting shuttered hospital(s) like Gardens Regional to serve the mentally ill homeless. This group is sorely in need, based on the spreading encampments and increasing numbers of obviously psychotic homeless raging and ranting on the streets. It is a crime against humanity to allow human beings to suffer in their schizophrenic nightmares, to allow others to be subjected to their often threatening overtures, and to allow them to live out in the elements in filth and squalor.
- Again the paper process for housing is such a long for a person to wait and some individuals need their housing alone.
- Need to be linked to supportive services and incorporate prevention.
- Yes, I helped a man obtain this.
- I know how hard it is for someone to benefit from any kind of mental health treatment if they have no roof over their head. I know because I have a son who's 37 years old and who has been challenged with Co-occurring disorders for the last 17 years. His combination of bipolar disorder and polysubstance dependence has rendered him unable to live a normal life. Because there is no concurrent treatment for his disorders he has been in and out of hospitals, ERs, and jail. Is SSI benefit does not come close

to funding adequate housing and food. Boarding cares do not meet people with those substance-abuse and mental health issues. SOBER LIVING's will not tolerate anyone who is using any substances. My son needs permanent supportive housing do you have a chance I've literally surviving. It is a miracle that he is still alive.

- There is an urgent need for housing for disabled individuals.
- Caregiver to those who need assistance and home and health care for all.
- We're told that there are hundreds of vacant lots throughout South Central LA due to the 1992 LA Riots. Build housing on these lots immediately, get people off the street and into these units, and provide family counseling, employment assistance and mental health services at these locations to the residents. We see apartment buildings go up all around town in a matter of months. There could easily be 10,000 new units on these lots in a year, enabling about a third of the homeless population to have roofs over their heads a year from now. If that is successful, more vacant spaces throughout the county can be found for additional units. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to multiple strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy B1)
- Yes. The type of housing will be the issue!
- No. Provide campgrounds where each person has a sturdy storage locker with a mail slot which is deliverable by the USPS. Use the housing \$\$ for other purposes.
- Yes- but this housing should be coordinated with a benefits maximization advocacy strategy both for SSI benefits and also the robust benefits re: which a homeless veteran may be eligible. The housing stability will anchor the capacity of trained advocates to maintain contact with these individuals, maintain their paperwork and coordinate their making appointments - challenges that are especially acute for those with mental afflictions or untreated PTS. Groups like the USC Stephen Cohen Military & Veteran Family mental health clinic should be enlisted to invigorate the capacity of this model, as they provide free mental health services that can be vital to stabilize individuals with histories of mental afflictions and substance abuse disorders during the benefits advocacy process.
- Programs that do exist have waiting list.
- This should be part of the plan & should only charge what resources individual has available.
- Yes, When I moved into Palo Verde Apartments, it was before I received my S S I benefits, I've lived in the same apartment for 5 years, thanks to supportive housing, 3 of those 5 years I lived on General Relief at \$221.00 a month, and \$221.00 a month for Snap Card, without subsidized housing for individuals pursuing SSI, I would have been required to live at LA Family Housing for 3 years instead of 9, months, also while at LA Family Housing, along with Supportive Housing, they helped me navigate the endless paperwork for the various agencies, get permanent housing.
- We are in support of providing subsidized housing to homeless disabled individuals pursuing SSI.
- HASC supports a subsidized housing program that supports disabled individuals who are eligible for and pursuing Social Security Income (SSI). As outlined, program will target 833 homeless individuals

who are “heavy users of County services. The proposed program will also offer a \$500 one-time only move-in assistance to an estimated 65 individuals per month. The budget may need to be augmented to address anticipated demand for move-in assistance given the stepped-up outreach and engagement. Will DPSS also identify 'heavy users' of non-county (private) hospitals and are GR recipients? Operational comment: it's unclear how individuals will be identified and referred to DPSS.

- Housing availability is of concern for all families and individuals in the Los Angeles area or looking to relocate to the Los Angeles area. Overall supply of housing is low relative to demand for housing regardless of income level. All financial assistance (e.g. rent subsidies) for disabled homeless should be provided in the form of low-interest microloans to help recuperate cost and to create a self-sustaining program. Microloans have had great success in Africa to help individuals and families succeed by giving hope, not handouts. Total lifetime outstanding microloans across all programs for disabled individuals or families should be limited to no more than 8% of the 50% AMI. Recuperating cost via microloans will allow the county of Los Angeles to serve more disabled homeless. Microloans may also help prevent fraud and abuse of this strategy. To further reduce the risk of fraud, the microloans should be treated like a bank loan with household members verified accordingly to DRAFT NIST Special Publication 800-63A Identity Assurance Level 3 standards or better for services.
- Given the tight rental market and scarcity, I'm concerned that a \$475/month housing subsidy and one-time \$500 for move-in costs for GR participants will not come close to securing them temporary housing arrangements in L.A. Also, I'm concerned that DPSS/the request does not mention any enhanced case management or housing assistance services to help these participants find housing while they await approval for SSI.
- Providence supports a subsidized housing program that supports disabled individuals who are eligible for and pursuing Social Security Income (SSI). As outlined, the program will target 833 homeless individuals who are “heavy users of County services. The proposed program will offer a \$500 one-time only move-in assistance to an estimated 65 individuals per month. The budget may need to be augmented to address anticipated demand for move-in assistance given the stepped up outreach and engagement. We would like to know if DPSS will also identify “heavy users of non-county (private) hospitals and GR recipients. It is also unclear how individuals will be identified and referred to DPSS.
- Many trafficking survivors are considered disabled and struggle to access appropriate housing resources to meet their disability needs—for example their trafficking resulted in physical injuries or the mental health issues stemming from the trauma. Ensure there are appropriate resources to deal with these specialized populations.
- Do the homework to understand SSI/SSDI. Applying for SSI/SSDI is a nightmare. The time and energy required to receive these benefits, (that all Americans pay into) can be the catalyst for falling into homelessness. Further, these programs tend to trap participants. Participants are barred from pursuing education and are limited in receiving additional income that supports paying rent food and other bills. Understand the web of regulations that come with these programs and the complex rules and time required in applying for SSI/SSDI, and the issues with denials. Often, people who actually qualify due to chronic illness are denied due to lack of medical notes in the case of SSDI. In addition, SSI/SSDI does not keep up with the cost of living in Los Angeles County.

- These resources should also be available for disabled families and those already receiving SSI as housing options are extremely limited and their incomes are not likely to increase.

Strategy B3: Partner with Cities to Expand Rapid Rehousing

- That's extra bureaucracy.
- As a long-term resident in Berrien Springs, Michigan (Michiana region with Indiana), I have experienced renting with other students, renting with the option to buy a small brick studio house, buying this house with renters, having my privilege of renting to same gender people denied, losing teaching work inappropriately--even illegally, continuing to work with seniors, losing that work to their passing, going on SSI, now hoping and working for a good transition to live again in California (Humboldt County)--I recommend highly we partner with cities like Houston for rapid re-housing for veterans and their families. Keep checking with places like Michiana where affordable rents, affordable education, affordable food, and lots of Christian friends can help make a change from sometimes too hot and often too expensive places (we love you LA) to legal camping, excellent RV parks, affordable apartments, affordable housing. Who with and where are the best transition places (Cleveland, Ohio and Portland, Oregon) to get and expand rapid re-housing? Keep partnering!
- This could greatly ease the influx here... how does this happen? We pay them to move and another city agrees to take them for a certain fee?
- I believe Partnering with cities is needed, but must be monitored to ensure the program is not being abused financially and those in need are being provided a chance of this awesome gift. I believe an annual audit must be conducted by an independent group.
- The housing must be affordable yet not detrimental to the communities in which they reside.
- The five-year limit on subsidies is an improvement. There should be funding for support staff development on this because management of these programs depends on having strong case managers.
- I applaud the decision to expand rapid rehousing. I should hope, that in this expansion, some of the things that on-the-ground case managers have indicated could be improved, are taken into serious consideration. Some of these things include: A more even distribution of funds between "rental assistance" and "general housing assistance." Many service providers have found that they certainly have enough funds per person to provide meaningful rental assistance for up to 9 months or more. The part we are missing is more funds for the things that go beyond that. Dollars dedicated to employment training and associated costs such as uniforms, Metro TAP cards for housing searches and employment, furniture and other essential household items, and a small amount of groceries at the time of move-in. We can help people by investing in them in these ways, giving them the opportunity to not only be housed, but also to increase their likelihood of remaining housed beyond the program end date. Dollars dedicated to landlord engagement. Stronger linkages with employment resources, assistance with applying for SSI benefits, and other potential ways (extra space this line and other lines in this paragraph) to increase income.

What I want to see is a program that can take people who are struggling to keep it all together, and give them the opportunity to flourish and become self-sufficient. Extended and increased rental

assistance is only helpful if the person is using that time in which their living costs are being subsidized to increase their own personal earning potential. That can be challenging when the person is not only experiencing a move (a difficult experience for anyone) but also struggling to find a place they can use a computer, struggling to get food, and unable to provide themselves with appropriate workplace clothing. We need to make sure we are housing people and ensuring that this remains true after our short-term role is over.

- Build low income housing in the cities that lack low income housing, rancho Palos Verdes, San Marino, Bradbury, Rolling Hills estates, Beverly Hills.
- Can some funds be set aside to explore housing alternatives such as micro-units/tiny houses?
- The wrap around team helping people should seek safe, clean housing for clients and make the rooms big enough for two people to have twin beds and a dresser without being in close quarters with their roommates.
- Very much needed.
- Only if it is done thoughtfully and with the communities that would be affected.
- California cities should work together to start a new mass produced pre-fab "CORE" building system, that would provide a truly lower cost home.
- Thank you for including this line item. We hope that the RRH program will take into consideration persons with low barriers, persons that are justice involved and not eligible for other housing subsidies, and transition age youth with a slightly higher allotment for case management services. We also hope that SPA 6 and SPA 4 will be allocated based on need as these have the highest concentration of these targeted groups. Finally, through one-time City of L.A. funding, LAHSA was able to innovate a great RRH for low barrier persons. We hope that a significant portion will be funded through LAHSA.
- The City of Carson supports re-housing and would encourage the County Board to allocate funding directly to Cities to assist in this effort. While the City has developed a philosophy of supporting low, very low and moderate income housing projects, there are costs that the developers need to make these projects "pencil out." For the City to be successful in bringing these projects to the community, there is a need for funding assistance.
- These resources should also be available for disabled families and those already receiving SSI as housing options are extremely limited and their incomes are not likely to increase.
- I think this is a huge investment in rapid re-housing that should be reconsidered and decreased. Though it is a best practice, rapid re-housing is less effective in high rent markets like LA. It is a good program, but it applies to a small percentage of currently homeless given the high rents in LA and ongoing low incomes for most formerly homeless people and should be funded at that need level, not continue to be overfunded.
- Open opportunities in clean safe environments.

- The allocation proposed for RRH seems excessive given that current RRH programs are struggling to identify eligible households and data is not clearly showing that households are able to retain housing once assistance ends. In order to ensure that Measure H funds are utilized quickly and effectively, perhaps a smaller allocation in Year 1 with scale up in Years 2 and 3 would be more appropriate.
- Yes, homeless have friends and family also, it would be beneficial for them to have the extra support, living near them.
- We are in support of partnering with Cities to Expand Rapid rehousing.
- Haven Hills calls for an allocation of Rapid Rehousing units and financial assistance for persons experiencing domestic violence. Survivors of DV are faced with unique and complex barriers to housing, including RRH, due to increased safety needs, responsiveness, PTSD, child care needs, isolation, or greater emotional support. Survivors are often placed into emergency shelter due to rigid and time-limits on RRH services because of these barriers, creating a cycle of poverty/homelessness and/or further victimization. The current housing systems, including RRH, do not support the DV survivor experience or needs to become self-sufficient. For example, upon a VI-SPDAT survey, an individual is directed to 211 or the DV Emergency Shelter System once they identify as a DV survivor, regardless of their current security or supportive service needs, thereby limiting or removing their opportunity to access RRH. Haven Hills call for a revised screening of DV survivors within the homeless provider system and an allocation Rapid Rehousing units and financial assistance for persons experiencing domestic violence to account for their unique and complex barriers to access and maintain housing.
- HASC supports this strategy as it seeks to leverage financial resources. However, it is unclear how the individual costs listed on the strategy summary under item section 3 was calculated based on the funding projections provided in section 5 for FY 2017-18. It's unclear if a cap is being imposed, if so, duration on individuals and families that are recipients of these funds. For clients in FY 2017-19, are these all new cases which would then correlate with the \$16 million funding increase in FY 2018-19. Or, a carryover of FY 2017-18 with an expansion of 83 households? Who will identify and case manage eligible individuals & families? Operational comment: is this strategy being centralized into one department or agency in order to facilitate referrals?
- Los Angeles must be prudent spending the additional tax revenues generated by Measure H from its approximately 10.19 million constituents. Strategy B3 is very costly and continues to grow in cost over the three year period from \$79.7M in FY17-18 to \$154.8M in FY19-20. All financial assistance (e.g. rent subsidies) for the homeless should be provided in the form of low-interest microloans to help recuperate cost and to create a self-sustaining program. Microloans have had great success in Africa to help individuals and families succeed by giving hope, not handouts. Total lifetime outstanding microloans across all programs for individuals should be limited to no more than 8% of the 30% AMI OR for families limited to no more than 8% of the 50% AMI as per the household's size. Recuperating cost via microloans will allow the county of Los Angeles to serve more disabled homeless. Microloans may also help prevent fraud and abuse of this strategy. To further reduce the risk of fraud, the microloans should be treated like a bank loan with individuals and/or household members verified accordingly to DRAFT NIST Special Publication 800-63A Identity Assurance Level 3 standards or better for services.

- This program has been incredibly beneficial for members of our community and is a program that we have had great success with. As we come to the close of our second contract cycle we have learned there are certainly holes and gaps in the current funding strategy. We would request more dollars for supportive services through this contract as well as more dollars for job assistance, public transportation, and flex funds (for hotels, cell phones, ect). There are also negative consequences associated with not spending out a contract in its entirety, however we want to push against this. When our clients move into housing, we allocate rental assistance on a case-by-case basis so that rental assistance is empowering our participants not becoming a crutch for these people. We do not want to provide people with dollars that will actually hinder their ability to thrive in housing.
- Chrysalis is very supportive of allocating Measure H funds towards rapid re-housing (RRH) services. Our suggestion to the County, as it partners with other cities to implement RRH, is to include employment services in any RRH program implementations. Chrysalis has seen how critical, and challenging, it is to increase incomes for RRH participants during their time in the program. Funding employment services, as a part of any RRH program, will be an important program component. As the funding level for this RRH Strategy is considered, we hope the cost of employment services is factored into that decision.
- An urgent need. Match it with health and substance abuse services funding especially inpatient substance abuse services.
- This request does not mention which cities (of 80+) will be partnering or targeted for partnership. How will you incentivize these cities to locate suitable, quality housing options?
- Providence supports this strategy as it seeks to leverage financial resources. However, it is unclear how the individual costs listed on the strategy summary under Section 3 were calculated based on the funding projections provided in Section 5 for FY 2017-18. Also unclear if a cap is being imposed (extra space in this line_) and to what extent. For clients in FY 2017-19, are these all new cases which would then correlate with the \$16 million funding increase in FY 2018-19? Will there will be a carryover of FY 2017-18 with an expansion of 83 households? Who will identify and manage eligible individuals and families? Is strategy B3 being centralized into one department or agency in order to facilitate referrals?
- For those in crisis, including domestic violence, sexual assault and human trafficking rapid re-housing resources are critical. However these individuals also may need additional specialized services to access this housing or have additional safety concerns that should be considered in the planning process for these services.
- Previous conversations have indicated that services would not be funded during shallow subsidy period. We are recommending that, at minimum, "light touch" case management services be funded during the shallow subsidy period. Also, there is a direct cost to administering subsidy, but recommendation calls for cost to come from indirect. Given that many families have high barriers to housing, and the recommendation is being made to serve some families through RRH whose assessments would indicate that PSH or affordable housing is the recommended intervention, we are recommending an increase in staffing for services, including employment to mimic wraparound/FSP. Also, there is a question as to why RRH for persons who have experienced DV are funded at a higher rate, is the cost per client in row 3 specific to families only?

- Rapid rehousing programs are important to improving opportunities for homeless individuals and families with low or no barriers to housing. However, rapid rehousing will not work for most DV victims, who have much higher housing barriers as a result of their trauma experience. Additionally, language/cultural issues and immigrant/undocumented status present additional barriers for many of our survivors. While RRH provides rental subsidies, housing identification, and financial assistance, we have found that to complete a rental application or job application or application for further education requires a certain level of proficiency with the English language. These programs will not help monolingual non-English speakers, nor will they help the majority of homeless DV victims. However, we support the RRH programs for those small percentages of people who might be job ready and housing-ready who can benefit from the rent subsidies.
- Is there data to support that the cost per client to support transition aged youth (\$12,500) is sufficient to make a long term impact for permanency through Rapid Re-Housing (RRH). Understanding that youth between the ages of 18-24 need multiple support areas, I am unclear in the strategy explanation that 67% who have been assessed for CES were "eligible" for RRH - does that mean that was the only housing option or RRH was the best housing option for these youth? In other words, does that mean 67% of these youth have consistent income to continue fully pay the full lease amount within 12 months with once a month case management?
- In December 2016, HACLA in collaboration with Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County convened a roundtable discussion with LAHSA, SPA coordinators of CES, DMH, and tenants rights organizations to find a solution to the services gap for single-individual, disabled Section 8 voucher holders who come off of the Section 8 waitlist, or are being evicted from their units. No supportive services are available because these voucher holders are often not considered homeless under CES definition. Currently, a disabled voucher holder who must leave her apartment in 30 days per a court judgment, or who is living on a friend's couch" cannot receive supportive services to locate housing and place her voucher until she is on the streets. Without support she is at risk of having her voucher expire before locating housing, losing it forever. If she becomes homeless the services she will receive will cost much more than if she had received short-term housing location assistance to preserve her voucher.

With a 2.7% vacancy rate, and only a 70% lease-up rate for voucher holders coming off of the waitlist, disabled voucher holders are particularly at risk of losing their vouchers because many cannot search for housing on their own. Often, disabled voucher holders who come off of the waitlist, or who are forced to move because of bad conditions or disagreements with landlords, are losing vouchers due to a failed housing search and are becoming homeless long-term. CES already has a fine-tuned system of landlord engagement, location services, and case management, to help this population. Thus, the Homelessness Initiative should allocate A5 prevention dollars to CES to expand their services to single-individual, disabled voucher holders who currently are excluded from CES services. The population in need is likely not very large according to HACLA, since 2015, only 4,238 Section 8 voucher holders that self-identified as disabled requested a voucher to move. Thus, this proposal should not place an extreme burden on the CES system.

- We are learning that once people are housed they are abandoned by agencies that are charged with supporting them. This creates a cycle causing people to fall back into homelessness after a 6 month or one year supplemental rent expires and the tenant is unable to pay the full rent due to lack of money, or lack of adequate employment, chronic illness, trauma, etc. this current method wastes precious resources AND does not address the root cause of the individuals homelessness. Every person will have

a different need and the one size fits all prescription of the current system and the plans outlined here have produced little success for homeless people. The ability of agencies to demonstrate success for sustainable housing, healing and employment for those at risk and those experiencing homelessness must be a requirement for receiving funding from measure H. This requires long-term commitment, building long-term cooperative relationships and building access to resources and innovation for and with people who are at risk for and experiencing homelessness. Where is the needs assessment for the person or family being housed and how are the needs met? Where is the development plan for the persons being housed? This should coincide with the medical plan, mental health and substance abuse plan (if applicable). We have learned that homelessness is a health hazard and massively traumatic and isolating.

The stigma of homelessness: Here it states, after nine months of implementation, HACoLA realized that there were unanticipated barriers that negatively affected owner participation in HIP, such as negative stigma of homeless families and individuals, lack of financial resources, and lack of case management.

1. That is discrimination: landlords must be trained not to discriminate in LA County.
2. Tenancy classes are critical for people being housed to basically learn how to live and manage home life again.

3. Education and upwardly mobile employment must be facilitated for people being housed is a major priority and must not be overlooked.

4. Trauma reduction services and support for people being housed is also necessary.

- Since not all cities are implementing Rapid Re-housing, provide options for regional efforts or service providers to address needs of multiple cities.
- DV Service Providers need to be one of the collaborating agencies on this strategy. This strategy states that rapid re-housing is not the most effective intervention for most individuals/families/youth impacted by domestic violence, but there should be a dedicated rapid re-housing program for victims of DV. Involving DV providers in this process will create a space for alternative methods to rapid re-housing that will allow for the dv intervention and prevention services needed by this population.
- Transition young adults when they are ready. Comprehensive wrap around services must be provided with housing. Provide in-home and residential therapists & counselors on a 24 hour basis. Need consistent time limits in housing programs. Supportive services should be part of rapid rehousing -Landlord incentives (i.e. partner with the City of LA to co-sign leases, address discrimination) Partner with faith-based to expand housing.
- If LAHSA is using County and City funds for the B3 programs, this programs should move to a fee-for-service model or the effect of the expansion and enhancement will be limited due to internal bureaucracy structure.
- Chrysalis is very supportive of allocating Measure H funds towards rapid re-housing (RRH) services. Our suggestion to the County, as it partners with other cities to implement RRH, is to include employment services in any RRH program implementations. Chrysalis has seen how critical, and challenging, it is to increase incomes for RRH participants during their time in the program. Funding employment services, as a part of any RRH program, will be an important program component. As the funding level for this RRH Strategy is considered, we hope the cost of employment services is factored into that decision.

Strategy B4: Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies

- Use with we have including remodeling and utilization of land the city has.
- More Section 8 knowledgeable realtors and land owners.
- Get the most out of federal funds? Yes, please. Is this not happening already??
- An independent organization will be extremely useful to facilitate.
- Use local dollars to bring all subsidies up to the same standard--HACoLA, HACLA & FHSP subsidies.
- We have been able to attract owners by quickly responding to problems. We do not favor up-front incentives. However, having funding to promptly pay for damages and for staffing to troubleshoot issues, and otherwise provide strong customer service is important.
- There must be collaboration and inclusive of all stakeholders, especially those who are most impacted. We must provide their story and align resources that fit specific needs not general. There also needs to be a deeper focus on generating more resources to address the needs of disabled.
- The supervisors should develop accessory dwellings on their lots and tent to section 8.
- Have some type of system that has security in three shifts for protection of property and tenants.
- Would be useful.
- We request that you consider funding the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles at a level of \$3.0M for landlord engagement incentives. Currently HACLA is the only local PHA with HUD-VASH vouchers and these incentives have been the key to housing many homeless veterans countywide.
- The City would like to request funding for up to \$3,500 per family as the current funding HACLA receives for incentives was a one-time funding that ends on June 30, 2017. The City has currently assisted over 300+ families and connected them to landlords using incentives since January 1, 2017 to present. Having access to incentives greatly increases the chances of helping homeless applicant families and connecting them with landlords.
- Evidence based programs that deal with impacted populations should be included in distributing housing vouchers.
- These seem to be cumbersome and slow.
- We are in support of the facilitation of utilization of federal housing subsidies.
- Not sure if this fits in here but we need to expand rental units by funding conversions of garages and motels etc. into habitable units thereby expanding capacity in addition to other suggestions.
- Thanks for including the other PHAs and move-in assistance funds.

- Cut the regulation that prevent those who use Federal subsidies from accessing education, employment and building wealth or uplifting families.

Strategy B6: Family Reunification Housing Subsidies

- Use what we have what's already been approved. (Please note: This comment was given as a response to all strategies. To avoid redundancy, the comment will only be listed in Strategy B6)
- Person by person, case by case--nothing better than being close and with family, with church families helping as family.
- I'm not sure how this works. It's like hiring a social worker to attempt to re-connect homeless folks with family that could potentially take them in or help in some way?
- Family Reunification? Those who are being released from incarceration (nonviolent) crime, children who were missing/homeless. Also, children who were placed in foster care, due to parent (s) neglect will create a domino effect. Housing Subsidy in this case will reduce funds being drained that could be used to help families remain together. Again, counseling, follow-up, record maintenance to know we're and how children are. It's difficult enough to be separated from your family and placed in an unfamiliar location. I believe Reunification is an excellent use of funds.
- I haven't seen any children on the streets of Hollywood. Just 20 somethings.
- Families have shunned the homeless for many reasons. Money should go toward mental health and addiction services instead.
- Support. As an operator of a shelter that serves families (and is connected to the SPA 2 FSC/CES) and single adults, we occasionally see clients with children in placement, or who have open DCFS cases. Our shelter is connected to a team of case managers at our Access Center. We would be happy to have this resource integrated into our case management offerings.
- My experience with this in the past is that though we are provided funds for travel/transportation, we are not provided with funds for other obvious costs such as food! Many people who use this subsidy are drifters who don't have much to their name, often times not ever GR. Many of these people end up traveling by greyhound (usually cheapest option), but don't have any money for food. It would be helpful and ethical if we could provide that for them.
- Why is there a significant reduction in this area.... Foster Youth is a target population in many subject areas such as housing and education yet we are not investing in connecting the family which is vitally need to build the community. More resources should be directed to this area. Not reduced.
- Counseling should be for the entire family and use the weekends to include working people and promote more jobs.
- Hunt down the dead-beat parents and force them to PAY!

- Yes, we need Temporary and Permanent Housing.
- If possible, of course. family reunification is always the goal. Isn't it?
- Reuniting loved ones who have been in prison with a life sentence and now returning home needs housing assistance to relieve the strain in family expenses creating tension.
- We are in support of the family reunification housing subsidy. We see firsthand the effects of broken families on youth who enter the juvenile justice system. 40% of them are crossover youth and are missing family support due to homelessness being the barrier for unification. This important provision would effectively help decrease the number of youth who are in the juvenile justice system by unifying families and providing the support that these youth desperately need.
- Haven Hills calls for a consideration of DV survivors as this population experiences minor children being removed from the home due to a "failure to protect" because of domestic violence in the household. Individuals exiting the emergency shelter system who are unable to secure permanent housing are at risk of losing their children permanently due the compounding impact of domestic violence and limited permanent housing support for survivors of DV.
- Regarding strategy B6, all financial assistance (e.g. housing) for homeless should be provided in the form of low-interest microloans to help recuperate cost and to create a self-sustaining program. Microloans have had great success in Africa to help families succeed by giving hope, not handouts.
 - Total lifetime outstanding microloans across all programs for families limited to no more than 8% of the 50% AMI as per the household's size. Recuperating cost via microloans will allow the county of Los Angeles to reunify more homeless families. Microloans may also help prevent fraud and abuse of this strategy. To further reduce the risk of fraud, the microloans should be treated like a bank loan with household members verified accordingly to DRAFT NIST Special Publication 800-63A Identity Assurance Level 3 standards or better for services.
- I support this. It is hard to reunify if there is not adequate quality housing which will require subsidies.
- Consider when providing funding for these programs the specialized needs of immigrant families who are reunited with a trafficking victim as well as trafficking victims whose children may have been placed in out-of-home-care and need housing quickly to reunify with children. Often waitlists right now can be 8-10 years.
- Why the need to be separate from B3?
- There are a small number of families who would benefit from being able to access a place to live with their children who are currently in the DCFS system as a result of "failure to protect" or other DV-related issues. But while rental subsidies to this small group would be helpful, it would not help the vast majority of families with DCFS involvement as the families will need a great deal of support to remain self-sufficient or employed.
- What are the needs of families? Who is walking with the family members to assure those needs are met? This is a long-term commitment to build and rebuild relationships, it must be handled as such.

- For family reunification, allow flexibility for funds to assist families relocate out of area and ensure that enough supportive services are available as these families need much more support on every level.
- Please keep in mind that victims of domestic violence are often accused of "failure to protect" their children. Trauma informed specific services will increase a families likelihood of remaining permanently housed.
- Good program that should be funded.

Strategy B7: Interim/Bridge Housing for Those Existing Institutions

- For a night, a weekend, 10 days, or enough time to do some serious job hunting and get that first paycheck for getting going on rent--keep getting people from under bridges and into Interim/Bridge Housing!
- "Institutions"? Like jail or rehab? This falls in line with the need for more psychological help for our homeless. People with addictions have specific needs right after release!
- Yes, my response to B7 is in part connected to B6. I've researched the success rate of programs while being incarcerated to help inmates learn how to live with mental illness, and addiction. The revolving door rate reduction is the bridge. Inmates should be allowed to enter programs that will uplift, encourage and know the illegal act is not who they are rather what they did. This is an effort involving the family. Maintaining a family-friendly program will build our community and reach those who otherwise would have been overlooked.
- Existing institutions have the most experience with this and should be helped.
- Consider alternative options for interim/bridge housing--i.e. motel vouchers--a lot of folks don't want to go to shelters.
- The interim housing should not be placed in residential communities where residents could be placed in harms way by mentally ill or drug-addicted individuals.
- What is the increased bed rate (\$30) based on? Additional services or smaller scale per shelter? The proposal is important and needs to be more specific about the model that should be funded, specifically the ideal number of beds.
- Yes, but with more help for those addicted to drugs and suffering from mental illness.
- Six month to one year follow-up to be a reward for keeping housing.
- Very much needed. But the services while in bridge housing need to be strong. Too many people still end up homeless and then back in our institutions.
- Yes, why not used the building and institutions we have already.

- Please consider including local jails in this program. The City of Los Angeles has begun identifying homeless inmates in its jail system and piloting a jail-in reach program to connect to services before discharge - even in as short of timeframes as 48 hours.
- Halfway houses and other transitional support, very much including housing.
- Very important, high risk from transitions out of foster care and jail, consider increasing.
- Apartments with a office for wrap around services to assist these individuals reintegrate successfully.
- Measure H funds for Interim/Bridge housing should be for operating NEW beds. "Buying" existing beds basically just supplants other funds that are already used to keep these beds in operation, and only serves to substitute one population/person for another. Buying existing beds does not add capacity to the system, or support efforts to reduce street homelessness.
- Should be part of plan, as well as needed support & services.
- We are in resounding support of this as many of our young people are exiting jails and DCFS and have an extreme high level of risk in becoming homeless. Additionally, we have seen firsthand how young people are being released to shelters without the appropriate bridge housing they need to successfully re-enter the community. HASC appreciates the additional clarity that was provided in this latest iteration. Are crisis stabilization beds and recuperative care a subset of interim/bridge housing? If not, need to define criteria for interim/bridge housing along with bed allocation for each of the three categories.

For purposes of consistency, hospitals should be clearly defined/clarified as private and public hospital institutions especially since identical language is also be used in strategy E8. What separates an interim bed from a shelter bed? HASC remains concerned that the funding allocation for 250-beds (FY 2017-18) continues to be insufficient given the referral demand that will result from hospitals, jails, and DCFS combined with bed-turnover. It also appears that entities that can make referrals was broaden to include (mental) urgent care centers and residential mental health facilities. Do these individuals not qualify for crisis stabilization beds that DMH needed to appropriate under SB 82 for patients being released by mental health urgent care centers? HASC strongly recommends that this strategy not be limited to individuals being discharged from an inpatient bed (40%), but also needs to include individuals who are 'treated and released' from a hospital ED (60%). This ensures that people exiting an institution have access to geographically dispersed interim/bridge housing - particularly since the primary objective of this strategy is to intercept and prevent people from re-entering homelessness. Operational comment: Will hospital (public and private hospital) referral be directed to each individual program (recuperative care, crisis stabilization & bridge housing)? Or, will all referrals be centralized to one location (local CES) where individual is triaged either into recuperative care, crisis stabilization, bridge housing and emergency shelter? A similar bed shortage concern applies to the 250-beds (FY2017-18) that are set aside for outreach teams. Expansion of outreach teams under E6 will directly contribute to increase referrals for bed placement.

- Regarding strategy B7, Interim/Bridge housing should be limited to a finite period of days per client (e.g. 120 days). Overall, the cost per bed per night is concerning ranging from \$30-\$155 for LAHSA and DHS/DMH. The true variable cost per occupied rooms for hotels are typically \$12 per room

night for a budget property to approximately \$75 for a world-class hotel (<http://lodgingmagazine.com/what-are-your-true-variable-costs-per-occupied-room/>). The cost per bed through the homeless initiatives appear significantly higher than most hotels. I would suggest contracting with existing budget hotels to house homeless as an alternative solution by occupying excess capacity at a reduced cost to the County of LA or identifying and implementing cost efficiencies for shelter beds like the hotel business.

- Where is the strategy for the newly proposed 93 M 1 year cost?
- Providence commends the county for expanding this program to include non-county hospitals and further increasing the total number of recuperative care and stabilization beds to 450. However, Providence is concerned that the funding allocation in FY 2017-18 for 250-beds is insufficient given the referral demand that will result from hospitals and jails. It also appears that entities that can make referrals was broaden to include residential mental health facilities, urgent care centers and custody settings. We urge the county to distribute these beds in all the regions (SPAs), including the San Fernando Valley, Westside and South Bay. Providence recommends that this strategy should not be limited to individuals being discharged from an inpatient bed, but also include individuals who are treated and released from a hospital ED. This ensures that people exiting an institution have access to geographically dispersed interim/bridge housing, particularly since the primary objective of this strategy is to intercept and prevent people from remaining homeless. A similar concern applies to the other 250-beds in FY 2017-18 that are set aside for outreach teams and homeless service providers. Expansion of outreach teams under E-6 will directly contribute to increase referrals for bed placement.
- Boosting the rate to \$50 a night is appreciated and necessary to cover basic operating costs. Is there capacity for ramp-up without simply reassigning existing beds? Starting and operating a shelter is an expensive investment and faces issues such as needing a CUP. What about allocating a portion for motel vouchers? Why not invest in permanent options rather than expanding shelter infrastructure? Shelter, at the rated proposed is almost as expensive as PSH. Exiting institution isn't really "bridge" if don't have a housing plan when entering.
- Shouldn't the 450 interim housing beds serving clients exiting institutions include foster care and probation carve out youth beds? It reads like the interim beds are only for single adults and there are no specific interim beds for youth (or it is not separated). Does the county have a estimate of the number of individuals/youth exiting out of these institutions?
- Interim/Bridge Housing should be available for victims of domestic violence exiting emergency shelter. There is NO HUD funding for transitional programs and this is a critical need!
- 24 hour youth specific crisis and interim beds available in the Community. Crisis beds for youth ages 13 and 17. Crisis beds with services for sex trafficked youth. Pilot host homes. Immediate connection and transition to longer term housing. Immediate.

Strategy C2: Increase Employment for Homeless Adults by Supporting Social Enterprise

- As a Humboldt County Native Son of the Golden West, and continuing to believe in the fine and lively arts, plus great food, food packaging and other inventive products from individuals and families, well

represented here, I am most interested in increasing employment for homeless adults by supporting social enterprise--currently connecting "Flowers for Donations" with Joyful Healer friends and Arcata House homeless adults, along with Arcata Florist, working with Hana and Heather, and Sun Valley Floral Group.

- YES. Finding jobs for them first or concurrently is critical. Unfortunately, there is a psychological issue that isn't addressed.
- In order to increase employment for the homeless may require incentives for the employer such as tax breaks, reduced rate for medical or working with the Department of Labor. We have programs currently working with business owners who hire retirees, disabled, and those released from being incarcerated. I believe the same programs should be adopted. In doing so, we boost the economy, community relation, and reduction in crime. As long as the person maintains an address, and connected with the program will uplift individuals. Clothing for interviews, mock interviews, etc must come with this form of assistance. Many of our homeless may carry with them issues that must be addressed first. Employers will more than likely be willing as long as some form of a reasonable incentives are provided.
- Use the LA:RISE program as a model for social enterprise opportunities.
- Yes. Again, there must be adequate oversight/inspections to make sure the money is not being redirected.
- Why has funding not been used yet? For this and all the measures, some thought should be given to how these opportunities are rolled out, and how they connect, or don't connect, to homeless services providers.
- Many are not unemployed because of lack of work. They are mentally ill and unable to hold a job. We need more focus on mental illness and finding a cure or a temporary solution.
- True and allow them to work part time daily for those who qualify. Some can answer phones, and some can braid or cut hair to add to their income.
- Big proponent of this. People need to feel that we are a part of something.
- This is the ONLY way to turn this disaster around. Put every person to work. No exceptions. Make it mandatory.
- Absolutely needed - employment is a buffer against PTS and depressive disorders. We should look in particular at workforce entry with wraparound supports for foster youth and youth from impoverished communities where unemployment rates are astronomical. (I heard a stat that nationally there are more than 7 million youth in America ages 16-23 who are not working, in school nor looking for work - if this is not addressed this is the pool of our future homeless population).
- Allow homeless individuals work to substitute paying rent.

- This funding allocation should be proportional to RRH funding. RRH will only be successful if households can increase their income to a self-sustainable level. In order to support RRH, we need a much greater investment in targeted, supported employment services as well.
- Need to have training support available to get necessary skills.
- Social Enterprises have a strong, demonstrated history of creating employment opportunities for individuals with barriers to employment and/or those that might not be able to secure employment elsewhere. Social Enterprises layer on additional supportive services to help individuals get back in the habit of work, develop critical work experience and skills, and stabilize their lives so that they can move on to careers in high-demand, family-supporting occupations.
- New Earth strongly recommends the support for Social Enterprises. New Earth has an alternative staffing agency that employs young people ages 16-25 who are transitioning from the juvenile justice system or are at risk for entering the Juvenile Justice system. This support would be critical in allowing us to offer more job opportunities and incubation for young people who have very little training in navigating the employment world. Additionally, they have a criminal history which puts them in another level of disadvantage.
- Chrysalis is supportive of allocating funds towards this Strategy. In addition to funding the core idea of a \$2 per hour wage subsidy, we are recommending that the County consider the costs related to staff running the programs and services at alternative staffing organizations. These staff costs are what allows individuals coming out of homelessness to successfully be placed in employment and succeed on the job. The wage subsidy accomplishes the goal of making alternative staffing organizations competitive in the marketplace, and better positioned to secure contracts, which is important. Allowing an additional portion of funds to be used to support the associated supportive staff costs would also be important to the success of this Strategy. As the funding level for this alternative staffing Strategy is considered, we hope that the cost of support staff is factored into that decision.
- There can be no doubt that it will be through employment that many people who are presently homeless will be able to maintain housing in the long term. With the dramatic increase in funding for RRH it is surprising that such little money is being put towards employment. The fact that no money is being put towards social enterprise in year one - often the first step for many back into the job world - is disheartening. RRH will be a resounding failure if we simply get people into housing and then expect them to maintain it without focusing on education and employment.
- Consider the specialized needs of those whose trauma bars them from certain work and/or those with limited to no English capacity.
- Los Angeles county should be a bastion of innovation for green and sustainable employment opportunities. It must focus on employing those who are most impacted and vulnerable to homelessness.
- How will lead agencies for this strategy ensure that single adult victims of domestic violence who are categorically homeless have access to these employment resources/services/opportunities?

Strategies C4, C5, C6: Countywide Supplemental Security/Social Security Disability Income and Veterans Benefits Advocacy

- The safety net of some cash each month makes a quality life happen for me and my family.
- Policies, regulations and guidelines should be the same. I believe the difference may fall within an annual locality increase. Organization such as nonprofit peer based are the best advocacy. Advocates speak with, help, and many are not large organizations. It's best to mix local advocate along with branches of larger organizations. How can one be considered an advocate if those who are in need fill comfortable with a system that can't see who they are because the situation blinds those who are without personal knowledge along with education and the ability of vetting by those who are true advocates and not in it to exploit nor abuse those who are in need.
- Yes - but is this just for County Departments or for providers? How can it best integrate with existing access centers?
- Must make sure that landlords do not continue discriminating against this population of people because nothing will change.
- This should a given to have ready housing and debriefing for Veterans as soon as they come home, and it should be for as long as needed. Again promoting jobs for the community is also a need. Everyone can do something, even some disabled. **DO NOT CUT THEIR SSI IF THEY CAN DO SOME TYPE OF WORK!!**
- If this comes from Federal benefits only, then yes.
- We voted to fund housing & services, not policing. Deny the Sheriff's Department's request for \$1,245,305 for the "Expansion of Sheriff's Department Homeless Services Team." This would be a colossal misuse of Measure H funds.
- This deserves highest priority. Benefits maximization advocacy can generate substantial income support capacity that is a vital component to a long term strategy to reduce and end homelessness. Housing for special needs and vulnerable populations is made "affordable" not only with government housing subsidies but also with more global strategies to generate access to robust income supports. Public interest attorneys are uniquely capable to navigate such access in the most cost-effective and high-quality manner because - 1) the quality of their advocacy is extraordinary - they are often among the most talented individuals in their law school class but opted to accept a job that pays a fraction of what they can earn working at a law firm, because they want to help transform the landscape of poverty and homelessness; 2) the county does not need to pay long term pensions to enlist their advocacy; 3) they provide the highest quality assurance to avoid obtuse outcomes, because they are expertly trained, consummately mission driven and outcome devoted. This benefits upgrade advocacy should be intimately coordinated with the housing strategies set forth in strategy B1 above ("Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing SSI (please add here "and Veterans Benefits)" As mentioned above, the housing stability will anchor the capacity of trained advocates to maintain contact with these individuals, maintain their paperwork and coordinate their making appointments - challenges that are especially acute for those with mental afflictions or untreated PTS. Groups like the USC Stephen Cohen Military & Veteran Family mental health clinic should be enlisted to invigorate the capacity of this model, as they provide free mental health services that can be vital

to stabilize individuals with histories of mental afflictions and substance abuse disorders during the benefits advocacy process.

- Questionable???
- Yes, anything that makes it easier for persons on SSRI, SSI, SSDI, or Veterans Benefits, regarding S.S.I. benefits it has become clear to me that the Senior Homeless crisis is more critical than acknowledged, today 10,000 people will become seniors, believe me after working hard all of my life the last thing I ever expected was to be homeless.
- We are in support of C4, C5 and C6.
- Operational comment: Support inclusion of CES to accept private hospital referrals for individuals who can benefit from C4. It appears that the DHS will lead the coordination of this program and thus county hospitals will have an internal mechanism for making referrals.
- I would like more detail on training and TA for FQHC's. FQHC's have a unique opportunity to identify the homeless and at risk for homeless populations and assist them with accessing resources. It will require funding for staff and training of them to do this.
- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County (CCALAC) understands that this strategy incorporates federally qualified health centers (FQHC) as entities that could connect patients to these benefits using the Department of Health Services newly developed portal. CCALAC is concerned that FQHCs have not been included in discussions regarding the feasibility of these activities in the FQHC setting. CCALAC agrees that clinics are uniquely positioned to be partners in this strategy because of their accessibility to the community and their ability to produce the medical documentation to support SSI claims. However, sufficient training and resources to build the capacity of clinics will be required. CCALAC looks forward to further discussions on this strategy.
- Providence supports inclusion of CES to accept private hospital referrals for individuals who can benefit from this strategy. It appears that DHS will lead the coordination of this program, meaning county hospitals will have an internal mechanism for making referrals.
- This will require federal and state changes in rules for benefits - Understand the restrictions placed on the recipients of federal, state and local programs. Investigate and become aware of the complex rules and restrictions these restrictions must be removed. There are built in barriers to upward mobility in federal housing subsidies that prevent recipients from receiving and pursuing long-term sustainable solutions like scholarships and entry into colleges and universities.
- Should consider adding legal representation to team in order that fees can be recouped from SSDI awards, up to 25% of the past-due benefits awarded or up to a maximum of \$6,000 can be recouped. This will make the program more likely to be sustainable moving forward and offset future cost.

Strategy C7: Subsidized Employment for Homeless Adults

- For city work and clean up yes.

- Keep working case by case and place by place to include the shelter-challenged in our neo-renaissance of work and health care for all.
- Employment = A+
- Center for Living and Learning strongly recommends:
C7 -WDACS be identified as the department to administer C7 as it is the department that is overseeing the coordination of the workforce programs across county agencies and works with workforce development boards and American Job Centers across the county.
C7- Model the subsidized job program on LA:RISE, which demonstrates evidence of success in achieving employment outcomes with individuals who have experienced homeless.

LA:RISE, the Los Angeles Initiative for Social Enterprise, is an innovative, collaborative partnership that unites the Workforce Development System (WDS) with non-profit social enterprises and for-profit employers in order to improve outcomes for people overcoming significant employment barriers “ helping these striving men and women get good jobs and stay employed. LA:RISE has built a pathway from chronic unemployment, to transitional employment, to full time work for opportunity youth or individuals that have been previously homeless or incarcerated. LA:RISE was initially funded with a Department of Labor Workforce Innovation Fund grant to the City of LA Employment and Workforce Development Department.

In partnership with the local workforce system, (Your Organization’s name) has been able to deliver an enhanced level of service to assist individuals facing significant barriers to employment succeed in the workplace.

Impact to date: In just 18 months, LA:RISE has provided transitional employment to 773 individuals and to date has placed 141 individuals into competitive employment. A number of people who have gone through the program have pursued vocational opportunities including diesel mechanic training, truck driving school, administrative and computer literacy, and culinary training.

LA:RISE is now positioned as a recruitment pipeline for the private sector and for multiple initiatives like the Mayor’s Office of Reentry Fair Chance Job Fairs and LA City Target Hire Program and private sector employers.

In October 2017 the County of Los Angeles launched the social enterprise certification program. There are more than 30 social enterprises certified, and to date 12 are included in the County’s Master Agreement managed by the Workforce Development, Aging & Community Services (WDACS) department. The Master Agreement is an effective tool to identify and procure social enterprises with expertise in the target population.

- Use the LA:RISE program as a model for social enterprise opportunities.
- Is this a good impact? There are no existing funding streams that do this?
- Need further info on what that is exactly.
- Most people have some type of skill; find out what they may want to do or are qualified to do, and enhance their skills.

- This is great.
- Yes, as long as it aims to get them to be as independent as possible.
- Empowers homeless adults and gives them income toward renting a home.
- Create pathways for homeless to work on infrastructure as laborers.
- Earn while you learn programs.
- LA Conservation Corps/Goodwill/New Earth/Chrysalis/LA Chamber of Commerce/Managed Care Solutions/YWCA and the Center for Employment Opportunities strongly recommends: C7 -WDACS be identified as the department to administer C7 as it is the department that is overseeing the coordination of the workforce programs across county agencies and works with workforce development boards and American Job Centers across the county. C7- Model the subsidized job program on LA:RISE, which demonstrates evidence of success in achieving employment outcomes with individuals who have experienced homelessness. LA:RISE, the Los Angeles Initiative for Social Enterprise, is an innovative, collaborative partnership that unites the Workforce Development System (WDS) with non-profit social enterprises and for-profit employers in order to improve outcomes for people overcoming significant employment barriers – helping these striving men and women get good jobs and stay employed. LA:RISE has built a pathway from chronic unemployment, to transitional employment, to full time work for opportunity youth or individuals that have been previously homeless or incarcerated. LA:RISE was initially funded with a Department of Labor Workforce Innovation Fund grant to the City of LA Employment and Workforce Development Department. In partnership with the local workforce system, LA Conservation Corps has been able to deliver an enhanced level of service to assist individuals facing significant barriers to employment succeed in the workplace. Impact to date: In just 18 months, LA:RISE has provided transitional employment to 773 individuals and to date has placed 141 individuals into competitive employment. A number of people who have gone through the program have pursued vocational opportunities including diesel mechanic training, truck driving school, administrative and computer literacy, and culinary training. LA:RISE is now positioned as a recruitment pipeline for the private sector and for multiple initiatives like the Mayor’s Office of Reentry Fair Chance Job Fairs and LA City Target Hire Program and private sector employers. In October 2017 the County of Los Angeles launched the social enterprise certification program. There are more than 30 social enterprises certified, and to date 12 are included in the County’s Master Agreement managed by the Workforce Development, Aging & Community Services (WDACS) department. The Master Agreement is an effective tool to identify and procure social enterprises with expertise in the target population.
- As a part of strategy C7, Subsidized Employment Program for Homeless Adults, the program should help homeless adults prepare for jobs of the future. These jobs include skilled jobs requiring manual dexterity such as agricultural work (e.g. picking fruit), landscaping, and janitorial services; or highly skilled jobs such as robotics, big data, and artificial intelligence.
- The LA Chamber of Commerce is committed to building a thriving, inclusive regional economy. For many individuals with barriers to employment, transitional employment and social enterprises are critical to delivering an enhanced level of service to help this population succeed in the workplace. The LA Chamber of Commerce helped prepare the Prop 47 Jobs & Services Taskforce Report, which makes

recommendations for how to connect the reentry population to jobs and services. In the report, the Chamber recommends that the county support the growth of social enterprises and transitional employment because it allows individuals with barriers to employment to work in a supportive environment, learn pro-social working skills, and earn a paycheck to pay for immediate needs -such as housing. The Chamber firmly believes that subsidized transitional employment is critical to reducing homelessness and recidivism among the reentry population.

- More money is needed for employment services for adults.
- Consider setting aside specialized resources for those who have been crime victims, including retraining programs.
- Must be living wages with benefits.
- Using homeless providers as job-sites and training sites would be incredible!
- Ensure that youth are provided these resources and opportunities.
- Good program, half of the GROW participants that were placed with our program were homeless. Majority of them were in day shelters or living on the streets, all received services while working subsidized employment at Good Seed. All needed coaching, training, case management services, and housing navigation services. We believe it would be difficult for them to maintain employment if they did not receive a subsidy to offset the additional services they required.

Strategy D2: Expand Jail In-Reach

- Just saw the news for private jails as winners within President Trump's first 100 days. Please expand jail in-reach to maximize good citizens during the transition back to civilization.
- Expansion of jail in reach is critical to prevent at-risk convicts from the chances of living on the streets. Jail in reach can provide services and create a game plan on how to make ends meet before inmates are released from prison.
- THIS IS CRITICAL NEED. This also ties in with the Criminal Record Clearing Project... It is not a crime to be homeless.
- My response to this is the same as I stated in B7. I would not refer to D2 as Expand Jail Reach. Respectively, rather Incarcerated Expansion Outreach Program. In fact during an intake process (questionnaire), inmates should be presented this question on the form. Because psychological evaluation are performed, incorporate this along with addiction. In mates are give jobs while incarcerated, trained, and educated. Begin at this stage.
- Since I live in Hollywood which is a destination spot for ex-cons I vote for this approach.
- Overall there are more positive educational programs needed in jails.
- Please note that we have clients who get arrested and it can really difficult to track them.

- Not sure what this means-I want to reach out more to the clients that are high functioning mental health individuals and some of them at this very moment are using one year residential programs for housing; I am recommending it because the process after leaving programs and jail are simply too long. Most people want a bathroom that they is in their unit/apartment, a bedroom, and kitchen. Most will not entertain any type of company, they just want their own space that they can afford.
- Very much needed. Need transgender specific services.
- Please consider including the City of Los Angeles' Metropolitan jails. In October 2016 we began a piloted program to identify inmates experiencing homelessness. As many as 80% of these persons are released and never enter the County jail system. It is this population that is recycling in and out due to behaviors associated with mental illness and substance abuse. Please fund those providers part of the current piloted program including Homeless Healthcare L.A. and Tarzana Treatment or include in the RFP for services inclusion of L.A. City and other City jails.
- To avoid recidivism and mainstream inmates back to productive life? You bet!
- Consider allocating funds for prevention/coordinate release transition plan.
- Make available expanded occupational training in jails and state prisons.
- This is needed - but the greater need is coordinated prevention designed to prevent traumatized and mentally unstable individuals ending up in jail. The consequences of being incarcerated are devastating and bleed into long term homelessness. We know that jail is toxic to individuals who suffer PTS or have traumatized brains from growing up in distressed impoverished households. Every expert working with incarcerated individuals agrees that isolating such individuals, detaching them from their positive, supportive and protective relationships, disrupting their employment (which potentially ends their employ-ability long term), and surrounding them with violent individuals and undue influences is a recipe for generating more violent, dysfunctional, and crippled individuals - basically creating a jail to homeless pipeline.
- Clearance for prior felons should be allowed to participate with jail resource fairs.
- We are in support of D2. Our population is in desperate need of housing solutions before they are released.
- The number of inmates assessed per day at 4.3 or closer to 3 due to inmates declining services appears low. This is approximately 2.5 hours per inmate. Most clinical facilities (e.g. doctor's office) spend less than half an hour to diagnose and recommend a treatment plan for a patient. Additional efficiencies should be investigated to significantly increase the average number of inmates assessed per day per case manager (e.g. prefilling out a questionnaire, information pamphlets, group sessions, etc.) to an average of more than ten (10) per day.
- Make available expanded occupational training in jails and state prisons.
- This is needed - but the greater need is coordinated prevention designed to prevent traumatized and mentally unstable individuals ending up in jail. The consequences of being incarcerated are

devastating and bleed into long term homelessness. We know that jail is toxic to individuals who suffer PTS or have traumatized brains from growing up in distressed impoverished households. Every expert working with incarcerated individuals agrees that isolating such individuals, detaching them from their positive, supportive and protective relationships, disrupting their employment (which potentially ends their employ-ability long term), and surrounding them with violent individuals and undue influences is a recipe for generating more violent, dysfunctional, and crippled individuals - basically creating a jail to homeless pipeline.

- Clearance for prior felons should be allowed to participate with jail resource fairs.
- We are in support of D2. Our population is in desperate need of housing solutions before they are released.
- The number of inmates assessed per day at 4.3 or closer to 3 due to inmates declining services appears low. This is approximately 2.5 hours per inmate. Most clinical facilities (e.g. doctor's office) spend less than half an hour to diagnose and recommend a treatment plan for a patient. Additional efficiencies should be investigated to significantly increase the average number of inmates assessed per day per case manager (e.g. prefilling out a questionnaire, information pamphlets, group sessions, etc.) to an average of more than ten (10) per day.
- Make sure all staff is trained on sex and labor trafficking and can explain the special vactur provisions that apply to them under SB 832 and refer to the right specialized resources to do this. We recommend that funding be allocated to SPAs to have at least one designated in-reach worker to engage individuals in city jails. This worker can be shared among regional cities.
- Please ensure underserved homeless populations like victims of crime, youth, and others receive the support being offered to offenders.
- Good program, fund it!

Strategy D4: Regional Integrated Re-entry Networks- Homeless Focus

- More layers or bureaucracy: nope.
- Thank you LA for leading the way for the much needed integrated re-entry networks for faster good citizen awards from current correction facilities.
- Gather nonprofit organization with knowledge of the needs of our homeless. We have families, individuals, Veterans, and teens. Each group represent a variety of issues to focus on. Create three groups of those to network with the community, and local representatives. National Board to review the body of nation wide, Regional to monitor, gather and dissemination and finally local. The local organization are the front line. locations, referrals, communicate with the community, foot work. We need layers to ensure more than one ensures the release of funds are being targeted for those who are identified and meets each criteria of this program.
- Please place staff members from these networks at agencies w/in the community that the reentry population actually accesses.

- This sounds like a bunch of people talking and not acting.
- Yes - this is vital - but even more so is a focus upon integrated and coordinated prevention as a core value and long term strategy!!
- Those that provide services to reentry should have leverage to operate decently with paid staff.
- We are in support of D4.
- Those that provide services to reentry should have leverage to operate decently with paid staff.
- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County (CCALAC) supports establishing a regional integrated re-entry network that includes high quality mental health, physical health, and substance use disorders providers. This strategy recommends embedding homeless case managers in clinics participating in the Whole Person Care (WPC) re-entry pilot. CCALAC is concerned that clinics participating in WPC will be limited due to administrative challenges. We strongly encourage engagement of FQHCs to understand administrative needs before implementation of D4. It is critical for the county to strategically work with clinics to create a formal program with services that would benefit the health and wellbeing of re-entry individuals. Due to these recommendations, it may require additional funding allocated for the reentry health care network.
- This is not clear in the description

Strategy D6: Criminal Record Clearing Project

- Aren't there projects or institution in San Pedro/Wilmington that doesn't already do this?
- Yes! As a person still suffering from a most challenging situation involving a strange, if somewhat unfair judge--keep helping innocent people get Governor and Presidential pardons, plus helping criminals to make good on their illegal records with clearing projects.
- The ability to clear past criminal records will allow those individuals a chance to redeem their livelihood by obtaining a job without any prejudice by employer.
- IM INTRIGUED. GO ON.... This is a major block for people who may have made a mistake or stolen food to eat, etc.
- D6 in my opinion if this can be introduced during the hearing process or directly to the DA this may work. My concern will be in the equal treatment of the project. Our local group may be utilized to ensure equality is followed. Also, offer this program to those who are facing non violent crimes. A career criminal may not be offered nor placed above a person who not a career criminal. Unfortunately, we have repeat offenders in part because he/she find it easier to cope in the system rather than living in a free society. This may appear harsh, but through my findings it's a reality.
- The public deserves to know with whom they are dealing.
- Many housing facilities will not take in a homeless person with a record. Many of them have a record because of mental illness.

- Probation and Parole people have a very difficult time getting on their feet for the first time or they continue to repeat jail just to get food and a shower on a regular basis. Without the proper help, we are losing the battle with co-occurring clients.
- Needed.
- Get volunteer lawyers or ask them to work for a reduced rate. Many criminal defense attorneys will be glad to do it for a reduced rate and bulk discounts. No kidding.
- Based on the individuals passion at helping others returning home should not be faced with barriers due to their past.
- We are in support of this as criminal records are direct barriers to obtaining employment.
- While clearing of criminal records may be beneficial for an individual for employment, the Criminal Record Clearing Project will endanger the public. In addition, it may discourage companies from hiring homeless without criminal records. For example, if an employer has a bad experience with another homeless who has had their criminal records cleared. Records of individuals should not be expunged for repeat criminal offenses (e.g. petty theft, etc.). Please eliminate funding for strategy D6.
- Based on the individuals passion at helping others returning home should not be faced with barriers de to their past.
- We are in support of this as criminal records are direct barriers to obtaining employment.
- While clearing of criminal records may be beneficial for an individual for employment, the Criminal Record Clearing Project will endanger the public. In addition, it may discourage companies from hiring homeless without criminal records. For example, if an employer has a bad experience with another homeless who has had their criminal records cleared. Records of individuals should not be expunged for repeat criminal offenses (e.g. petty theft, etc.). Please eliminate funding for strategy D6.
- This is important. The funding seems very little to accomplish this effort.
- Coordinate with existing efforts.
- Fund it! Programs to reduce barriers to employment and housing are required in this economy.

Strategy D7: Provide Services and Rental Subsidies for Permanent Supportive Housing

- Yes expand Get apartments on board to offer/accept vouchers.
- Some people with disabilities and age related diseases need our help--make it happen for their joy and ours.

- Is this like transitional housing? But instead of providing housing, the city helps pay for the rentals obtained?
- Under former President Bill Clinton, he introduced a program for those who wanted to get off welfare but needed help to enter the workforce. Upon intake inform applicants that the objective is to provide permanent housing. This act is huge to the spirit of a person (s) who were homeless. More cause to push self beyond the comfort zone. Several stages to conquer but the final result will turn the person state of mind from hopeless to hopeful.
- Support; particularly for scattered site PSH services.
- My landlord will NOT rent to outsiders who hold a Sec 8 voucher. So what good is having it if you can't find housing with it.
- Please do this around Los Angeles County and allow the housing to be affordable. Security can help with keeping things in order along with other professionals.
- Yes, but only for those who will always need support.
- Where is the money for a Safe Parking Program? We need to immediately start separating the RV'ers on our streets who need housing assistance from the rolling criminal enterprises. This is critical and glaringly absent from what I see above. Please, please allocate some of the Measure H money to this important initiative.
- Great solution.
- Through this funding line the County is committing to provide supportive services and retention funding to PSH units brought online by cities including the City of Los Angeles through Prop HHH. Can you please clarify how we can ensure matching between developers applying for Prop HHH capital funding and access to County supportive services and rental subsidies? Should we plan for joint application processes? Or can we coordinate timelines so that a developer could apply for the supportive services first? Will these details be outlined in a memorandum of understanding format with participating cities?
- A must, until the person no longer needs help.
- No. Impose rent ceilings on all apts. in LA county.
- PSH is touted as the solution - but I'm sorry - too many of the calls I receive for help are to assist a PSH provider needing to re-house an individual they placed in PSH, because he has severe addictive disorders or untreated mental illness and is severely disrupting the tenancy of others due to anti-social behavior. PSH needs to be viewed as in integral part of the long-term solution - but the investment in prevention is more prudent focusing upon fortifying distressed households and helping their children achieve whole person wellness if we are to see any radical change in the landscape of visible human suffering that is homelessness. (Liken the investment in prevention to the power of a holistic vaccine that can prevent - through its stabilizing interventions - the onset of depressive disorders, mental afflictions, self-medication leading to addictive disorders - all of which yields erratic behavior that inevitably leads to incarceration and

further entrenched marginalization - cascading into irreversible destitution and alienation that is homelessness.)

- Year 1 funding is too low. Though there will be a delay in the expansion of new units coming online via HHH, these funds could be used for scattered site approaches as well and should be expanded.
- Permanent supportive housing is needed for those whom have never lived on there own.
- The premise behind voters approving a city property tax hike and county sales tax hike to fund homeless housing/services was that we are in a crisis. Voters believe that the current degree of homelessness in our communities is a humanitarian crisis and one that reflects badly on our reputation as a good place to live and work. Therefore, the highest priority should be placed on getting people off the streets. The perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. We cannot wait the three to five years it is likely to take for costly permanent housing to be sited, constructed and occupied. We need to get everyone, who is willing, off the streets within the next year. We should treat this crisis similar to a natural disaster where we provide emergency shelter, food and medical care. In order to do this we need to direct Measure H funds into available resources including: - government buildings and properties — the city of L.A. owns 9,000 properties, including about 240 commercial buildings identified as "underutilized," and situated on land whose zoning allows housing as a use. - existing motels, some of which could be purchased much more quickly, and for less, than new construction. - publicly owned-land suitable for erecting pre-fabricated structures. In addition, the L.A. City Housing and Community Investment Department has reported a high 12%+ vacancy rate in LA's thousands of market-rate apartment units built in the past 10 years -- units sitting empty that people can't afford. We should use as much money as is available to tap these units for short-term rental. We strongly agree with Measure H committee member and Shelter Partnership leader Ruth Schwartz, who several days ago publicly called for a very high share of the Measure H services funds to go to rental costs to get people housed as soon as possible. Ruth Schwartz's proposal stood out among many fine ideas that must take second priority to moving those who are willing into shelter within one year.
- We strongly encourage this strategy to be expanded to include individuals who have already moved into housing and who agencies are retaining through private dollars.
- Yes, as I mentioned earlier I live in a Supportive Housing Complex, I can honestly say not one week has gone by in the 5 years I have lived at the Palo Verdi Apartments that I have not used the social and mental services, provided for residents.
- New Earth is in support of D7.
- We strongly encourage this strategy to be expanded to include individuals who have already moved into housing and who agencies are retaining through private dollars.
- No. Impose rent ceilings on all apts. in LA county.
- Los Angeles must be prudent spending the additional tax revenues generated by Measure H from its approximately 10.19 million constituents. Measure H is estimated to raise 322 million dollars annually or about \$127 dollars per family of four (from \$32 per capita from all tax revenue). The Strategy D7 funding request is very costly and continues to grow rapidly in cost over the years from \$17.3M in FY17-18 to \$64.6M in FY19-20. Providing permanent supportive housing gives little incentive to former homeless to live on their own without continued subsidies and societal support. It hides the homeless from public view

rather than addressing the underlying issues causing homelessness. Strategies for permanent housing should be eliminated from the plan. A Housing First approach may sound morally right initially, but it does not save Los Angeles money and endures the hardship of supporting former homeless on Los Angeles families and homeowners. The tax revenue generated by Measure H costs a family of four in Los Angeles entire one month of groceries annually. Housing First strategies are primarily commissioned by biased parties involved in homelessness. The Housing First papers are flawed and do not provide a holistic comparison of actual cost. Many include billed medical cost versus collected medical cost (typically <60% of billed medical cost are collected); police enforcement cost (which are not a hard cost; the number of police are not reduced as homeless are housed); all supportive (volunteered) cost; housing and medical cost from extending the lifespan of a former homeless, and/or do not continue to account for police enforcement, incarceration cost, or medical cost post housing. The best approach to end homelessness is to prevent homelessness before it happens. A portion of the funds allocated to strategy D7 should be used to support extremely low income households (30% AMI) and homeless in: job training and placement, temporary employer incentives for hiring homeless, family planning services, basic financial planning services to encourage saving for emergencies, and relocation assistance to other parts of the state or nation where homeless may have family/friends or where jobs are available. In addition, the funds should be used for a rainy-day fund for the next recession when there may be an influx of homeless needing support. Although the following may not be in the immediate control or purview of Los Angeles homeless agencies, homeless agencies and the Los Angeles County Supervisors should encourage: promoting job creation at state and local levels, streamlining the building and permitting process to reduce building cost, and ending rent stabilization ordinances to encourage landowners to build more housing. Job training and placement is a critical to preventing homelessness. The job training and placement should be for jobs of the future. These jobs include skilled jobs requiring manual dexterity such as agricultural work (e.g. picking fruit), landscaping, and janitorial services; or highly skilled jobs such as robotics, big data, and artificial intelligence. Employers should be incentivized to hire homeless by providing a temporary subsidy (e.g. \$3/hr for 3 months) to the employer to help the person become accustomed to their new job. Please help support eliminating RSO to help encourage RSO landlords to invest in our community. Â Los Angeles's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) was enacted in 1979 in Los Angeles and has not keep cost down for most tenants. Over the last 40 years, it has taken and prevented units from being available in the rental market. Providing stable housing availability helps prevent homelessness by keeping rental prices low for everyone in Los Angeles. Â RSO has not helped with the availability of housing and create[s] financial disincentives for owners to invest in maintenance and capital improvement of their units as per the Economic Study of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance and the Los Angeles Housing Market as prepared for the City of Los Angeles Housing Department (HCIDLA). Only a third of RSO owners say they would still acquire their rent-stabilized property today, a plurality say they would not buy it again, while a quarter are uncertain. RSO owners are a disenfranchised minority. If we do not support RSO landlords, our communities' investors, they will continue to appropriate their resources and funds on other non-Los Angeles housing endeavors further exacerbating the housing crisis.

- Housing is just the beginning, keeping people housed and providing support services is imperative and many times difficult. Physical health, mental health and substance abuse services are needed.
- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County (CCALAC) is supportive of this strategy to provide services for permanent supportive housing tenants. We recommend for lead agencies to partner with community clinics to provide comprehensive health services for tenants.
- We need investment in long-term solutions, especially when the key outcome of this process is helping our homeless neighbors make it home. We, at PATH, agree that D7 should be one of the Core Measure H

Strategies, but investment in local rental subsidies and services for permanent supportive housing should be increased. As the only strategy providing long-term housing supports for chronically homeless individuals, the investment is critical to achieving and maintaining the potential success of Measure H.

- This amount - especially when compared to money going to emergency and bridge housing - is way too little. It seems that the funding from Measure H is being focused on emergency, rather than permanent solutions. With the CES system in place, we are now taking people with the highest acuity in our buildings. This is putting increasing pressure and stress on staff. We are under resourced, both in terms of caseload and also skill set to deal with a high needs and aging population. There needs to be much more focus on PSH and what is required for success and retention - including building the capacity of organizations, adding services and ensuring rental subsidies. I feel we have returned to a former time when emergency solutions were given more importance than permanent housing.
- Consider the specialized needs of victims of trauma for these specialized services, especially victims of sex and labor trafficking. Also consider the specific needs of immigration trafficking families who are reunited with family members abroad and may need additional supportive housing support when this happens.
- Services for existing PSH are drastically underfunded, and some are funded through short term grants with no opportunity for renewal. We are highly recommending that an assessment of this gap is completed and strongly suggest that we ramp this funding area to fill the existing gap, while setting aside revenue for new PSH. Agencies are leveraging CES housing navigators for PSH services, and cannot continue to both house new clients and provide the necessary support to ensure retention without adequate funding. 2015 COC PSH provides hardly any service dollars. Align with COC reallocation of RRH to PSH. Some individuals and families are residing in nontraditional PSH - shared, B&C, and require longer term services to ensure success. The CES flat file (client prioritization list) shows a majority of individuals with a VI-SPDAT score over 8, indicating that many of the individuals assessed need PSH. The gap analysis demonstrated a gap for PSH for families. Rather than fund more RRH, let's fund the intervention prescribed that has proven to be successful.
- A survey of 9 PSH providers revealed a range of challenges using the CES system. Providers report the need for additional staffing and funding to address supportive service needs for new high acuity CES referrals. PSH providers also report significant turnover among CES referrals due to the lack of staff capacity and retention resources. Recommendation: Invest in improved and expanded supportive services for existing PSH. This strategy is vital to the long-term success of the County Homelessness Initiative and the region's collective ability to end homelessness for those that have been able to locate and secure PSH. Yet so many of our existing site-based PSH communities that are now required to accept CES referrals are simply not equipped with sufficient on-site, retention services. The little these developers can squeeze out of their operating budgets to support a resident services coordinator or case manager is not sufficient for this new challenge of serving high acuity residents; in some of the oldest PSH buildings, that may not even allow for a full-time staff member to be on-site 5 days a week. As a result, residential stability is being compromised and the capacity of our PSH operators is being stretched too thin. As the County has coordinated to dedicate the right level of supportive services for new PSH developments opening up each year, they should also view the existing stock of PSH as a ripe and equally important opportunity to leverage the County's physical health, mental health, and substance abuse treatment services to provide a more robust, on-site supportive services package that can better promote recovery and stability for the most vulnerable residents.

Strategy E6: Countywide Outreach System

- Don't we have this already?
- I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the funding of any law enforcement activities via the Measure H revenue funds. As a registered voter in LA County, you courted me, called me, sent me post cards and begged me to show up to vote to tax myself to end homelessness on March 7th. And I did so willingly, because I believe that everyone deserves a home. I voted yes on Measure H on March 7th in order to get the much needed funding resources to end homelessness. I voted YES ON H for housing, not law enforcement. At a recent Measure H revenue planning meeting, as part of County Strategy E6, the LA County Sheriff's Department requested \$1,245,305 for the "Expansion of Sheriff's Department Homeless Services Team". The justification was that the Sheriff's Department is often called to respond to many encampment situations and that "due to the lack of resources, there have been significant challenges regarding follow up on many homeless encampments including the lack of follow up after a homeless encampment clean-up". As an LA County voter, I reject this justification. The LA County Sheriff's Department regularly receives tons of money for their annual budget because the people of LA value "public safety". As such, they should be able to redirect some of their existing budget to help "serve and protect" the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness. As leaders of the Homeless Initiative you are smart and you know smart people. You literally have just convinced the voters of LA County to tax themselves to end homelessness. I feel sure you can sit down with the Sheriff's Department and help them make some systemic changes to their existing budget that will allow them to fully join the rest of the County as true partners in ending homelessness. I urge you to remove all funding directed at any law enforcement agency, including Sheriff's Departments and Local Police Departments, from the Measure H Revenue allocation. As it exists there is not enough money to fully fund the housing and services that our homeless neighbors need, please do not move forward with funding law enforcement. (13 responses)
- As stated before as long as the program remains consistent, strong, line of communication with regional and local the outreach program will create strong roots. However, this can only be done by not allowing one person with the "power" Communication is the key. Town hall meetings, Media, social network, radio station, missions, salvation army, Goodwill, newspapers and definitely local and national advocacy organizations, such as Peer To Peer Empowerment Group. I founded this organization in 2014. My own plug.
- DO NOT FUND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES WITH THIS STRATEGY (or any of the other strategies). Please please please do not use Measure H dollars to provide funding to law enforcement. If law enforcement is serious about being a partner in ending homelessness then please work with them to understand how they might be align some of their existing budget to support the work to end homelessness, but please do not use my tax payer dollars focused on ending homelessness to fund law enforcement related activities.
- This concerns us because it does not seem to consider or acknowledge locally-based outreach teams with their own networks with law enforcement and support networks. Glendale has had an outreach team for 20 years. Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank have PET or MET teams. Under this proposed system, what takes priority, the program supervisor of our agency, or the SPA outreach coordinator? Also, how are incoming calls balanced with ongoing work and commitments to people we are already serving on the streets? I would like to add another outreach time for our area, but I want them reporting to our sub-region, not the whole SPA. We recommend a two-track system, where LAHSA or regional teams field the 211 calls, but strategically coordinates with existing local outreach efforts. Also, we get calls directly to us, including the Executive Director, not via 211. And we have to be accountable to those stakeholders, so that

will take priority over a 211 referral. Finally, we have particular issues related to the LA River that we would like to continue to pursue. How does that fit with this strategy?

- Outreach with services...not just shelter services.
- Please make it a priority.
- Creates bottle neck effect.
- I urge you to remove all funding directed at any law enforcement agency, including Sheriff's Departments and Local Police Departments, from the Measure H Revenue allocation.
- Funding should go directly to housing not policing.
- Most cities, including Los Angeles, now have dedicated law enforcement outreach teams. Please consider how E6 multidisciplinary teams can be leveraged and coordinated with these law enforcement teams. A crucial element of law enforcement engagement is having the civilian teams "show up" when needed with a sense of dependability. We must ensure that teams funded through E6 overcome historical clinical biases against law enforcement and in the area of homelessness consider them a 24-hour response partner, a valuable resource to leverage. For L.A., we would like LAHSA workers CBO outreach workers funded to partner with our Homeless Outreach and Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Teams. The City is investing close to \$20M in general funds for City departments to support outreach efforts and we would like to leverage these services with E6.
- Mobile teams, with vans, stocked with food, medicine, blankets, soap, personal care products of all kinds? With social workers and others to encourage people to come in off the streets? Yes.
- Seek out homeless camps, transition them into treatment and stable affordable housing.
- Utilize organizations like Community of Friends, Housing Works, Ocean Park Community Center, UCLA/VA Family Resource & Wellbeing Center, others.
- The Little Tokyo community has been overlooked in homeless outreach support. Located in SPA 4 and next to Skid Row, the community have been dramatically impacted by the homeless crisis. Residents, business-owners, patrons, workers, and other stakeholders in Little Tokyo have expressed concerns around safety and quality of life. Because the city does not see Little Tokyo as having a homeless issue, the community is left on its own to figure it out. The community wants to be part of resolving the homeless issue but needs the support of the city and local representatives. Help empower our community by funding and supporting the outreach efforts in Little Tokyo.
- Funding should be made available to support an outreach team that can work with people experiencing homelessness in Little Tokyo. We have learned that service providers, staff at the County and LAHSA generally are under the impression that there is no homelessness "problem" in Little Tokyo. This is not true. There are a number of homeless people who reside in Little Tokyo in various locations, and a larger number of individuals that may reside elsewhere but frequent Little Tokyo regularly during the day and on weekends. This includes many individuals who have experienced mental health issues, sometimes violent, that have impacted residents and business owners in Little Tokyo. Many residents of Little Tokyo are

seniors, and there have been several instances of assault and injuries sustained by senior residents, break-ins and homeless individuals spending the night inside buildings such as Little Tokyo Service Center's affordable housing building and offices - "Casa Heiwa" at 231 E. Third Street - the Teramachi senior condominium building on 3rd and San Pedro Streets, and at various temples such as the Higashi Hongwanji also on 3rd Street. Many businesses have been impacted as well by aggressive panhandling in front of or inside their store or restaurant, people having psychotic incidents in stores or restaurants, and some property damage. Little Tokyo Service Center is a multi-service nonprofit with some experience providing services to homeless individuals, and is interested in developing a neighborhood-based outreach effort in Little Tokyo in coordination with the Countywide outreach system, to help serve as a connector between homeless individuals in Little Tokyo with housing and services in the area. We have been convening conversations with local stakeholders, including residents, business owners, nonprofit institutions and there is a desire to collaborate in a neighborhood-based approach to addressing the issue in close coordination with Countywide systems and services. With funding support and collaboration with other service providers, Many in Little Tokyo desires to contribute to helping homeless individuals enter housing and receive services, and to address concerns of residents and business owners in a positive, productive way. To do this, we request to be included in funding to expand outreach, and to be included in Countywide and SPA 4 service collaborations.

- New Earth is in strong support of a countywide outreach system.
- Haven Hills calls for support in implementing a domestic violence (DV) training component in outreach efforts, including training coordinators to understand the dynamics of DV, and to learn to assess a survivor and direct individuals through the appropriate channels for support.
- This strategy requires greater transparency of how the \$19.3M to 36.4M requested annually will be spent. In FY19-20, strategy E6 requests over one hundred (116) various personnel (58 personnel and an additional 58 "multi-disciplinary teams"). It is not clear what the specific role and purpose of these individuals will be and how their time will be spent. Why is a significant increase in spending year over year required for coordination if measure H will end homelessness? Please do not fund this strategy without greater public transparency and additional public comments.
- Homeless outreach in Little Tokyo is very important and needed desperately. Many people (including City & County dept staff!) feel that Little Tokyo does not have an issue with homelessness. However, according to many stakeholders, there are far more people experiencing homelessness in Little Tokyo than just a few years ago. Also there is a sharp increase in the number of negative incidents between homeless folks and other community members. We have a strong need for staff who can connect these folks to services and case management.
- There is only funding for 30 community based outreach workers in this strategy. Why aren't more dollars going directly into communities for agencies to do neighborhood-specific outreach? Outreach is most effective when workers have the opportunity to build long-term relationship with the people they are meeting on the streets.

Strategy E7: Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System

- Strengthen our neighbor to neighbor coordination, too!

- I'm not sure what this is, but if it's a tracking system across counties it would be helpful to share info.
- Assignment of people who are experienced in areas of working with diversity. Knowledge of the community, flexibility, infrastructure, global knowledge of culture difference. Maintaining platforms by knowing who you are and where you want to be. Morning gatherings at the site for our local stations, once a month meeting with our regional members and quarterly meetings with Nationwide. Communication and maintenance of operations build the environment.
- Not sure what this entails.
- Too much system, too little connection to local communities. Glad to see that Access Centers are back in favor. Please note that people who are not "street homeless" also use Access Centers. This strategy should have started with the Access Centers and flowed from there. "Regional Coordination" is not specifically defined.
- This is a great idea. Example, a number of guys in the jail want to go back to the work they were doing before substances and alcohol over powered their lives.
- There are many components to a successful CES system. Please include operating funding for the CES leads to support the various coordinating functions. LAHSA received significant administration funding to build its capacity and now we must invest the same way with our regional CES organizations.
- Having good records is important, no?
- Needed - but even more needed is Coordinated Prevention from entering into the system altogether - focus upon fortifying our distressed households to keep them more resilient, stably housed and intact =- and prevent their displacement and the acute distress that also may put their children at risk of protective placement in foster care - almost a death sentence when you look at the radical over-representation of foster children in our jails, homeless services industry and on the streets.
- This funding seems too high unless it is actually adding housing or housing subsidy resources to CES, which I don't think it is. Our internal coordination and wait list processes should not be funded at higher amounts than direct housing and services - such as prevention services, services for TAY, others.
- Most definitely needed, I have been in their system since 2010, and have yet to be connected to housing.
- We recommend this funding be used to create additional case management capacity (new FTE's) and create more access centers/access points for CES. Outreach is not effective without a place to take people. Current case management waitlists are long, and Access Centers are at capacity. We need additional capacity in the middle and end of the system -- making the front door bigger is not effective on its own.
- New Earth is in strong support in strengthening the coordinated entry system so that opportunity youth have the access they need for housing and employment.

- Haven Hills calls for stronger domestic violence (DV), homeless services, and supportive services coordination within the CES. DV agencies are underrepresented in the CES due to a lack of understanding of how each system operates and the needs of DV survivors. There needs to be a dedicated lead and system within the CES to coordinate services and provide DV survivors with direct access to housing and financial assistance to maintain housing; while acknowledging DV-specific considerations such as safety needs, child care, emotional support, and greater legal issues.
- HASC supports this strategy to strengthen the Coordinate Entry System (CES) across all the SPA's in order to improve the coordination of services for the chronically homeless and chronically mentally, including funding for navigator assistance to ensure the delivery of needed services that is geographically distributed.
- This strategy requires greater transparency of how the \$26.6M to 35.1M requested annually will be spent. For example: How many Regional Liaisons will be hired for \$695,000 in FY17-18? Why do the salaries of 30 housing locators cost \$3,060,000 (\$102,000 annual compensation)? People with realtor experience in Los Angeles can be found for between \$33,000 and \$82,000 per Glassdoor.com All financial assistance (e.g. used for paying bills, housing, groceries) for families at risk of homelessness below 50% AMI should be provided in the form of low-interest microloans to help recuperate cost and to create a self-sustaining program. Microloans have had great success in Africa to help individuals and families succeed by "giving hope, not handouts". Total lifetime outstanding microloans across all programs for families should be limited to no more than 8% of the 50% AMI as per the household's size. Recuperating cost via microloans will allow the county of Los Angeles to serve more individuals at risk of homelessness. Microloans may also help prevent fraud and abuse of this strategy. To further reduce the risk of fraud, individuals should be verified accordingly to DRAFT NIST Special Publication 800-63A Identity Assurance Level 3 standards or better for services (similar to obtaining a personal loan from a bank). Although the following may not be in the immediate control or purview of this working group, the Los Angeles County Supervisors and homeless agencies should encourage:
 - promoting job creation at state and local levels, Overall, the funding request items are not specific and need further clarification. Please do not fund this strategy without greater public transparency and additional public comments.
- We request more dollars for access centers and staff members who administer the CES assessments.
- Needed - but even more needed is Coordinated Prevention from entering into the system altogether - focus upon fortifying our distressed households to keep them more resilient, stably housed and intact =- and prevent their displacement and the acute distress that also may put their children at risk of protective placement in foster care - almost a death sentence when you look at the radical overrepresentation of foster children in our jails, homeless services industry and on the streets.
- This funding seems too high unless it is actually adding housing or housing subsidy resources to CES, which I don't think it is. Our internal coordination and wait list processes should not be funded at higher amounts than direct housing and services - such as prevention services, services for TAY, others.
- Most definitely needed, I have been in their system since 2010, and have yet to be connected to housing.

- We recommend this funding be used to create additional case management capacity (new FTE's) and create more access centers/access points for CES. Outreach is not effective without a place to take people. Current case management waitlists are long, and Access Centers are at capacity. We need additional capacity in the middle and end of the system -- making the front door bigger is not effective on its own.
- New Earth is in strong support in strengthening the coordinated entry system so that opportunity youth have the access they need for housing and employment.
- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles County (CCALAC) is supportive of strengthening the Coordinated Entry System (CES). Under this strategy, we agree with developing a training academy and technical assistance for CES agencies. With additional training and resources, more clinics could become CES certified partners and become entry points for supportive services. We recommend more resources to be dedicated in building more robust regional coordination, such as more partnerships between housing locators/navigators with clinics. Clinics are often challenged with treating people who are experiencing homelessness because they may not be able to adhere to a treatment plan or have somewhere to store their medications. In addition, clinics may not have the resources to connect individuals to housing resources. Funding to create these linkages between housing and health would benefit vulnerable patients.
- Implementation of the local initiative will cause a very fast and significant influx of dollars for community based organizations. This fast influx of resources requires rapid agency expansion, and, in many cases, exponential organizational growth. Based on our significant growth over the past several years, PATH recognizes that rapid growth is not simple and expanded capacity with high quality infrastructure is necessary to support the swift implementation of new and complex programming. As recognized in E7s justification, capacity assistance for agencies is necessary to ensure successful implementation of the programming discussed throughout the funding request. While we appreciate the acknowledgment of this integral aspect of successful Measure H implementation, the funding level for capacity building areas should be increased.
- Providence supports this strategy to strengthen the Coordinate Entry System (CES) across all the SPA's in order to improve the coordination of services for the chronically homeless and special population, including funding for navigator assistance to ensure the delivery of needed services that is geographically distributed.
- Although we greatly appreciate the specific dollars that will be allocated to TAY-focused programming under Strategy E14, we recommend that all strategies have a specific lens to ensure that they are meeting the needs of our County's homeless population, including those who identify as LGBT. Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers as their needs are significantly different, so we would like to stress the importance of fully funding E14 and, also, other strategies where funding for TAY is set aside. Further, we request that for each strategy that has services targeted for youth including strengthening CES and expanding housing navigation (E7), the specific details of that focus, including what funds will be allocated towards youth populations be specified and provided to the public. As communities have been participating in CES for a few years now, we've developed by-name lists and people have expressed interest in services. However, we simply do not have enough housing navigators, and therefore those in need can sometimes sit on the CES "waiting list" until a housing navigator has capacity. We need more housing navigation boots on the ground and those services

should not be segmented from outreach. What was the request reduced from 180 new hires to 124? Also, Outreach and navigation works better if there is continuity of care from street to home. While we support any effort to enhance collaboration between the different CBOs and governmental agencies serving the homeless (including DV victims), we do not see any money being provided through this strategy to DV providers. If the CES system were to prove hugely successful and referrals were appropriately made to DV agencies to provide supportive services and housing coordination for DV victims, how would the DV agencies increase their capacity to serve these increasing numbers of victims? DV agencies are currently strapped for money and their programs are already at capacity -- they are limited by both staffing and sometimes by the repair needs of their shelters to house more victims. Without money going to the DV provider agency, they will not see an increase in their ability to serve these new victims being referred to them. Our current MOU with our local CES agency does not include any money for serving DV victims being referred by the lead agency.

- On behalf of the Executive Committee of the City of Los Angeles Domestic Violence Task Force, we offer the following comments regarding Measure H funding/Strategy E7: According to coordinated Entry System for Los Angeles: Lessons from Early Implementation an evaluation of the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation Chronic Homelessness Initiative prepared in May, 2015 Coordinated entry is an approach to ending homelessness that requires comprehensive coordination of all housing and service resources in a community to better match people experiencing homelessness to appropriate permanent housing placements. Following this approach, both the County and the City are relying on CES as a means of coordinating newly formed homeless strategies and programs developed as part of their larger initiatives. Disturbingly, a large percentage of those experiencing homelessness are victims fleeing domestic violence - are excluded from accessing CES and therefore excluded from the benefits it provides. Pursuant to VAWA, domestic violence service providers are prevented from disclosing personally identifying information about their clients. Underlying this prohibition are very real concerns about client safety and the need to maintain and secure confidentiality. Accordingly, as presently organized, CES burdens victims fleeing domestic violence with a choice of either maintaining safety and confidentiality or accessing resources. This is unfair. We understand that the County has purchased a new HMIS system. Unfortunately, incorporating victims fleeing domestic violence into this system in a safe manner was not an issue considered when a new system was chosen. Therefore, as LAHSA works to modernize CES, victims of domestic violence are again left out. In Multnomah County, Oregon, domestic violence and sexual assault victims use a separate system that is essentially a mirror of the system used for the rest of the homeless population. This permits those clients to retain safety while simultaneously allowing the County to collect and analyze data in a way that is meaningful with regards to assessing need and measuring success. This also permits Multnomah to utilize a standardized entry system for domestic violence and sexual assault housing so that the available units can be efficiently utilized. We request that adequate funding is set aside to develop and implement a CES system for domestic violence, sexual assault and trafficking victims. Funds are needed to conduct research on a workable system, including analysis of systems used in other jurisdictions. Funds are also needed so that the new CES system can work in a way that includes victims of domestic violence. Whether this means the development of a mirror-type system or the development of a means of participation through coded confidential identifiers, we seek to prevent the introduction of a new system that, at its inception, is already missing an integral part.
- Make the services and resources available more transparent.
- We support and encourage the plan to establish DV Liaisons within each SPA. However, some SPA's are quite large and others have a high concentration of homeless persons. While a lot of effort and

funding is going towards housing navigators, and even towards multi-disciplinary teams, how can we ensure that these teams and navigators understand trauma, and how to work directly with traumatized persons? There is a lot of training and education that needs to happen to ensure the safety and stability of survivors as they navigate the coordinated entry system. There is no centralized, systematic tracking in place now to measure how much time it takes for an individual/family/youth to be placed in housing once they are matched to housing at the SPA level. Moreover, there is no consensus goal around how long the match to lease-up process should take. There is a need for accountability to ensure that the system is functioning optimally and that the housing placement phase is as brief as possible. Providers report the need for greater program structure, guidelines, and clearer roles and responsibilities of system parties to ensure that the CES system can more effectively house and serve high acuity households. Recommendation: Ensure that CES enhancements and capacity building include PSH operators as well as promote greater accountability and efficiency in the match to lease-up phase. In reviewing the narrative accompanying this funding request, and in light of the research above, it is unsettling to see that the entire scope of system enhancement appears to exclude the PSH development community, as if to suggest that they are not part of the CES system, even though they are required to house the highest acuity referrals in available PSH with no extra financial support or training. Any investment in the CES system must recognize the anchor role that these organizations play in ending homelessness and helping individuals and families thrive and not recidivate. In addition to expanding the system's front-end there should be a parallel investment in strengthening the capacity of the PSH operators as well as of the public agency staff responsible for vetting client eligibility and keeping the system moving. Any technical assistance or training component of this strategy should encompass their role. PSH operators and SPA-level navigators need cross-education to maximize their success. Given the timeliness concerns we have observed around site-based lease-ups, this strategy should focus on building out the program structure, creating a user guide accessible for all system parties, creating work flow targets for the match to lease-up phase, and better measurement and evaluation of the system's performance, especially as it relates to housing placement.

- We applaud the plan to establish regional liaisons for DV, IPV in each SPA and one centralized DV coordinator for the County. Given the prevalence of DV, and close association with homelessness, one centralized for the entire county seems inadequate. We suggest there by a separate centralized coordinator focused on human trafficking since such victims are also homeless. Of the proposed \$8,691,000 to hire approximately 124 housing navigators throughout the County, how many of these navigators will be specific to DV, SA and HT? We suggest that within each SPA a minimum number of navigators exclusively serve victims.
- This money should NOT all go to LAHSA. Part of these resources should go to CSH for capacity building, and an independent facilitator to help work on the bureaucracy with implementing new systems. Capacity building is not a strength of LAHSA, neither is it something they have done well over the past decade. In addition, the CEO Office should fund the provider(s) who is providing the capacity building.

Strategy E8: Enhance the Emergency Shelter System

- As long as all buildings are safe and can survive rain, flooding, earthquakes; up to date on permits.
- Everyone needs to know where to go in emergency situations and where emergency water, food, and sleeping area will be--keep preparing for the worst while we enjoy the best of single life, church families, family relations and friends.

- YES. There are not nearly enough beds for the times it's storming, freezing cold or sweltering heat...
- Seek the needs of current shelters. First work with shelters that are working but need additional funds, space, items, and food. Shelters work with our homeless daily. Current Shelters that are working being the and build upon what we have.
- Shelters do not seem to be chosen by those who need it most - drug and alcohol addicts and the mentally ill homeless.
- Shelter programs in cities other than Los Angeles will need some help from the County in trying to expand operating hours and upgrading facilities that meet the needs of our clients beyond the weather related shelter.
- Yes - no one - not LAHSA, the City or the County - has ever committed to a system-wide number of year-round shelter beds. Stop being afraid of the criticism and set a number! I would start with a conservative number and see how it might need to grow. Also, drop the winter shelter standards. They are terrible. The fixed bed night rate forces the creation of mass shelter that is not welcomed in neighborhoods, not good to manage, and not popular among homeless people. Promote more smaller-scale, geographically dispersed models that do not overwhelm communities, but rather give them a fighting chance to actually end the homelessness of the people who use them.
- We need more beds and better services in emergency shelters. There is often a waiting list and the facilities are less than adequate.
- Please make this a year round project and allow the responsible clients to run the shelters for food and bed if they are on GR. Their need something to do in the course of a day instead of being let out at seven in the morning.
- The shelters should not close seasonally.
- We need thousands of beds, not dozens.
- Extremely important and I recommend that the funding amount, be kept at its now high levels. Need to get people off the streets and into case management services where possible while we go through the long and arduous process of getting PSH units built.
- Please ensure there is enough funding for crisis and bridge housing to operate with new minimum standards such as acceptance of companion animals, opposite and same-sex partners, onsite case management, and increased nutritious food options. Many people do not want to "come inside" because our current supply of crisis and bridge housing is not acceptable. If we are going to house the most vulnerable, we must have interim, safe places with minimum rules for them to reside. As a former shelter provider, I volunteer to sit on any committee to help identify shelter standards for the region.
- Why is crisis and bridge housing one-year funding only? There will be an ongoing need, and these items are facing cuts in the City budget as well.

- Yes for Youth and adults
- First and foremost, I want to complement the LA County Homeless Initiative for its comprehensive approach to the issue of homelessness and their dedication to effective solutions. Your leadership in addressing the homeless situation in LA County is exemplary and will prove to be a model others will emulate. In 2016 we were contacted by the City of LA and asked what it would take for LA to have a program like Dignity on Wheels, an initiative of Project WeHOPE that provides showers and laundry service to the homeless on a mobile platform. We subsequently visited with the City of LA and LAHSA on more than one occasion and were recently requested to respond to a LAHSA RFI regarding mobile showers and laundry. Regarding, in particular, our attendance of the Measure H Web meeting on Tuesday April 24 and in particular “Strategy E-8 - Creating a Coordinated System - Providing Temporary Hygiene Services”, we direct you to the following background and comments. We, at Project WeHOPE (Helping Other People Excel) (“PWH”), have been deeply involved with the underserved of East Palo Alto (CA) since 1999 and have run a homeless shelter since 2009. We have been acknowledged by the County of San Mateo as doing a superior job of satisfying the needs of our clients and last year California Senator Jerry Hill recognized PWH as his nonprofit for the year. Our contribution to the LA County Homeless Initiative is Dignity on Wheels, our mobile showers and laundry solution which we launched in 2015.

It is our belief that without a clean body and clean clothes, the homeless, no different than those of us with housing, feel embarrassed by their physical condition and quickly become disempowered and reluctant to engage in any significant way with normal society. After serving the homeless in Redwood City with Dignity on Wheels for just five months, San Mateo County Supervisor Warren Slocum said “the demeanor of the homeless in Redwood City has radically altered as a result of the presence of Dignity on Wheels”. Our goal is to assist in returning dignity to the homeless through the use of mobile showers and laundry allowing us them to address their other needs through case management. When addressing the homeless phenomena, it has been postulated that the cost to contribute to the housing of the homeless is cost effective relative to the cost of frequent visits the homeless make to the Emergency Room (“ER”). We understand this position and support the idea of reducing visits the homeless make to the ER. But, what is it that reduces the ER visits? Is it that they are now housed? Or, is it that because they are housed, they have access to showers and laundry that results in their radically improved hygiene?

We believe that being clean and having clean clothes: 1) changes the homeless’ person’s demeanor – they no longer feel like pariahs of society; they regain the dignity they deserve as human beings. Not only will the homeless engage more in causing a change in their circumstance but they will also be more engagable! In fact, an article in Nursing 2017 concluded that “an opportunity to shower improves patients’ receptiveness to services”. 2) the change in their hygiene keeps them from contracting diseases and infections that in their other state would go largely unnoticed and uncared for. We believe that with the ability to shower and launder their clothes, the homeless feel more deserving and comfortable receiving medical care and therefore make themselves available for routine medical appointments. A quick survey of the homeless that frequent the ER will likely prove out that the unsheltered homeless are the ones more likely to wait until the last minute to address their medical issues and therefore be the ones to over utilize the ER. In addition, we have found that the homeless become more inclined to do more for themselves as noted by one of our clients in San Jose who after showering and putting on clean clothes said, “Now I can go for that job interview!”. Case management in conjunction with the showers and laundry will encourage the freshly washed and laundered homeless clients utilize available job training resources and take advantage of employment opportunities. We understand that the City of LA alone has some 28,000 homeless individuals, 21,000 of whom are unsheltered. In listening to the webinar on Tuesday, it was evident that the homeless who benefit from the majority of the current strategies will be the 25% who are

sheltered. We can not overemphasize that we believe that showers and laundry are essential services that the unsheltered homeless (75% of the homeless population) in the City of LA desperately need to preserve their health and return to them a sense of dignity. We also believe that the \$1m (see footnote 1.) proposed for safe parking (see footnote 2.) and mobile showers and laundry is not adequate to address this need. We are available and look forward to discussing our program to see how we can partner with the LA County Homeless Initiative for a even brighter outcome for the homeless. W. Morris Chubb | Board Chair email: mchubb@projectwehope.com direct line: 650-269-1375 | fax: 650-745-0936 Footnotes: 1. Less than 0.3% of the annual budget of \$354m 2. Safe parking needs the component of showers and laundry as well.

- The premise behind voters approving a city property tax hike and county sales tax hike to fund homeless housing/services was that we are in a crisis. Voters believe that the current degree of homelessness in our communities is a humanitarian crisis and one that reflects badly on our reputation as a good place to live and work. Therefore, the highest priority should be placed on getting people off the streets. The perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. We cannot wait the three to five years it is likely to take for costly permanent housing to be sited, constructed and occupied. We need to get everyone, who is willing, off the streets within the next year. We should treat this crisis similar to a natural disaster where we provide emergency shelter, food and medical care. In order to do this we need to direct Measure H funds into available resources including: - government buildings and properties — the city of L.A. owns 9,000 properties, including about 240 commercial buildings identified as "underutilized," and situated on land whose zoning allows housing as a use. - existing motels, some of which could be purchased much more quickly, and for less, than new construction. - publicly owned-land suitable for erecting pre-fabricated structures. In addition, the L.A. City Housing and Community Investment Department has reported a high 12%+ vacancy rate in LA's thousands of market-rate apartment units built in the past 10 years -- units sitting empty that people can't afford. We should use as much money as is available to tap these units for short-term rental. We strongly agree with Measure H committee member and Shelter Partnership leader Ruth Schwartz, who several days ago publicly called for a very high share of the Measure H services funds to go to rental costs to get people housed as soon as possible. Ruth Schwartz's proposal stood out among many fine ideas that must take second priority to moving those who are willing into shelter within one year.
- New Earth is in support of enhancing the emergency shelter system.
- Haven Hills calls for dedicated funding to support additional and extended stays for emergency and bridge housing beds for survivors of domestic violence (DV). Survivors of DV are faced with unique and complex barriers to housing due to increased safety needs, responsiveness, PTSD, child care needs, isolation, or greater emotional support. The current housing systems require permanent housing placement after 90-120 days, a time frame that is often too short for survivors who are working through complex emotional issues that require more time to heal and work towards becoming self-sufficient.
- Supports expansion of shelter operation to 24/7.
- Regarding strategy E8, Emergency Shelter System should be limited to a finite period of days per client (e.g. 30 days). Overall, the cost per bed per night is concerning ranging from \$30-\$50 for LAHSA and \$59 to \$155 for DHS/DMH. The true variable cost per occupied rooms for hotels are typically \$12 per room night for a budget property to approximately \$75 for a world-class hotel (<http://lodgingmagazine.com/what-are-your-true-variable-costs-per-occupied-room/>). The cost per bed through the homeless initiatives appear significantly higher than most hotels. I would suggest contracting with existing budget hotels to house homeless as an alternative solution by occupying excess capacity at

a reduced cost to the County of LA or identifying and implementing cost efficiencies for shelter beds like the hotel business.

- Where is the strategy for the newly proposed 93 M 1 year cost?
- I find it outrageous that LA County doesn't have year around "shelters". Further, because we live in a temperate climate, we could have outdoor "shelters" all over the city, ie No construction costs, and they could be open and in use in 90 days from today . These would be places that people without housing/lodging/etc could go, legally camp, that are NOT ON THE SIDEWALKS. They could have port- a-potties, drinking water, outdoor shower areas, trash cans available, a tented nurses station, tents for social workers, etc. There are many city/county/state owned lots that are being either used as parking lots, or rented to nurseries or marble slab companies, and they are often not immediately in the middle of a residential neighborhood. One such location is off of Pico and Sawtelle, where the 405 or 10 goes over. Certainly there could be safe camping for over 100 individuals, plus their pets there, and if given the chance I could personally identify at least 50 more places in the County that would work as "temporary outdoor emergency shelters". And once we create a network of outdoor shelters, the police and neighborhoods could enforce the no camping on the sidewalks laws. I have recently read in the NY Times that Mayor DiBlasio is opening 90 new shelters citywide in NYC. Berlin had no trouble immediately absorbing thousands of refugees in airplane hangers, etc., without building a single new building. This is what's done in an emergency....immediate action. In fact, LA seems to be the only place anywhere that doesn't provide temporary emergency spaces for people to legally find refuge.....there are camps for internally displaced people all across the world.....what is wrong with LA to be so slow to provide camping spaces that are NOT on the sidewalks , or in the middle of residential neighborhoods. This is outrageous, both for residents and property owners, and for the homeless. Further, by allowing near anarchy in the neighborhood sidewalks and streets, the situation where I live (3rd and Rose in Venice) is simply out of control, largely with young travelers . My friends in the neighborhood have been physically attacked (John Frane), and the smell and human waste is a threat to our health. Many of these travelers don't mind camping, so let's give them asap some places to camp with facilities, and some order, and help us regain civility and safety in our neighborhood NOW.
- Imperative and must be linked to mental health, physical health and substance abuse services.
- Again - that the emergency shelter system is receiving \$56 Million annually vs PSH which is receiving \$17 Million is more than frustrating. We need more and better services at PSH.
- Domestic violence (DV) services are homeless prevention services. Domestic violence is not just a public safety issue, it is a housing issue. "Fleeing DV" is included in the HUD definition of homelessness. However, Los Angeles' homeless services do not meet the needs of victims of domestic violence as they are not designed to address the unique trauma DV survivors experience. Transitional housing is designed specifically to meet the needs of domestic violence survivors and must be included under the E8 strategy. With DV Transitional Housing programs facing reduction of their HUD Continuum of Care funding this year, the County needs to protect transitional housing for DV survivors, not just emergency shelters. Transitional housing offers more than housing and provides wrap-around services to help clients attain self-sufficiency and long-term housing stability.
- Providence supports expansion of shelter operations to 24/7.

- Although we greatly appreciate the specific dollars that will be allocated to TAY-focused programming under Strategy E14, we recommend that all strategies have a specific lens to ensure that they are meeting the needs of our County's homeless population, including those who identify as LGBT. Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers as their needs are significantly different, so we would like to stress the importance of fully funding E14 and, also, other strategies where funding for TAY is set aside. Further, we request that for each strategy that has services targeted for youth including enhancing the emergency shelter system (E8), the specific details of that focus, including what funds will be allocated towards youth populations be specified and provided to the public.
- Although sex and labor trafficking victims meet the federal definition of homeless, many do not match the profile of the traditionally homeless. Ensure there is sufficient funding to provide shelter systems for both male and female sex and labor trafficking victims.
- Boosting the rate to \$50 a night is appreciated and necessary to cover basic operating costs. Is there capacity for ramp-up without simply reassigning existing beds? Starting and operating a shelter is an expensive investment and faces issues such as needing a CUP. What about allocating a portion for motel vouchers? Why not invest in permanent options rather than expanding shelter infrastructure? Shelter, at the rated proposed is almost as expensive as PSH.
- This strategy seems to be the most relevant to the DV community, but it would require an expansion of the definition to include transitional shelter programs, or force DV Agencies to contort their definition of "bridge" housing to include their transitional programs. Agencies should not be forced to change their service-delivery model to conform to this strategy in order to be funded under Measure H. How do we ensure that programs retain their client-centered, trauma-informed focus and still receive funding under this strategy? We are not operating under a "housing first" model, but rather a "trauma-informed" model in order to help our survivors to heal. Funding under this strategy needs to include funding for transitional programs (even HUD agrees that fleeing DV meets the homelessness definition). Without transitional programs, victims will not be able to take the time to heal from their physical and psychological abuse and they will not be successful in their transition to housing situations.
- We have been brainstorming with Ventura County Health Care Agency (VCHCA) to find an inexpensive delivery system and facility to medically treat a homeless person at early stages of medical needs. By providing field medical exams, showers, and treatment, VCHCA can avoid and minimize the costly expense of hospital admissions and extended stays for many of the homeless population. We are a disaster support group that works with EMSA. We now provide innovative modules that provide shower, exam rooms or sleepers in portable storage container as needed. Our model is mission sensitive to reduce the expense of a brick and mortar or mobile trailer delivery systems. These units are custom built with a variety of configurations that are scalable to the needs. Please contact us at 805-207-4911 for more information.
- On behalf of the Executive Committee of the City of Los Angeles Domestic Violence Task Force, we offer the following comments regarding Measure H/Strategy E8: We are requesting a set-aside for domestic violence transitional housing. Although we support the expansion of new and innovative housing models for victims of domestic violence, we remain certain that there are many victims who will need domestic violence specific transitional housing. Emergency shelter runs from 30-90 days depending on the program. When you consider that studies show that domestic violence victims generally do not call police until suffering 7-10 incidents of domestic violence, you can see many victims accessing services have been suffering long term trauma. Moreover, victims are often experiencing additional trauma, whether from

their own familial experiences, substance abuse used to cope with the stress of abuse, loss of hope, self-esteem and autonomy that is part of the coercive control exercised during an abusive relationship and so on. Understanding that someone who seeks emergency shelter is doing so because they are likely facing a threat of serious physical and emotional harm makes clear that 1-3 months is likely not enough to get them back on their feet to the degree required to successfully access rapid rehousing. While emergency shelter allows a victim the safety and space to begin their journey, that journey is not one that can be completed in a short period of time for most victims. Accordingly, rapid rehousing and other models, which provide rental assistance, requires a victim to obtain, hold and keep a job. That is not a likely scenario for those still traumatized from their experience. We are asking that you support a domestic violence specific housing program and in doing so, you recognize the need for housing models that address the needs of this population. While there is overlap between the “general” homeless population and those who are fleeing domestic violence, the experiences are not identical and require responses designed to support success. Each year for the last three years, providers have had to fight to retain funding for transitional housing. We are asking that you acknowledge the need for this housing and include an ample set-aside each year so that the limited resources of domestic violence service providers can focus on providing services, not funding.

- The administrative cuts LAHSA made in 2016 should not be back filled by measure H funds. LAHSA needs to utilize infrastructure that is already available.
- PLEASE fund some substance abuse rehab/detox programs for homeless populations and increase shelter systems with low barriers. When homeless individuals are ready to get housed, there is no where to place those with active substance abuse issues.
- The population impacted includes "ALL" however it needs to be specific to victims of DV as there is a disregard to a victims need for a longer window of care in order to transition into permanent housing opportunities.
- We fully support enhancing the current system to include adding crisis beds specifically for individuals who are "Fleeing DV" and in supporting the DV system of transitional housing. DV shelter programs should not be required limit a survivors' length of stay to 90 days. Limiting their length of stay does not put survivors needs first, especially those who are living at or well below the poverty limit, those from specific cultural groups and those who have been severely traumatized as a result of the violence they experienced in their own homes. We ask that you support a domestic violence specific housing program and recognize the need for housing models that address the needs of this population. While there is overlap between the “general” homeless population and those who are fleeing domestic violence, the experiences are not identical and require responses designed to support success.
- Could the Committee consider ways in which non-traditional shelter might receive some funding assistance? In Hollywood, we've had a "winter refuge" for five years which has paired churches and their volunteers with one location (Hollywood Presbyterian Church) to provide 8 weeks during the winter for about 35 - 40 guests. The churches provide all food and volunteers. It is low-cost, high impact. This model could be expanded/lengthened with additional grant funds. Is there a way to allow for blending of private and public dollars to support non-traditional shelters and leverage the Measure H dollars?
- Does the planned nightly bed rate increase for youth shelter beds only pertain to TAY shelter beds or also to shelter beds serving unaccompanied homeless youth who are younger? If non-TAH youth beds are not included, why is this? If due to unforeseen circumstances, with the federal budget or with the to be release

FY 17 COC NOFA, the LA COC, LBCOC, Glendale COC or Pasadena COC reallocate TH housing grants for DV victims, will E8 funding step in to fill this gap? At this point funding is dedicated to supporting 17 DV units that were reallocated by the LA COC during the 2017 COC competition.

- Capital cost should be also be available to DMH shelter providers NOT just LAHSA. The resource would never reach other providers, and Prop HHH is not a guaranteed option for providers.
- Turning Emergency Shelter and Transitional Shelter Programs into Bridge Housing may work for some populations however for Domestic Violence Survivors we need to acknowledge that the barriers they face; especially if the have specific cultural/linguistic/immigration, are numerous and they will need the comprehensive and trauma informed services that are offered at Domestic Violence Emergency and Transitional Shelters.
- A possible solution would be to create large emergency. Why is crisis and bridge housing one-year funding only? There will be an ongoing need, and these items are facing cuts in the City budget as well. Yes for Youth and adults First and foremost, I want to complement the LA County Homeless Initiative for its comprehensive approach to the issue of homelessness and their dedication to effective solutions. Your leadership in addressing the homeless situation in LA County is exemplary and will prove to be a model others will emulate. In 2016 we were contacted by the City of LA and asked what it would take for LA to have a program like Dignity on Wheels, an initiative of Project We HOPE that provides showers and laundry service to the homeless on a mobile platform. We subsequently visited with the City of LA and LAHSA on more than one occasion and were recently requested to respond to a LAHSA RFI regarding mobile showers and laundry. Regarding, in particular, our attendance of the Measure H Web meeting on Tuesday April 24 and in particular Strategy E-8 - Creating a Coordinated System - Providing Temporary Hygiene Services, we direct you to the following background and comments. We, at Project We HOPE (Helping Other People Excel) (PWH), have been deeply involved with the underserved of East Palo Alto (CA) since 1999 and have run a homeless shelter since 2009. We have been acknowledged by the County of San Mateo as doing a superior job of satisfying the needs of our clients and last year California Senator Jerry Hill recognized PWH as his nonprofit for the year. Our contribution to the LA County Homeless Initiative is Dignity on Wheels, our mobile showers and laundry solution which we launched in 2015. It is our belief that without a clean body and clean clothes, the homeless, no different than those of us with housing, feel embarrassed by their physical condition and quickly become disempowered and reluctant to engage in any significant way with normal society. After serving the homeless in Redwood City with Dignity on Wheels for just five months, San Mateo County Supervisor Warren Slocum said the demeanor of the homeless in Redwood City has radically altered as a result of the presence of Dignity on Wheels. Our goal is to assist in returning dignity to the homeless through the use of mobile showers and laundry allowing us them to address their other needs through case management.

When addressing the homeless phenomena, it has been postulated that the cost to contribute to the housing of the homeless is cost effective relative to the cost of frequent visits the homeless make to the Emergency Room (ER). We understand this position and support the idea of reducing visits the homeless make to the ER. But, what is it that reduces the ER visits? Is it that they are now housed? Or, is it that because they are housed, they have access to showers and laundry that results in their radically improved hygiene? We believe that being clean and having clean clothes:

- 1) changes the homeless persons demeanor they no longer feel like pariahs of society; they regain the dignity they deserve as human beings. Not only will the homeless engage more in causing a change in their circumstance but they will also be more engageable! In fact, an article in Nursing 2017 concluded that an opportunity to shower improves patients' receptiveness to services.

- 2) the change in their hygiene keeps them from contracting diseases and infections that in their other state would go largely unnoticed and uncared for. We believe that with the ability to shower and launder their clothes, the homeless feel more deserving and comfortable receiving medical care and therefore make themselves available for routine medical appointments. A quick survey of the homeless that frequent the ER will likely prove out that the unsheltered homeless are the ones more likely to wait until the last minute to address their medical issues and therefore be the ones to over utilize the ER.

In addition, we have found that the homeless become more inclined to do more for themselves as noted by one of our clients in San Jose who after showering and putting on clean clothes said, Now I can go for that job interview. Case management in conjunction with the showers and laundry will encourage the freshly washed and laundered homeless clients utilize available job training resources and take advantage of employment opportunities. We understand that the City of LA alone has some 28,000 homeless individuals, 21,000 of whom are unsheltered. In listening to the webinar on Tuesday, it was evident that the homeless who benefit from the majority of the current strategies will be the 25% who are sheltered. We can not overemphasize that we believe that showers and laundry are essential services that the unsheltered homeless (75% of the homeless population) in the City of LA desperately need to preserve their health and return to them a sense of dignity. We also believe that the \$1m (see footnote 1.) proposed for safe parking (see footnote 2.) and mobile showers and laundry is not adequate to address this need. We are available and look forward to discussing our program to see how we can partner with the LA County Homeless Initiative for a even brighter outcome for the homeless.

- Haven Hills calls for dedicated funding to support additional and extended stays for emergency and bridge housing beds for survivors of domestic violence (DV). Survivors of DV are faced with unique and complex barriers to housing due to increased safety needs, responsiveness, PTSD, child care needs, isolation, or greater emotional support. The current housing systems require permanent housing placement after 90-120 days, a time frame that is often too short for survivors who are working through complex emotional issues that require more time to heal and work towards becoming self-sufficient.
- Regarding strategy E8, Emergency Shelter System should be limited to a finite period of days per client (e.g. 30 days). Overall, the cost per bed per night is concerning ranging from \$30-\$50 for LAHSA and \$59 to \$155 for DHS/DMH. The true variable cost per occupied rooms for hotels are typically \$12 per room night for a budget property to approximately \$75 for a world-class hotel (<http://lodgingmagazine.com/what-are-your-true-variable-costs-per-occupied-room/>). The cost per bed through the homeless initiatives appear significantly higher than most hotels. I would suggest contracting with existing budget hotels to house homeless as an alternative solution by occupying excess capacity at a reduced cost to the County of LA or identifying and implementing cost efficiencies for shelter beds like the hotel business.
- Where is the strategy for the newly proposed 93 M 1 year cost?
- I find it outrageous that LA County doesn't have year around "shelters". Further, because we live in a temperate climate, we could have outdoor "shelters" all over the city, ie No construction costs, and they could be open and in use in 90 days from today . These would be places that people without housing/lodging/etc could go, legally camp, that are NOT ON THE SIDEWALKS. They could have port- a-potties, drinking water, outdoor shower areas, trash cans available, a tented nurses station, tents for

social workers, etc. There are many city/county/state owned lots that are being either used as parking lots, or rented to nurseries or marble slab companies, and they are often not immediately in the middle of a residential neighborhood. One such location is off of Pico and Sawtelle, where the 405 or 10 goes over. Certainly there could be safe camping for over 100 individuals, plus their pets there, and if given the chance I could personally identify at least 50 more places in the County that would work as "temporary outdoor emergency shelters". And once we create a network of outdoor shelters, the police and neighborhoods could enforce the no camping on the sidewalks laws. I have recently read in the NY Times that Mayor DiBlasio is opening 90 new shelters citywide in NYC. Berlin had no trouble immediately absorbing thousands of refugees in airplane hangers, etc., without building a single new building. This is what's done in an emergency....immediate action. In fact, LA seems to be the only place anywhere that doesn't provide temporary emergency spaces for people to legally find refuge.....there are camps for internally displaced people all across the world.....what is wrong with LA to be so slow to provide camping spaces that are NOT on the sidewalks, or in the middle of residential neighborhoods. This is outrageous, both for residents and property owners, and for the homeless. Further, by allowing near anarchy in the neighborhood sidewalks and streets, the situation where I live (3rd and Rose in Venice) is simply out of control, largely with young travelers. My friends in the neighborhood have been physically attacked (John Frane), and the smell and human waste is a threat to our health. Many of these travelers don't mind camping, so let's give them asap some places to camp with facilities, and some order, and help us regain civility and safety in our neighborhood NOW.

- Imperative and must be linked to mental health, physical health and substance abuse services. Again - that the emergency shelter system is receiving \$56 Million annually vs PSH which is receiving \$17 Million is more than frustrating. We need more and better services at PSH.
- Domestic violence (DV) services are homeless prevention services. Domestic violence is not just a public safety issue, it is a housing issue. Fleeing DV is included in the HUD definition of homelessness. However, Los Angeles homeless services do not meet the needs of victims of domestic violence as they are not designed to address the unique trauma DV survivors experience. Transitional housing is designed specifically to meet the needs of domestic violence survivors and must be included under the E8 strategy. With DV Transitional Housing programs facing reduction of their HUD Continuum of Care funding this year, the County needs to protect transitional housing for DV survivors, not just emergency shelters. Transitional housing offers more than housing and provides wrap-around services to help clients attain self-sufficiency and long-term housing stability.
- Providence supports expansion of shelter operations to 24/7.
- Although we greatly appreciate the specific dollars that will be allocated to TAY-focused programming under Strategy E14, we recommend that all strategies have a specific lens to ensure that they are meeting the needs of our County's homeless population, including those who identify as LGBT. Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers as their needs are significantly different, so we would like to stress the importance of fully funding E14 and, also, other strategies where funding for TAY is set aside. Further, we request that for each strategy that has services targeted for youth including enhancing the emergency shelter system (E8), the specific details of that focus, including what funds will be allocated towards youth populations be specified and provided to the public.
- Boosting the rate to \$50 a night is appreciated and necessary to cover basic operating costs. Is there capacity for ramp-up without simply reassigning existing beds? Starting and operating a shelter is an expensive investment and faces issues such as needing a CUP. What about allocating a portion for motel

vouchers? Why not invest in permanent options rather than expanding shelter infrastructure? Shelter, at the rated proposed is almost as expensive as PSH.

- This strategy seems to be the most relevant to the DV community, but it would require an expansion of the definition to include transitional shelter programs, or force DV Agencies to contort their definition of "bridge" housing to include their transitional programs. Agencies should not be forced to change their service-delivery model to conform to this strategy in order to be funded under Measure H. How do we ensure that programs retain their client-centered, trauma-informed focus and still receive funding under this strategy? We are not operating under a "housing first" model, but rather a "trauma-informed" model in order to help our survivors to heal. Funding under this strategy needs to include funding for transitional programs (even HUD agrees that fleeing DV meets the homelessness definition). Without transitional programs, victims will not be able to take the time to heal from their physical and psychological abuse and they will not be successful in their transition to housing situations.
- We have been brainstorming with Ventura County Health Care Agency (VCHCA) to find an inexpensive delivery system and facility to medically treat a homeless person at early stages of medical needs. By providing field medical exams, showers, and treatment, VCHCA can avoid and minimize the costly expense of hospital admissions and extended stays for many of the homeless population. We are a disaster support group that works with EMSA. We now provide innovative modules that provide shower, exam rooms or sleepers in portable storage container as needed. Our model is mission sensitive to reduce the expense of a brick and mortar or mobile trailer delivery systems. These units are custom built with a variety of configurations that are scalable to the needs. Please contact us at 805-207-4911 for more information.
- On behalf of the Executive Committee of the City of Los Angeles Domestic Violence Task Force, we offer the following comments regarding Measure H/Strategy E8: We are requesting a set-aside for domestic violence transitional housing. Although we support the expansion of new and innovative housing models for victims of domestic violence, we remain certain that there are many victims who will need domestic violence specific transitional housing. Emergency shelter runs from 30-90 days depending on the program. When you consider that studies show that domestic violence victims generally do not call police until suffering 7-10 incidents of domestic violence, you can see many victims accessing services have been suffering long term trauma. Moreover, victims are often experiencing additional trauma, whether from their own familial experiences, substance abuse used to cope with the stress of abuse, loss of hope, self-esteem and autonomy that is part of the coercive control exercised during an abusive relationship and so on. Understanding that someone who seeks emergency shelter is doing so because they are likely facing a threat of serious physical and emotional harm makes clear that 1-3 months is likely not enough to get them back on their feet to the degree required to successfully access rapid rehousing. While emergency shelter allows a victim the safety and space to begin their journey, that journey is not one that can be completed in a short period of time for most victims. Accordingly, rapid rehousing and other models, which provide rental assistance, requires a victim to obtain, hold and keep a job. That is not a likely scenario for those still traumatized from their experience. We are asking that you support a domestic violence specific housing program and in doing so, you recognize the need for housing models that address the needs of this population. While there is overlap between the general homeless population and those who are fleeing domestic violence, the experiences are not identical and require responses designed to support success. Each year for the last three years, providers have had to fight to retain funding for transitional housing. We are asking that you acknowledge the need for this housing and include an ample set-aside each year so that the limited resources of domestic violence service providers can focus on providing services, not funding.

- The administrative cuts LAHSA made in 2016 should not be back filled by measure H funds. LAHSA needs to utilize infrastructure that is already available. PLEASE fund some substance abuse rehab/detox programs for homeless populations and increase shelter systems with low barriers. When homeless individuals are ready to get housed, there is no where to place those with active substance abuse issues.
- The population impacted includes "ALL" however it needs to be specific to victims of DV as there is a disregard to a victims need for a longer window of care in order to transition into permanent housing opportunities.
- We fully support enhancing the current system to include adding crisis beds specifically for individuals who are "Fleeing DV" and in supporting the DV system of transitional housing. DV shelter programs should not be required limit a survivors length of stay to 90 days. Limiting their length of stay does not put survivors needs first, especially those who are living at or well below the poverty limit, those from specific cultural groups and those who have been severely traumatized as a result of the violence they experienced in their own homes. We ask that you support a domestic violence specific housing program and recognize the need for housing models that address the needs of this population. While there is overlap between the general homeless population and those who are fleeing domestic violence, the experiences are not identical and require responses designed to support success.
- Could the Committee consider ways in which non-traditional shelter might receive some funding assistance? In Hollywood, we've had a "winter refuge" for five years which has paired churches and their volunteers with one location (Hollywood Presbyterian Church) to provide 8 weeks during the winter for about 35 - 40 guests. The churches provide all food and volunteers. It is low-cost, high impact. This model could be expanded/lengthened with additional grant funds. Is there a way to allow for blending of private and public dollars to support non-traditional shelters and leverage the Measure H dollars?
- Does the planned nightly bed rate increase for youth shelter beds only pertain to TAY shelter beds or also to shelter beds serving unaccompanied homeless youth who are younger? If non-TAH youth beds are not included, why is this? If due to unforeseen circumstances, with the federal budget or with the to be release FY 17 COC NOFA, the LA COC, LBCOC, Glendale COC or Pasadena COC reallocate TH housing grants for DV victims, will E8 funding step in to fill this gap? At this point funding is dedicated to supporting 17 DV units that were reallocated by the LA COC during the 2017 COC competition. Turning Emergency Shelter and Transitional Shelter Programs into Bridge Housing may work for some populations however for Domestic Violence Survivors we need to acknowledge that the barriers they face; especially if the have specific cultural/linguistic/immigration, are numerous and they will need the comprehensive and trauma informed services that are offered at Domestic Violence Emergency and Transitional Shelters. Capital cost should be also be available to DMH shelter providers NOT just LAHSA. The resources would never reach other providers, and Prop HHH is not a guaranteed option for all providers.

Strategy E14: Enhance Services for Transition Age Youth

- More affordable education with room and board. More apprentice places like Blue Ox Millworks of Eureka, CA. More ways of encouraging drug-free and alcohol-free living, and encouraging more weddings and less abuse for lovers of all ages.
- There should be a LOT of money going towards helping youth. Let's make sure they know we care about them and prevent someone remaining homeless for the rest of their life.

- Again we have counselors within our educational system, state programs working with teens. First step the nationwide body should identify various programs working with teens in foster care. Funnel to our regional body schedule and meet with representatives regarding the main focus being transition. local identify teens with the help of social services to identify, where, and the next phase. Next phase ensure we are working with high schools between tenth and eleventh grade. provide our teens with tools to survive when they age out. If college is the choice we are the, if employment is the choice, we already set programs with employers and because they may meet SSI, pursuing, disable he/she should live within our subside housing. In other words stop placing teens on the streets because he/she reached the age of 18. The cycle must end.
- So many transients in Hollywood are very young. I would expand the "youth" group to people in their 20s.
- Yes - invest in these needs now. This is a crucial form of prevention and should pay off.
- I see youth homeless on corner on Bronson/Hollywood Blvd. My Friend's Place is an organization in the area that provides services for them. Not sure if it's helping. Still see many hanging out doing nothing along with other vagrants/mentally ill and social misfits who wander by and park themselves there.
- After a certain age, the services literally stop for teens! What else am I suppose to do!
- Yes! Include couch surfing to include more youth falling through the cracks before they become chronically homeless. Need more LGBTQ focus.
- Yes, strongly support. We have an obligation to build a system that ends chronic homelessness by building in more successful interventions earlier in one's lifespan. Far too many youth are exiting foster care without proper supports. City of L.A. would like to partner with the County on calling out a certain number of PSH units dedicated to youth through our Prop HHH funding with your support of services.
- Very important.
- Needed of course - - but even more needed is a coordinated prevention strategy drawing upon best emerging evidence based practices that help prevent distressed households from losing their children to foster care. There is a stellar model in Michigan that Casey Family Foundation endorses that has shown profound impact protecting unstable households at their first point of contact with Child Protective Services and interjecting legal and holistic supports that fortify their ability to remain intact. LA should bring back David Sanders to run DCFS and mobilize this model on a dramatic scale!
- New Earth is in strong support for enhanced services for Transition Age Youth. Additionally we are would like to add that Drop In Centers should not only be "probation" ran but the county should look to CBO's who are already operating a "one stop shop" type of model that Transitional Age Youth are already gravitating towards. Since we opened our reentry center in 2015 we have served over 200 TAY youth. Sometimes CBO's are more attractive to the youth as they don't represent the system.

- Needed of course -- but even more needed is a coordinated prevention strategy drawing upon best emerging evidence based practices that help prevent distressed households from losing their children to foster care. There is a stellar model in Michigan that Casey Family Foundation endorses that has shown profound impact protecting unstable households at their first point of contact with Child Protective Services and interjecting legal and holistic supports that fortify their ability to remain intact. LA should bring back David Sanders to run DCFS and mobilize this model on a dramatic scale!
- New Earth is in strong support for enhanced services for Transition Age Youth. Additionally we would like to add that Drop In Centers should not only probation ran but the county should look to CBOs who are already operating a one stop shop type of model that Transitional Age Youth are already gravitating towards. Since we opened our reentry center in 2015 we have served over 200 TAY youth. Sometimes CBOs are more attractive to the youth as they don't represent the system.
- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles (CCALAC) is supportive of this strategy to provide enhanced and expanded services for Transition Age Youth. For access/drop-in centers, clinics can be a partner in providing health services in these spaces for youth. In fact, CCALAC clinics have partnered with Department of Mental Health's Transition Age Youth (TAY) Division on their Drop-In Centers. We recommend that the county continues building on these partnerships and funding health services in these drop-in centers.
- We are particularly appreciative of the intentional inclusion of services specifically targeted to Transition Age Youth (TAY) in the Strategy Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth (E14). Strategy E14, entitled "Create a Coordinated System", reflects some of the specific services that youth experiencing homelessness truly need to survive and includes "youth collaboration, transitional housing, SPA level homeless liaisons at LACOE, family re-connection models and access/drop-in center enhancements. In America, up to 1.6 million youth experience homelessness each year and up to 40% of those youth identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (Choi, 2015). In addition, about 65% of agencies that provide services to young people experiencing homeless identified lack of funding as the main barrier to sufficiently address the nuanced needs of LGBT youth (Choi, 2015). Considering the need for an array of housing services that are population-specific, we are looking forward to seeing how Strategy E14 will be used to create specific services for LGBT TAY.
- Ensure all staff is trained on sex and labor trafficking and that there is sufficient funding for specialized services for those who have suffered this form of commercial exploitation.
- Again, I question if more of the allocation for RRH for TAY should be put in Transition Housing. In addition, there are very few housing options for pregnant and parenting youth (especially with more than 2 kids) that are in the gap between TAY and Families that need additional support so would ask that Transitional Housing and RRH for youth include Pregnant and Parenting options.
- Dear Mr. Ansell and the Measure H Revenue Planning (extra space on this line) Committee, On behalf of the Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership, we are writing to express our concern regarding the revised funding for transition age youth (TAY) through Measure H, specifically changes to Strategy E14: Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth. The Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership (HHYP) is an alliance of 6 agencies including Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, Covenant House California, Los Angeles LGBT Center, Los Angeles Youth Network, My Friends Place, and Step Up on Second" that provide services to youth experiencing homelessness in Hollywood. The Measure

H budget proposed on April 22 reflected a significant decrease in funding for Strategy E14. While we recognize that significant cuts were required across all strategies, we are deeply concerned that the reconciliation committee did not take into account that adolescents and young adults are too often not fully and/or appropriately served by agencies whose primary focus are homeless adults. The biggest cut in the initial E14 recommendations was to Housing Stabilization & Retention (Y1 = \$3.3M; Y2+ = \$6.6M). The justification was that funds allocated under D7 (Enhanced Support Services in PSH) would cover the increased support service need in PSH; the higher request in B3 (Rapid Rehousing) would increase the amount of support services and financial assistance that a person could utilize; and the A5 request (Prevention/Diversion) could meet the needs of young people who have moved into housing without a subsidy but may need some assistance with services and/or some financial assistance. Our collective experience of over 30 years of serving adolescents and young adults experiencing homelessness demonstrates that this population is not adequately served by adult providers and service models. Our participation in Youth Coordinated Entry over the past 18 months also demonstrates that young adults continue to experience significant barriers accessing PSH and RRH services that are operated by adult providers.

Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers whose programs are not developmentally appropriate. Homeless youth require stable, secure, and supportive housing models that are responsive to their developmental needs. Programs and services for youth must be expanded, integrated, guided by trauma-informed approaches, and responsive to youth's cultural diversity, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Without appropriate and compassionate intervention, many homeless youth may be at risk of entering into a cycle of chronic homelessness. Because of these reasons, we strongly encourage the Measure H Revenue Planning Committee to support youth specific support for PSH, RRH, and (extra space) homelessness prevention.

- Los Angeles County must prioritize becoming a "family and youth supportive" place. "As of June 2016, 62,931 homeless students were identified in LEAs across the county."
- Work to ensure that all youth fostering out of foster care have basic needs met.
- DV Service Providers need to be one of the collaborating agencies. Many of the clients who enter shelter programs are between the ages of 18-24 and the need to address the concerns of this population intersects with those of most non-TAY adults, but aren't best served in programs that solely emphasize the fact they are "youth". Stronger links to DV advocacy would mitigate this challenge. This money should not all go to LAHSA, neither should LAHSA be solely responsible for administering these funds. They are still sitting on money received from the Supervisors from 2-3 years ago for TAY, and have not distributed it. In addition, there was not an open and transparent process on the administration of the funds though it was for youth service providers. There is a lack of trust of LAHSA among service providers, and it is not going to increase when they receive more funds.
- The LAUSD Homeless Education Program has a fairly new partnership with LAHSA to provide assistance to Family Solutions Centers (FSCs) across the LA County Service Planning Areas in their Family Coordinated Entry System (CES) of care. The LAUSD would appreciate and welcome an opportunity to put in a request for funding to continue and strengthen our system of identification, support, and service delivery to families. I was a bit surprised to see that the work of LAUSD Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors at the FSCs was not mentioned in the Measure H revenue

planning process. Much of the work we are currently doing in the FSCs directly supports HI Strategy A1- Homeless Prevention Program for Families.

The LAUSD Homeless Education Program is currently providing the educational piece (i.e., identifying and connecting students and families to LAUSD educational resources, ensuring Mc Kinney-Vento Assistance Act enrollment rights and protections are being upheld, coordinating service delivery to LAUSD students, conducting initial assessments and intakes to determine the needs of students/families, etc.).

Our counselors are not only in LAUSD district offices and schools, but they are also co-located in 6 of the eight Family Solutions Centers (FSCs) in the LA County Service Planning Areas. Additionally, the Homeless Education Program was approached by LAHSA to assist them in providing our services to support HI Strategy E14- Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth. It would be unfortunate that the LAUSD would lose out on the opportunity to obtain funding to expand the services we are already providing to the Family Solutions Centers as we are only assigned to the FSCs 1-2 days a week. For 2016-17 school year we have identified 18,014 students who are experiencing homelessness. We have a very small staff of 1 Program Coordinator, 17 Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors (7 who are at the FSCs) and 9 PSA Aides, 1 Senior Parent Community Facilitator, and 1 Senior Office Technician. We have a great need with few resources to support the work that we do. LAUSD works closely with LACOE in matters concerning educational matters pertaining to students facing housing instability; however, it seems the services that the LAUSD can offer are more in alignment with the boundaries of SPAs 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8 (1 and 6 are not in LAUSD boundaries and may be better served by a LACOE representative). Please consider working collaboratively with the LAUSD to help in the identification process and service delivery to our LAUSD students and families facing homelessness.

Strategy F7: Preserve Current Affordable Housing and Promote the Development of Affordable Housing for Homeless Families and Individuals

- Yes development and redevelopment. When was the last time current housing has been inspected and will they survive an earthquake.
- More legal camping, RVs and networks for traveling artists and/or farm workers, more affordable rents, more renting with the option to buy, more smart group homes for people with health disabilities and/or mental challenges, more fast-track small, medium and large houses, better use of motel/hotel and resort places and spaces. Let love and charity be given our best efforts--for peace and plenty, acceptable and even joyous lifestyles for all, giving and giving again.
- Yes, housing is needed so badly. We need more and more. There are so many areas of Los Angeles that are decrepit and buildings lay unused. Let's figure this out!
- Preserve by pulling out weeds before they grow. Continue to annually require folks to prove they still qualify. Local board should keep a record of waiting list. Remember checks and balances. We have many abandon buildings that should be made available for our homeless. Promote development with the community. Either purchase acres of land or brighten the community by giving building's a face lift. This create jobs, increase our economy, and people will have a since of pride of the representative. Introute our three level of boards, our mission and goals. I would host this announcement with the mayor and invite the governor, chief of police. Give the people who live within the community

knowledge about the program, security and if presented as well informative program people who are not homeless, live in a target community may feel a sense of ease.

- Current building codes do not support homeless and truly affordable options. Developers need to stop getting a free ride with waivers and variances that allow them to over-build without addressing the infrastructure: traffic, water, parking, energy usage, etc.
- When will LAHSA begin engaging the LA County departments of Planning and Zoning and Building and Safety to develop an expedited process to combat homelessness? Since 2014 our organization has paid all county fees to these departments, altered and revised structural and architectural plans as requested, and submitted materials testing protocols designed to meet or exceed minimum California Building Code requirements involving innovative low cost processes for homeless construction without receiving a single approval from these agencies. If LAHSA wishes to truly achieve its three year budgeted initiatives then it must garner interagency cooperation from these two County department or the process of renovation, remodel, and new homeless housing construction will not keep pace to achieve budgeted objectives.
- We absolutely need to protect the gains made in creating affordable housing, but shouldn't cities and counties have asset plans in place to do this? Shame on them if this new tax is supposed to backfill planning that should have been done when they first started funding these programs. And while there needs to be funding to support more affordable housing, if the electeds don't get serious about growing a spine around land use, real estate speculation, and siting, the cost of subsidies are going to go higher and fewer units will be built because a) no one will want them in their neighborhood and b) it will be too expensive. ACOF's experience in East LA right now is a perfect example of this challenge.
- This is needed asap.
- More long term. There should not be a limit to how long a unit is affordable.
- Yes, but not in middle class neighborhoods where it will change the character of them.
- The best solution to the homeless problem in LA County is to prevent homelessness and preserve affordable housing.
- Allocate grants for conversion of single family home garages into "granny flat" rental units.
- We're told that there are hundreds of vacant lots throughout South Central LA due to the 1992 LA Riots. Build housing on these lots immediately, get people off the street and into these units, and provide family counseling, employment assistance and mental health services at these locations to the residents. We see apartment buildings go up all around town in a matter of months. There could easily be 10,000 new units on these lots in a year, enabling about a third of the homeless population to have roofs over their heads a year from now. If that is successful, more vacant spaces throughout the county can be found for additional units.
- Given the complexity of funding for PSH and other affordable housing for persons exiting homelessness, please do not exclude eligibility for these programs in the City of Los Angeles.

- YES!! This is absolutely vital to ensure low income households do not lose their capacity to work and live in their community due to acute housing distress.
- Not promote but actually develop more affordable housing.
- We are in agreement and full support of F7.
- Greater transparency of the additional \$5,000,000 requested annually to fund innovative housing solutions is required. As a part of the innovative housing solutions, please help support eliminating RSO to help encourage RSO landlords to invest in our community. Los Angeles's Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO) was enacted in 1979 in Los Angeles and has not kept costs down for most tenants. Over the last 40 years, it has taken and prevented units from being available in the rental market. Providing stable housing availability helps prevent homelessness by keeping rental prices low for everyone in Los Angeles. RSO has not helped with the availability of housing and "create[s] financial disincentives for owners to invest in maintenance and capital improvement of their units" as per the "Economic Study of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance and the Los Angeles Housing Market" as prepared for the City of Los Angeles Housing Department (HCIDLA). "Only a third of RSO owners say they would still acquire their rent-stabilized property today, a plurality say they would not buy it again, while a quarter are uncertain." RSO owners are a disenfranchised minority. If we do not support RSO landlords, our communities' investors, they will continue to appropriate their resources and funds on other non-Los Angeles housing endeavors further exacerbating the housing crisis. In addition, solutions such as granny flats / shipping containers ruin the character of neighborhoods and do not adhere to zoning regulations (e.g. parking). Please consider encouraging rezoning R1.5+ (multi-family) areas to higher density with strict parking/traffic requirements/studies. Also, city owned affordable housing should follow templates for design and building. Many hotel chains use the same building blueprint/design repeatedly across each property location. The same approach could be used to expedite the review, permitting, build, and bidding process of city owned housing projects.
- Measure H presents an opportunity to make necessary long-term investments in addressing the homeless crisis in LA County. To embrace this opportunity, there should be increased investment in affordable housing for individuals experiencing homelessness. Without seriously addressing the massive affordable housing shortage, many of the other efforts funded through Measure H will be severely limited in their ability to be successful.
- What is being done to explore less costly affordable housing development options, such as modular shipping containers or government-owned parcels for parking RVs/cars/tents with bathrooms, etc.? We would agree with this strategy, and would also encourage a certain number of such affordable units being preserved specifically for DV victims. Even when we can help a survivor onto her feet and she has opportunities for employment, we find that we sometimes cannot locate affordable housing for her near her work. Therefore, she might have to live miles or hours away from her place of employment, which adds to the stress of her commute and job retention. Preserve and increase affordable housing units, and reserve a specific number of units in many different communities for DV victims.
- Community members not developers must lead this effort.

- Over the past year we have been working with a PSH preservation cohort representing the leading PSH development organizations in the region, to identify the unique barriers associated with PSH preservation. We have learned that there are approximately 1,500 aging, project-based PSH units in Los Angeles County that are at-risk and require immediate capital for preservation assistance, including modernizing the physical layouts to accommodate on-site service and property management personnel. Older PSH buildings are increasingly being repurposed to house CES referrals as the units turnover, which can create an added strain on the operator, the building, and the residents, if the right level of on-site support services is not in place. Historically, PSH developers are at a competitive disadvantage or simply ineligible to compete for PSH capital funding because their residents no longer qualify as homeless and there is currently no priority or carve-out specifically for PSH preservation projects within these capital financing programs. Recommendation: 1) Revise Strategy F7 to put preservation of affordable housing back into the scope of eligible projects; 2) provide a 25% set-aside for the preservation of existing permanent supportive housing; and 3) increase the overall funding amount for the strategy.

This strategy originally provided a dual focus on preservation and production of PSH, recognizing the importance of sustaining existing PSH and building new PSH to truly support a reduction in homelessness. However, the new recommendation changes the scope and what is eligible for the funding to exclude the preservation of existing PSH. Preservation is a less expensive means to promote long-term housing affordability while presenting formerly homeless residents with the chance to remain connected to their social and supportive service networks. Ultimately, it prevents people from falling back into homelessness. With a significant number of aging, at-risk PSH projects that require financial and physical restructuring and suffer from deferred capital needs, estimated at \$100,000 per unit, dedicating a percentage of ongoing funding from Measure H will enable these buildings, operators, and residents to remain stable and healthy over the long-term, while leveraging emerging State resources such as No Place Like Home. We also recommend that no less than 25% of funding be dedicated to such projects, with established criteria to ensure that investments are directed towards PSH projects with the greatest risk. Further, this strategy should establish a specific number of units that will be preserved annually with this funding.

- There should be a statewide ordinance that EVERY city must follow concerning new multiple housing units MUST include 15% of the housing must go to low cost housing units. Every city has homeless. Most cities have contractors coming in and building new units. Currently in my city of Monrovia, we have TWO units being built (over 100 units each) and there is NO stipulation that any of the projects must go towards low cost housing. Duarte presently does not have an active ordinance either. Cities are content to ship the homeless to skid row and cop the attitude: "Not in my backyard!" THIS IS part of the solution for every city to come to the aid of there homeless. I have personally interviewed 18 homeless Monroviaans (12 of whom are females) 'if they are willing to move to skidrow if they get their own place'? The answer is 'no'. Anyone that has been there, can understand why. This is do-able. It is every city's problem. Every city should have part of the solution.
- These funds should be available to all service providers for projects, and not only the current AH Providers. The goal of housing 10,000 individuals per year requires innovation and new ideas. Part of these resources could allow for innovative projects that are going to be required to reach our ambitious goals.

General Comments

- I have not responded to any of the above. The word "subsidize" seems to be a theme throughout the list of programs. As a registered nurse my question is--where in all of this process is the outreach by professionals to personally build relationships (trust issues and healthcare problems) in order for the homeless to "buy into" the Measure H program? Also the homeless really don't want large apartment buildings--nice duplexes with yards would work better--SMALL. All you are doing is building projects within tall buildings like Jordan Downs etc.only multi-level. "Been there done that." This problem is not going to be solved within the time designated by Measure H. The solution will not come during a Monday thru Friday 9:00 to 5:00 hour program either. We need to go to them over and over again till WE succeed --recognizing most of the homeless don't want us meddling with their life style. The other prong--mental health--is huge and requires special and specific solutions. I wish you the best and good luck with your decision making. (2 comments)
- LA has many homeless living in cars or RVs. We need to start helping those in need living out of their vehicles and prosecuting those using their RVs to operate rolling criminal enterprises like selling drugs and sex trafficking. LA desperately needs a Safe Parking Program to help with both of these important issues. Please allocate some of the Measure H money to this important initiative. (2 comments)
- I think based off my current answers that my mind set is clear. But to iterate, use what we have and that's been approved and improve what we have. Can redevelop housings and go up multi stories with underground parking and prioritized disabled for bottom level and low income up top.
- Housing subsidies should be limited to people who are not abusing drugs or alcohol. If they have successfully completed programs to overcome those addictions, then they should be eligible.
- This is baffling. NONE of these measures deal with one of the core problems of homelessness, and that's lack of ***proper mental health treatment and facilities***!!! I think priority number ONE should be to rebuild the public mental health system that was gutted by Governor Ronald Reagan. As someone who had to be hospitalized in a horribly underfunded public psych ward called BHC Alhambra (my HealthNet insurance didn't cover Cedar Sinai's awesome rehab ward) I can tell you about the cockroach-infested bathrooms, the depressing jail-like atmosphere that looks like it was last remodeled in the 70s, and the unqualified top psychiatrist who still uses the ancient DSM-II to diagnose and treat patients (we're now on the DSM-V btw) among other horrors; basically that place was jail for people who suck at killing themselves, and it only taught me that next time I attempt suicide I do it right so that I can avoid spending 72 hours in that hellhole. Many homeless people are in that precarious situation because of little to no access to PROPER mental health facilities and treatment, and that includes addiction counseling and harm reduction (expecting drug addicts to quit cold turkey is folly, harm reduction therapy should be emphasized at first over outright drug abstinence) If it weren't for my amazing loving family members who came to my aid after I escaped that BHC Alhambra hellhole I would've probably ended up homeless too. But not everyone has a safety net of loved ones, and there really isn't much we can do about rising rent prices in the short term but giving our most vulnerable citizens the mental tools they need to find value in themselves and the courage and willpower to pick themselves up and slowly rebuild their lives is one thing we can do to tackle the problem at the source. TL;DR homelessness will not go away unless we have a comprehensive, well-funded, and affordable/heavily subsidized mental health system in Los Angeles.

- I believe that the Downtown Womens Center, which has a >90% homeless-to-self-sustainable success rate, provides a very useful model for tackling the homeless problem in Los Angeles. In short: Provide permanent housing to the city's homeless that's accompanied by health services, job training and counseling. Additionally, I think it's incumbent on us to partner with neighboring cities to help shoulder the financial and geographic burden associated with homelessness. Many of Southern California's homeless come to Los Angeles because that's where shelters, food banks, and medical services are concentrated. If we're serious about ending homelessness, it's vital that all cities chip in and help shoulder the load.
- More hammocks in Arcata. More veterans' connections in San Bernardino, including boats, ships and trips to Houston, Washington, D.C. and Virginia. More ways to get people out of the cities to some good country people and good country living and work. More match-housing for people wanting to work in our cities when country life just is not working. Let the USA come together more and still more in understanding, love and peace ending homelessness with great caring, funding and charity. Let those of us privileged to be born in the Americas keep connecting with our friends, and loving our enemies, preventing and stopping illegal behavior. Let us pray for those interacting and traveling to other war-torn places and other places with humanitarian disasters--sending our military and charity organizations in coordinated efforts for speedy recovery. Let us enjoy more and still more people and places living well in forgiveness and peace.
- Monies need to be added for Mental health evaluation services. It's vital we identify those at-risk to confrontations with law enforcement to provide them with the medication and help they need to live safe and healthy lives.
- Why do none of these areas focus on mental health? There are mentally unstable people on the streets who need psychological help. When their ailments flare, they are jailed or shot - - not helped. I think we need to hire more psychologists to help with this issue.
- We also suggest providing funds for organizations and practices that are newer and don't necessarily fit into the current system. Lava Mae, for example, is expanding its mobile shower unit services in Los Angeles. More organizations want to become on board with this and even start their own. Some of that money should go to giving support for them to start. Another example is Mobile Leaves & Fishes in East Austin. They have a 27 acre village designed to provide sustainable and affordable housing to homeless people and creates a community in doing so, not subjecting them to a 250 square foot box in a massive multi-unit complex.
- Yes, if you are looking for a nonprofit organization with a keen sense of knowledge, peer and meets your requirements. Think of my organization Peer to Peer Empowerment Group 27690 Medford Way, Sun City CA 92586. 714 625 3818.
- I do not see anything for homeless youth other than those aging out of foster care. That should be a strong priority. These young people are often largely invisible, but that does not justify neglecting them in this way.
- People need to be off the streets. Camping on streets should not be allowed. Right now in Hollywood there are streets/sidewalks that are filthy health hazards forcing the public to walk in the streets which is dangerous. El Centro is a hell hole. These people are permanent transients who have been there for

years. There are also a few "regulars" who are a danger to the community. They are absolutely mentally ill and have taunted and threatened pedestrians. Police say that they just move people to a new location rather than take them in. This needs to stop. (Example: A buck naked woman on Meth was given clothes and driven to another neighborhood after my landlady called the police.) Shelter is meaningless without taking care of the core problems. Lack of education Drug Abuse Mental Illness Lack of Discipline The streets need to be cleaned regularly as well to protect the rest of us from the filth. These people are also defecating in private gardens and flowerbeds. It's time for tough love, as my grandmother used to say... Housing subsidies don't work since we don't have enough housing. Also many of these people cannot take care of themselves. Serious mental/education/social issues.

- Stop hospitals from releasing elderly people to shelters. Build more assisted living and long term care, nursing homes, so that seniors with health issues, dementia are not recycled through the shelter system. Prioritize elderly and family housing. More funds for low income and affordable housing projects. Upgrade and inspect SRO Housing Corp buildings to follow modern housing codes. Remodel SRO housing units to allow family housing and long term residents. Force the 800 sex offenders to register if they live in Downtown LA in order to expand housing beyond expensive single room occupancy. Create room and board housing, houses that offer rooms for rent. Force shelters to use their residents fees, monthly fee paid by homeless people, to invest in perm housing or shelters for families in diverse communities not just Skid Row. Families, children and senior housing now.
- Remove all law enforcement funding from the revenue plans, fund housing and services provided by CBO's!
- How do you expect to succeed with no African American males, the most undeserved, on the 50 member Advisory Panel?
- I am in agreement with the funding priorities laid out in the discussion during the webinar. My comments are: 1) we need a strategy involving the BOS directly to work with to help and encourage them to be partners in this effort and 2) we need a contingency budget in case our federal HUD support is cut. This entire undertaking has been incredible and I applaud the good work done by everyone involved at every level and for many months!
- All above-referenced proposals have significant merit. However, I am unclear about which intervention(s) will compellingly draw the individuals who are sleeping on the streets and in tents to participate. I worked with LAHSA and USC to collect qualitative data as part of their homeless count project. Many of the individuals living on the streets believe they are trapped in a state of hopelessness, guilt and shame. It will take a concerted collaborative effort to get them to participate and choose these targeted interventions.
- While the Committee needs to make funding level recommendations, it is easy to see why that can be difficult when many of the strategies have issues. For example, the summaries of strategies should be more explicit about who is expected to carry out the work (what agency, what type of personnel). Also, I am generally concerned that many of the plan recommendations are based on poorly examined assumptions, or on incomplete research. Prevention sounds good, but is highly problematic and subjective in practice. Creating "systems" sounds good, but seems devoid of community connections which have been so important to many nonprofit homeless services providers and the people we serve. Some of the recommendations seem geared to an efficiency mindset, almost forgetting that

we are dealing with people who have incredibly complicated lives. Finally, if not already in the plan, there should be robust analysis of each of these measures and their impact. We as a sector have to be care about touting "best practices" that work - there is a lot of selective use of data in contemporary homeless services thinking and it has been driving bad policy.

- Defund facilities like Telecare Corp that continue to have violations and deaths on their record. Provide more oversight for facilities the county funds.
- I hope that the opinions of the folks working on-the-ground are truly considered equally to the voices of those at the top who often are not as familiar with the day-to-day struggles and gaps in services there are.
- Is the County considering the use of funds to prioritize locations where it would cost less to build and maintain housing/services, such as the Antelope Valley where land is cheaper? Is the County considering the relocation of existing housing/services to areas that will reduce the negative impacts of homelessness in existing urban and suburban communities? What plan does the County have for the use of these funds if neighborhoods oppose the creation and develop of homelessness housing and programs in their communities? I look forward to the County's responses. Thank you.
- Having the experience of being homeless in 2005, we have made strides in the area of coordination of services, however we are still making mistakes in not targeting to specific needs. We increasing staffing stock, however we are not fully moving in alignment with the economic impacts such as deficits and cost of living. Without providing specific quality interventions and retentions that meet specific needs and without using the correct methods of data to align supports and services we will continue having larger populations of homeless. In the working and decision making process, we MUST include ALL stakeholders, especially those who are homeless, who have experienced homeless. It is from their stories that we build the bridges and foundations, otherwise we start over again with the problem cities.
- I can't comment on everything as I don't know all the info. But what MUST be done is NOT to allow landlords to EVICT families/disabled/elderly, etc. and others who may not be able to afford another apt. It should be mandatory that a landlord FINDS a SUITABLE and AFFORDABLE alternative for these people at same rent they were paying if they want to empty their property. Or NOT ALLOW THE EVICTION TO TAKE PLACE with this vulnerable population.
- There is something fundamentally broken at the core of the present system and the present thinking. All of the plans, the budget initiatives, the "crisis/emergency" declarations, the political rhetoric, etc.. has failed to even make a dent in the homeless situation in Los Angeles. It seems to me that it is the utmost in either hubris or ignorance or both to think that yet another plan and yet another outlay of funds will make a difference this time. I suggest that you start thinking of the streets, in the context of the homeless, in a holistic sense as a singular "place" (e.g. the public realm) owned and operated by the city. When a new person moves into that place, the city should record information about the person (e.g. not just a homeless "count", but a true homeless census). You goal, as a property owner of a space un-permitted as and unfit for a permanent "residence", should be to "evict" them asap. Your goal as a steward of humanitarian social agency should be to relocate them to permanent supportive housing asap. Thanks for listening and thanks for the opportunity to engage. I love Los Angeles and there is not a day that goes by that I don't encounter the sight of mentally-ill homeless

people. In DTLA the situation is surreal. Pedestrians scooting around unconscious homeless people sprawled across the sidewalks. LA needs to take its destiny in its hands and once and for all face the reality that the presence of homeless on the streets is not a "situation" or a "problem" or an "issue" or a "crisis" or an "emergency". It is, as I opined previously, a crime against humanity.

- I have a son the recently got SSI. He is not able to find housing because he is on probation. He is sharing a room in transitional living however I think he needs his own space because he suffers from PTSD. I currently work for the county and have resources but can't seem to find housing and this has been an issue for over half of his life.
- Get the homeless off the streets NOW. The voters have approved the funding and we expect action that is not stalled for years by the bureaucracy. Get busy and get it done ASAP. Permanent supportive housing. Federal subsidies. Rapid rehousing for disabled. Improve aggressive tactics to remove people from the streets. Living on the streets is an unhealthy and unsafe choice made by individuals with mental illness and drug abuse problems.
- Please take into consideration that we are severely lacking a safe place for our transgender community. We are also lacking a safe place for people experiencing violence because our dv shelters no longer consider them to be in danger or meet their criteria. Senior, transgender and victims of violence are falling through the cracks. thank you!
- Janice Hahn asked for input regarding the San Pedro Courthouse recently, and the shuttered Whittier Courthouse is also in her district. I am certain that all of the Supervisors have those moth-balled courthouses in their districts, that have now been sitting empty for some time. Optimum use would be to use them to speed up the trials on the docket in LA County, but since that doesn't seem to be a priority, why not repurpose those taxpayer owned facilities into either shelters or subsidized housing units, possibly containing a Social Services, Job Training site, or Mental Health facility on the repurposed buildings? Upsides: Would put many construction workers back to work, suppliers of building materials would make some money, utilizes the skills of County urban planners and engineers, would employ managers for the buildings once refurbished, and would provide much needed shelter for many. Perhaps this idea you have heard before, but it just makes sense to this one stakeholder, and I would like to see, the Whittier Courthouse at least, which is close to where I live, be purposeful again.
- How are cities, like the City of Industry (and Santa FeSprings,etc.) able to damage the County infrastructure, and NOT be held accountable to fix the damage causes by the businesses themselves and large trucks they employ? One way that this city could help to mitigate its impact on residents in the County, would be to provide more affordable housing, homeless transitional housing, OR shelters within its boundaries. I know this would mean more voters, and possible oversight for their "business" interests, but it would alleviate some of the homeless that are living in our local parks, washes, and underpasses. There seems to be plenty of "for lease" signs on large empty warehouses throughout Industry's tentacles in the San Gabriel Valley. They also were able to force out the farmer on Azusa to create a personal dump site, which now appears to be under construction for more warehouses. Why can't the County require that that city build a homeless shelter for "x" amount of vacant warehouse space. Since homeowners and renters seem hesitant to house the homeless close to their residences, wouldn't shelters interspersed among empty warehouses be a compromised solution? Upsides: Shelter for those who need it most, jobs for those associated with the shelters, food services(one of the businesses in City of Industry), security, trash collection, possibly job training to help put some of

the homeless back to work, tailored to the businesses that continually have "help wanted" signs up in the City of Industry. City of Industry is in Hilda Solis' district, but greatly impacts those who live in Janice Hahn's district.

- There seems to be nothing in the plan about how long it will take realistically to achieve RESULTS. Will these expenditures go on for years - and decades - without achieving any visible and meaningful improvement? Each one of these plans needs to have specific and measurable goals to actually reduce the County's homeless population within a specified time period. Funding for programs that are unsuccessful should be removed and used to expand those that are.
- Until people are off the streets we need to provide port-a-potties for them and also mobile showers. I realize that port-a-potties can be mis-used but I believe with enough units out in the community, and regularly servicing them, we can keep our streets cleaner and help the homeless feel less of a burden.
- I have seen progress where homeless persons, especially those with physical and mental disabilities, and addiction receive consistent daily life skills services. This might mean group homes with some live-in counselors and aides. It might cost more, but along with outreach workers who actually work intensively with people on the street, it is effective. What is the point of just throwing money and facilities at homeless with life problems if there is no intensive interpersonal assistance? It doesn't achieve lasting results. There are both good and bad groups doing this, so they would have to be capable and supported consistently. Serious interpersonal relationships are key. I once interned with a counseling agency where I observed this need.
- Whatever good comes of this will still not decrease the homeless population any time soon. In fact where I reside in Hollywood it's increased both youth and non.
- Funding for services for people experiencing homelessness should NOT be directed to law enforcement.
- In my opinion, the pervasive lack of affordable housing creates, exacerbates and perpetuates chronic homelessness. Rest assured, most of the homeless are not homeless BY CHOICE. As a society, we have a responsibility to ensure there is adequate housing available to the homeless and that we provide linkages to resources to help people access and utilize housing options. The VAST INFLUX of upscale housing in Los Angeles is SHAMELESS. The recent development of 'housing' for 'small aircraft' at Van Nuys Airport is atrocious given the large numbers of homeless 'people' in the region. Such projects reflect our values as a society. We must all remember each person is just that, a person, not to be scoffed, feared or shunned. They are entitled to dignity and quality of life more so than the aircraft at Van Nuys Airport.
- I like the Restoration Model in San Antonio Texas. I think we need one in each of La County's eight service Areas. I believe the vacant lots that have not been developed since the 1992 Riots should be developed for housing and supportive services. I believe that zoning needs to be less rigid so that more than one unit can be built on a piece of land. Each unit should have a kitchen and bathroom(s).

- The problem of people with no home will never be fixed unless you deal with the root causes. I have years of experience getting people back on their feet. Call me if you really care about solutions from a person with a track record. 310 3282102 Conrad
- Where is the part for the safe parking program for RV's. Mike Bonin has major issues in his district and needs help.
- I live in echo park. I work in East Hollywood. I see tent encampments everywhere. I know it would be difficult but somehow I think homeless services-- from shelters-- to permanent housing-- must be integrated into every community. The homeless problem belongs to us all.
- Six vacant homes for every homeless Patt Morrison liked some of these ideas Let the free market work its wonders: make it profitable to use such homes and abandoned buildings. And to use campgrounds, farm labor camps, parts of military bases, fallout shelters, halfway houses, school dorms off-season, stadiums, group homes, sobriety homes, trailer parks, trailer junkyards, underused jails and prisons, and shanties and tents from the military on the outskirts of towns. The homeless do not HAVE to live downtown. Preferably they should be near work and/or transportation. - Let the homeless work for less than minimum wage. - Keep winter shelters open year round. - Require volunteer work in exchange for food, clothing, shelter, and services. – Do NOT build anything till the above have been exhausted, then convert buildings to SRO's – single room occupancies like the old YMCA's – tiny rooms with a common bathroom down the hall. [I lived in some.] In these the single residents don't need cooking facilities or a restaurant allowance. They can buy food from markets. Have them provide their own furniture from thrift shops or whatever. Furnishing them with new one bedroom, furnished apartments is exactly the wrong approach. – Never reward the non-working with more than what the working get. Nothing is more discouraging for those who work. - Don't build permanent housing for 100 when you can house 2000 in a mission for the same money. - Don't call it 'permanent'; the homeless will feel entitled to it permanently. The working poor don't get this. - Provide safe parking for those who live in their vehicles
- Don't ask any community to provide shelter for more than their share.
- Don't let I.a. become an even bigger magnet. - Explore getting the working homeless into vehicles they can live in - campers, minivans, mini rv's ...
- A big impediment to solving the problem is the nomadic, pop up anywhere aspect of homelessness. Here's a quick 'band aid' that will make delivery of vital services -- from food to medical to sanitation to policing -- vastly more immediate and efficient: Make sections of the banks of the LA River safe and the only approved homeless encampments. In addition to leaving more \$ for permanent solutions, it will reduce threats, real and perceived, to the health and safety of the general public. They, in turn, will become less fearful and more supportive as confrontations decline. It will also help businesses and tourism. The spread of civilized society was always rooted on riverbanks -- let us not squander the unique resource of the LA River.
- Too much bureaucratic, social work jargon and buzzwords - should use plain language. Too many words in most categories. far too much capitalizing the first letter of words. No outline, no flow chart, no mention of rewarding those with traditional values so they can move away from the irresponsible. Little mention of work. One reads this bafflegab and gives up.

- Use the funds strategically to prevent homelessness and provide housing to those in greatest need.
- There needs to be a specific plan and money devoted to eliminating all people living in RV's and cars throughout Westchester and Playa del Rey. The number of RV's parked down Manchester is particularly alarming. It is unsafe and unsanitary to have the RV's blocking visibility of drivers and bikers. The discarding of human waste and trash on the streets is a health hazard and disgusting. Numerous laws are openly violated daily with no apparent consequences.
- Measure H was presented to residents of LA County to prevent homelessness for 30,000 people as well as to secure permanent supportive housing for another 45,000 people who are now homeless. PSH is the ultimate goal, but in the near term assisting those that are at risk of becoming homeless should become a greater priority monetary wise than what is currently being discussed by the Measure H Revenue Planning Group. Strategies A-1 and A-5 are crucial to reduce homelessness. It is my understanding, after conversing with a member of LAHSA that the Planning Group 1) is aware that the need outstrips available resources and tough decisions will need to be made; and 2) there does appear to be significant support for prioritizing those strategies that provide permanent supportive housing for people currently experiencing homelessness. Finding adequate PSH is going to, unfortunately, take time. I suggest that there the proposed funding recommendations is allocating too much money in year 1 for PSH and there should be more money allocated towards preventing homelessness. A-1 now has only \$3,000,000 in year one. More is needed for both A-1 and A-5. B-3, rapid rehousing, has \$57,000,000 allocated in year one. E-7 has \$25,000,00 in year one and E-6, the countywide outreach system has \$19,000,000 on the "blackboard". I recommend a re-allocation of these funds. I do believe that the Planning Group is working on the right strategies. Good going. HPRP funding distributed \$1.5 billion nationwide and the city and county of Los Angeles received ample amounts of this money. The program worked but now a similar program in LA County has the opportunity due to Measure H funding to immediately reduce homelessness.
- In the late 70's, homes in the Los Angeles were sold at 2-3 times the average annual income, instead of the 8-9 times average today. Homelessness is the tip of the iceberg of a nationwide affordability problem. Part of the solution would be to create an intercity construction platform to produce some homes in a way similar to the automotive and computer industries.
- NO where in this proposal do i see any help for the blight, danger and health hazards that the westside is dealing with. Where is the Safe Parking program???? I lived in Mar Vista the RV's moved on Rose right by the community center and where kids played their soccer and baseball games. My daughter could no longer walk our dog near Penmar Park as RV's selling drugs, needles on the sidewalk, bags of urine and feces came with those RV's. All up and down that street. Venice is full of RV's who dump their sewage among the homes. Now i'm in Westchester and the RV 's have been pushed out by incorporated cities like Culver City, Santa Monica and El Segundo. They are now flooded in Venice, and Westchester and Playa del Rey. Where is the money i voted for this proposition being used to help my area not walk by bags of urine. All the kids that live near where these vehicles are allowed to park and no police is enforcing the rules to get them out at night are just forced to walk by needles, prostitution, drug deals and sewage thrown into our neighborhoods by our houses? Why should we abide by the law, pay taxes and be forced to watch criminals line the streets near our houses with impunity? They are not homeless as many have nice cars they pull up next to their RV's. They have listservs telling them which streets to come and park at where no one will ever ask them to move. Please help us deal with this and create some safe parking for them. Churches at night, empty parking lots they need somewhere to go that is not our neighborhood streets.

- Money and a workable plan MUST be allocated to address the RV dweller problems in Westchester. It appears the current plan is simply to empty out the RV's currently in Manchester Square by allowing them to relocate to residential areas throughout Westchester. Other RV dwellers outside Manchester Square have also gotten the word that Westchester is a spot where laws aren't enforced and they're moving in to take advantage of that. This is NOT a workable plan! Years of neglect by the city and LAWA created this enormous problem and now that there is going to be an influx of taxpayer supplied funds, we deserve to have our money used to remedy this blight in our neighborhoods. Nearby cities like El Segundo and Inglewood have put a stop to this nonsense and it's high time LA followed suit.
- We need money to be spent that will allow the LAPD to prosecute those who are not homeless and just choose to break laws and make our community unsafe. The true homeless would be helped by this program.
- True homelessness is not a choice. Many of the RVers have made the choice to live in our community rent and tax free while spewing their garbage and illegal activities throughout the neighborhood. Crime is up, filth is up, and before you know it, we are going to have illnesses running rampant from all the illegal dumping.
- We will start by friendly approach and get them to our gym and recreation place to take a shower and get cleaning clothing. We will take them to get medical and food. We need to have a place available for them to spend the night. A small emergency fund is necessary, for the people who needs public transportation to get a job. Before we build houses, they need a room at the Hotel.
- The RV's parking in Westchester/Playa del Rey is getting out of control. There are as many as 12-15 on one block. Trash is left on the street and some do not move for days/weeks at a time. As on some sections of Manchester no parking from 10pm-6am should be posted.
- Please use funding from measure H to help the growing homeless population in 90045. It is a glaring fact that more and more vehicle dwellings are being parked in Manchester west of Sepulveda. Most near westchester park a popular destination for families with young children. Sadly, the increased population brings a variety challenges. While, shopping at the nearby Ralphs on Sepulveda two weeks ago, I was aggressively approached by a homeless man who cursed and threaten me and my son. I finally had to call the police to intervene. We must come up with plan to help both residents, homeless and vehicle dwellers in this area. Thank you.
- Please find a place for all of the vehicle dwellers that have taken over Westchester and Playa Del Rey. They are bringing crime, trash, toxic hazards, and traffic hazards and NO ONE is doing anything about it. We continue to vote in taxes to solve these problems, and our taxes get completely wasted, and we still have these problems. Do your jobs as elected officials, get the vehicle dwellers moved to an appropriate, approved place.
- Homelessness is not a crime. Parking RV's (not working and working) illegally is. Parked in bike lanes, as well as blocking right turn lanes. According to law, there is not supposed to be any overnight parking of RV's.. How about enforcing that law.

- There has been a growing problem in my neighborhood - Westchester- with homelessness and RV. These individuals need a safe place to live and help. At the moment, they are living in tents and RVs that are affecting their health and safety and that of our neighborhood. Trash are disposed on streets and sidewalks. Human urine and feces are a health hazard. Please allocate some of the Measure H money to this important issue as Westchester is home to LAX and a gateway to our city.
- Coordinate with city and county agencies to modify existing single family home zoning ordinances, in order to allow legal conversion of single family home garages into "granny flats".
- Money and a workable plan MUST be allocated to address the RV dweller problems in Westchester. We have needles, bags of urine, feces, drug deals, prostitution all around us — we are law abiding homeowners and renters who should not have to deal with this in our areas! It seems our leaders are simply emptying out the RVs currently in Manchester Square and allowing them to relocate to residential areas throughout Westchester. The word is out for other RV dwellers outside Manchester Square that Westchester is a place where laws are NOT enforced and they're moving in to take advantage of that. This is NOT acceptable! We need a workable plan! Years of neglect by the city and LAWA created this enormous problem and now that there is going to be an influx of taxpayer supplied funds, we deserve to have our money used to remedy this blight in our neighborhoods. We need Safe Parking places for the RVs and out of our neighborhoods — the police are not enforcing them moving at night.
- We're told that there are hundreds of vacant lots throughout South Central LA due to the 1992 LA Riots. Build housing on these lots immediately, get people off the street and into these units, and provide family counseling, employment assistance and mental health services at these locations to the residents. We see apartment buildings go up all around town in a matter of months. There could easily be 10,000 new units on these lots in a year, enabling about a third of the homeless population to have roofs over their heads a year from now. If that is successful, more vacant spaces throughout the county can be found for additional units.
- We live in PDR and have RVs 100yards from our house, in front of a daycare facility. This is disturbing for several reasons, including the fact that it's not safe for little kids to cross the street between these vehicles (can't see) and because we paid a significant amount for our house in a NEIGHBORHOOD, not in an RV park. If/when we try to sell our house in the future, having RVs a few feet away will have a significant impact on the sale price. This is grossly unfair to my family. Please help us feel safe and maintain our neighborhood atmosphere by offering a safe haven for those who CHOOSE the RV lifestyle near the beach.
- LA has many homeless living in cars or RVs. We need to start helping those in need living out of their RV and prosecuting those using their RVs to operate rolling criminal enterprises like selling drugs and sex trafficking. LA desperately needs a Safe Parking Program to help with both of these important issues. Please allocate some of the Measure H money to this important initiative.
- At a minimum, use the \$10 Million for "testing" the various priorities and strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of them. Answer the question: Which strategies work most effectively for which populations of those individuals and families that are homeless? 2. Many people who are homeless and mentally ill remain on the streets because they meet the Section 5150 criteria for involuntary hospitalization, but there are not enough psychiatric beds, staff and other needed resources to

evaluate and treat them, in order for these individuals to be transferred to residential treatment facilities and/or board and care homes in the community; or to permanent supportive housing where they can live on their own with supportive services, indefinitely. Funding is needed for these services as well as item 3, that follows. 3. Finally, some individuals have acute psychotic episodes on a regular basis and meet the Section 5150 criteria. These individuals need long-term psychiatric hospitalization and/or residential care. Without these services they will remain on the streets, living in stairwells or on the sidewalks, suffering with their mental illness, physical diseases and injuries; and the violence that often ends their lives prematurely.

- I am a Candidate for Congress in the 28th Congressional District, and have been working on the Homeless Issue since 1984, as well as I have a plan to deal with Individuals living on the streets of Los Angeles, and across our Nation. The current proposals for Measure H funding are overwhelming, some 19 different Programs and Agencies seeking funding. That is a formula for failure in dealing with the Homeless population. My suggestion for Measure H funding is my plan the Non-Area Resident Act (NARA). It is made-up of five components, working in conjunction with Federal, State, County, and City funds from Measure H, as well as Non-Governmental Agencies. NARA Component #1, Immediate Temporary Housing for all Homeless Individuals living on the streets provided by the City of Los Angeles. Component #2, Assessment Team to evaluate the status and condition of each Individual. Component #3, Healthcare services for all Individuals, with a Healthcare Team for Medical Care, Mental Health Services, Dental, Vision, as well as Drug and Alcohol Treatment. Component #4, Vocational Services and Counseling. Component #5, Transition Team to assist Individuals back into the Community with Housing, Employment, Healthcare Services, Resources to achieve their goals, as well as appropriate funding sources.
- In collaboration together for the past two years, the City of Los Angeles and County have made significant progress in developing a responsive homeless services delivery system to house our homeless neighbors. It is important that this collaboration continue- not just in terms of funding allocation but in terms of aligning implementation strategies and sharing of best practices. Our City along with Long Beach, Santa Monica, and a few others will always be receiving communities and thus request strong consideration of funding based on need to ensure that we do not erase the progress made to-date and inadvertently impact the suffering caused by this human crisis. Finally, if cities must provide bridge funding until the County programs are up and running, could this funding be reimbursed to sponsoring cities? If so, could the terms be put in writing? Thank you Phil and team for outstanding work on this process. In ten years we will look back and see a difference.
- Please watch the movie "The Grapes of Wrath" 1940 - Henry Fonda. About 2/3 of the way into the movie, they show a permanent camp, with small, wood, summer-camp-style bunk-style buildings that house the people. It is all supervised by government, but run by the residents. There are showers, and it's a community. The County should identify empty lots that are cheap to rent, or buy, all over the County, and build these permanent encampments. There, homeless people can get services, all manner of services. People can live there for a time, get transitional help. They can get food, a shower, clean, fresh clothes and leave, if that is their choice. BUT, they can become known to the people running the facility, who have social workers and other people available doctors, dentists, etc. Since we cannot force people to get help (homelessness and poverty are not crimes) we must ENTICE them, with CLEAN, SAFE PLACES where they can go on their own and get help. We can send mobile teams in vans, with sandwiches, medicine, personal care products, etc. and tell people about these places and give them information, for outreach, but it's got to be offering a CLEAN, SAFE PLACE where they can come and go, if they feel uncomfortable.

- The City of Carson continues to support the mission of Measure H but also needs assistance in meeting the needs of the City in its efforts to be helpful in reducing and eliminating homelessness. We ask that serious consideration be given to making allocations to each City.
- We are concerned that the strategies do not prioritize people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) into housing, which is an integral part of reducing the transmission of HIV in Los Angeles County and moving towards an AIDS-free generation. Below, we provide a summary of homelessness and HIV/AIDS in Los Angeles County, comments on the importance of prioritizing PLWHA into housing, and a recommendation for how to achieve this goal. Demographics As of 2014 there were an estimated 58,000 persons living with HIV/AIDS in Los Angeles County, representing 41% of all HIV/AIDS cases in California, and of those 58,000 people, 10,629 (18.1%) are undiagnosed. In addition, 75% of PLWHA live below 300% of the Federal Poverty Line (FPL), and homeless individuals account for 10.8% (4,960) of the diagnosed cases of HIV/AIDS in LA County. Thank you for leading an inclusive community-driven planning process aimed at identifying the most strategic and effective path for ending homelessness in Los Angeles County. Our County is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to foster and sustain regional partnerships to develop and implement a comprehensive homeless prevention plan for families and individuals. In March 2016, the Los Angeles County Commission on HIV wrote a letter to the Board of Supervisors highlighting the role that safe and affordable housing plays in saving the lives of people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS. A copy of that letter is attached. We are writing to reaffirm our voices and commitment to ensuring that the needs of people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS are integrated on the Homeless Initiative Plan and its implementation. The National HIV/AIDS Strategy 2020 recognizes the provision of safe, affordable, and permanent supportive housing as a structural approach to reducing the risk of HIV transmission at community and societal levels. Los Angeles County, with the Homeless Initiative, is now poised to lead the Nation in developing a model for unfettered access to comprehensive medical and social services for people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS. Thank you for your continued leadership. Attachment: March 30, 2016 County Board of Supervisors Honorable Hilda Solis, Chair, First District Honorable Mark Ridley-Thomas, Second District Honorable Sheila Kuehl, Third District Honorable Don Knabe, Fourth District Honorable Michael D. Antonovich, Fifth District Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street, #493 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Re: Concurrence with the Los Angeles County HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) Comments on the Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness Dear Supervisors: The Los Angeles County Commission on HIV (COH) supports the recommendations submitted by the Los Angeles County HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) on Los Angeles County's Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness.
- These numbers are exacerbated by the structural challenges to accessing housing and supportive services and the high cost of living in LA County. Housing and the HIV Care Continuum The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has documented the link between housing instability and both delayed HIV diagnosis and increased risk of acquiring and transmitting HIV infection. In addition, homelessness and unstable housing are strongly associated with inadequate access to healthcare and poor health outcomes. It is important to note that as an infectious disease without a cure, HIV/AIDS continues to be a critical public health issue, and there is a disproportionate risk of transmission and lack of healthcare among the homeless and unstably housed. For PLWHA and those at a high-risk of contracting HIV, stable housing is the most effective health intervention, over time having a bigger impact on preventing transmission and retaining PLWHA in medical care than demographics, health status, insurance coverage, mental illness and substance abuse, or other supportive services. Retention in and continuity of medical care leads to

reduced viral load (the amount of virus in the blood), which means that PLWHA are less likely to transmit HIV, and the overall County expenditures on healthcare decrease. Stable housing is also linked to more frequent HIV testing and fewer transmissions, and this three-pronged benefit of housing PLWHA will help bring LA County one step closer to realizing an AIDS-free generation. Recommendation Based on this evidence, it is paramount that the County includes in its recommendations a strategy to prioritize PLWHA into housing. Both the County and City of Los Angeles primarily prioritize homeless individuals into housing through the Vulnerability Index – Service Prioritization and Decision Assistance Tool (VI-SPDAT) , which uses a scoring system to assess the “chronicity and medical vulnerability of homeless individuals”. To date, HIV/AIDS is weighted extremely low because the serious public health aspect of HIV/AIDS as a transmittable and incurable disease has not been factored into the scoring system. Thus, current methodology for prioritizing housing exacerbates the vulnerability of homeless and unstably housed individuals living with HIV/AIDS who do not qualify as “chronically” homeless. This, along with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s new definition of chronic homelessness, will leave many homeless persons with HIV/AIDS on the street and unhoused. However, there is a clear and simple opportunity for the County to prioritize PLWHA into housing while continuing to house the chronically homeless. LACHAC recommends that LA County include HIV/AIDS as an automatic high acuity designation for the Coordinated Entry System (CES) prioritization for housing in Los Angeles County. The reduction in transmissions of HIV and lower healthcare costs to the County that would result are important benefits for the community. The Los Angeles Commission on HIV sincerely appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on Los Angeles County’s Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the COH office at 213-639-6714. Thank you. Sincerely, Cheryl Barrit, Executive Director, Los Angeles County Commission on HIV Brad Land, Co-Chair, Los Angeles County Commission on HIV Ricky Rosales, Co-Chair, Los Angeles County Commission on HIV

- I AM A HEALTHCARE PHYSICIAN AND BELIEVE THAT HOMELESSNESS LEADS TO POOR HEALTH AND VICE VERSA. WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO CARE FOR ALL OF LONG BEACH'S HOMELESS POPULATION. OUR CLINIC PROVIDES HEALTHCARE TO OVER 1200 HOMELESS IN LB AND WE HAVE JUST STARTED A MOBILE CLINIC TO TRY TO LOCATE AND CARE FOR THE OTHERS. PLEASE VOTE TO HELP OUR HOMELESS WITH HOUSING AND THE OTHER SOCIAL NEEDS THEY HAVE!
- 1. Create spaces where it is legal and acceptable for homeless to camp out. Either sections of parks, or separate camps, or 9pm to 6am on county sidewalks. 2. Retrofit all park restrooms to be used 24/7 with running hot and cold water, hot showers with adjoining small dressing room with bench and hanger, lockable from the inside. Or, this should be available in the camps. This way, homeless are not excluded from employment because of hygiene issues. 3. Faucets to draw potable water. 4. Homeless should be able to obtain a sturdy locker with mail slot where they can receive US mail in proximity to where they are allowed to camp. 5. Free mental health services. 6. Free healthcare, dental, optical. 7. Free job retraining. 8. Free housing not necessary nor recommended. Stow tent in locker in the mornings. 9. If the county were to create homeless encampments, then provide one good inexpensive, healthful meal a day in a way that does not interfere with a new job. 10. Make it easy to BEGIN and hold down a new job while still homeless.
- I applaud your efforts and look forward to supporting the initiatives your leadership will generate.

- I have individuals that are 16 to 24 years of age living on the streets and its only one place I know of that deals with homeless youth. Increase satellite offices
- In general, Measure H funds should be used exclusively to add capacity to the system - new staffing (not funding existing staff to do new things), new beds - rather than supplanting existing funding. Local incentives/local match should be considered to promote greater local leveraging and ensure existing funding does not pull back.
- YPSYCOWGIRL PRODUCTIONS 8407 Reading Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045 310.293.7157 May 1, 2017
 Re: Public Comment for HHH Funding Thank you for putting out the public notice that you are looking for community input on the HHH funds. I, and my very mobilized neighbors, live in Westchester where we have the second largest encampment of RVs and tents in the city next to skid row. I was successful in getting the LA times out to do an article on this area a couple of months ago. Our community's concerns are two-fold: 1. We do not want this encampment moving into our neighborhoods once LAX shuts down the encampment to make way for the LAX consolidated rental car facility. 2. We are a very compassionate community and want to make sure that our homeless within our community are given the best of public services and opportunities. Many of our neighbors regularly go to Manchester Square and Skid Row to provide necessities to those living in these area. Manchester Square is unique in that housing the homeless can be measured and quantified. There is a limited number of people in the encampment that have to leave at a designated time. This is ground zero and where efforts can be tried and then moved towards other parts of the city without a hard deadline to leave. It is a fertile creative outlet for filmmakers, LA Times, and all of the news outlets to monitor. Having lost complete faith in our Councilman, Mike Bonin, our neighborhood council and city government, a group of very knowledgeable and experienced group has found each other on next-door.com. This online site currently has 11,000 members online and growing within the Westchester/Playa Del Rey communities. The neighbors working together towards these ends each have an impressive CV. One is a retired judge who before becoming a judge was a social worker on skid row. Grey Schmidt has spent the past 25 years housing the homeless mentally ill in outreach and in transitional care programs. We are advised by is a leader in Santa Monica who works in affordable housing, an International Faith Based organization, the DMH. Doris Davis is a faith-based leader who leads an Interfaith organization in Culver City. We are also consulting and being inspired by an entrepreneur who worked at Space X as well as documentary film makers and You Tube producers. Academically, we are helped by OTIS artists and professors in Intentional Community and Community Activist Programs. We are inspired by Loyola University that provides a solid bedrock of Social Justice to our community. I am an artist/activist/writer who worked 10 years in sales and marketing at Conde Nast Publications on Vanity Fair Magazine and 25 years working for the Academy Awards, Grammy Awards, and many other reality and award show programs. I have also negotiated contract issues with UTLA and SAG AFTRA, as well as successfully suing LAUSD twice. Following are the ideas we will champion. We are working toward getting documentary filmmakers to document what happens at Manchester Square. Following is the result of extensive conversations with those who have successfully helped the homeless with housing and a collective collaboration of ideas and ways to EFFICIENTLY and EFFECTIVELY provide housing: 1. It is imperative to listen to the mental health and outreach people who are boots on the ground and not in upper management. They will tell you that what the homeless need is a relationship with program providers based on trust. This trust is built on time to build consistent predictable, and routinely scheduled visits by the SAME people. This will be the only way that the homeless will buy into moving into permanent housing. 2. Eliminate the inordinate and ridiculously LARGE and PROHIBITIVE amounts of paperwork. We need an ARMY of mental health and outreach people who actually want to do this great work but are forced to sit at their desks and fill

out forms instead of spending A LOT of time with the homeless on the street. 3. Transitional housing programs were eliminated. My husband had a very successful program where he currently works that was cut. In this program, people were re-trained and helped to learn forgotten skills while forging for basic survival on the street. These skills included, cooking, laundry, keeping a check book, paying rent; all the things that those of us who have a home take for granted. 4. This transitional housing can occur in temporary intentional communities staffed with those trained in transitional care. In Portland, they have an incredible place called Dignity Village that provides a place that has laundry, services, bathrooms, a kitchen. It also has a large room that can house 60 people on cots who are just coming off of the streets. 5. Our homeless situation was declared a state of emergency. That was a political posturing only. The emergency is still there and growing. If it were a FEMA situation we would see temporary housing on public lands to give the necessary relief to people: bathrooms, showers, food, services, phones computers. If the city is going to call an EMERGENCY, they need to respond and act like it is one. 6. Once the city takes this emergency seriously and doesn't use and exploit the homeless to developers and politicians that want to feign compassion for the homeless to appeal to the liberal LA base, then the situation needs to be triaged with common sense and affordable housing. 7. Crate homes, \$1,000 Ikea homes that come in a box adobe homes, trailers, RVs, and Tiny homes and other alternative housing ideas can be are placed on empty lots as a transitional base before the residents can be moved into permanent housing. These solutions are actually great proactive alternatives that can become communities and a place to live. 8. To open up section 8 housing and land for the homeless, landowners need to have incentives to do so: no property tax and those things that make it lucrative to make this a profitable venture. There is 1.2 billion for 45,000 homeless, that is 26,000 per person. This money can be used for incentives for EXISTING structures, there is NO necessity to build expensive homes. In LA, we need to move towards out of the box solutions for housing. The exercise in housing the homeless could lead the way in providing solutions for teachers, nurses, firefighters, service workers and others who are being forced out of the LA rental an property market. 9. Then, the Homeless must say yes to moving into permanent housing. If they are offered housing and refuse, they should no longer be able to live in squalor on our streets. Allowing homelessness, sleeping in cars, etc., enables people to stay where they are and also supports criminal activities like prostitution and drugs. Mike Bonin has his offices on the corner of Manchester and Lincoln right near Westchester Park. He ignorantly believes that he is helping the homeless by allowing them to live outside steps from his office. Last summer, 5 homeless people died in that park, steps from his office. If you can't help those who are right out of your door, then you certainly cannot wear a halo or get bragging rights to helping the homeless. His office could have reached out and given priority helping those right outside his door. Our community is very disappointed that only one person has been housed since last October by the LAHSA, the county, PATH. It is presented that this kind of cooperation is unprecedented. Yet, since October until this year, only one person has been placed in housing. There is no continuity of care. Grey Schmidt, on his own, has housed 8-12 homeless. This number is the same for the person at DMH who also houses the homeless mentally ill. He has housed 8-12 homeless. We do not have the luxury of time to fund another study, host another luncheon, give another impassioned speech. This is a true STATE OF EMERGENCY! It would be a disgrace if we treated people similarly situated after a disaster. It goes without saying that there needs to be GREAT accountability with the money that the voters are entrusting you with. Thank you for giving serious consideration to these things that are actually proven to work. They are common sense and tried and trued methods used by boots on the ground licensed professionals. Peace, Jane Finstrom Artist/Activist

- As far as the clean sweep, it does not work! Think of it like this If you teach a man to fish, he learns to feed himself forever. If you house along with supportive services, you will teach the homeless, how to have the most productive life they are capable. Clean sweeps remove and replace with new homeless, while the only future the homeless who were in the last clean up have no where to go, when release. with no hope in sight or problem solved.
- Where is the line for the safe parking program? My neighborhood as well as many others has been overrun with people living in cars, busses, pickups, and especially rvs. The new parking map is not being enforced. Bike lanes are blocked, sight lines are blocked, trash is everywhere, broken glass is everywhere, drug paraphernalia is everywhere. Human waste sits in jugs on the curb or is just dumped to the ocean. Known ever dwellers steal packages off porches and both usps and Lapd refuse to do anything, saying it's the others problem. Those living in vehicles who just need a hand deserve one and can get one thru safe parking. Those who use their rvs as a cover for criminal behavior can and should be arrested for that behavior.
- Take care of the mentally ill. We need many more facilities where people can get permanent help. Supplying them with housing will not help them. Many people should be in a mental hospital getting treatment and medication. This problem goes way back to Governor Reagan when he closed the doors of so many mental health institutions. Unless we treat the problems of mental health we will never solve the problem of homeless people. Thank you.
- The structure of the contracting process is stringent and leaves little opportunity for grassroots, smaller non-profit organizations and faith-based organizations. Most of these organizations have budgets of less than \$1 million, many less than \$500,000. Yet, these organizations provide neighborhood supports and opportunities that many larger organizations are unable to provide. I am recommending that the oversight committee look at establishing a small agencies fund in several of the initiative areas so that these organizations can receive funding for the work that they do in the community.
- Haven Hills calls on the committee to strategically implement Domestic Violence (DV) services into the homelessness initiative. For too long, services for DV survivors have been reduced or eliminated from public budgets. In 2016, DV was reported as the 4th highest reason for homelessness, as reported by LAHSA, yet the current systems do not support this population through its outreach, general screening, housing models, or general supportive services. Instead, the burden has been on DV Service Providers to serve more, with ever-decreasing resources to thousands of women, men, and families. Domestic violence is linked across all our social issues - whether the cause or effect - its impact is great and is our responsibility to help stop the cycle of abuse and prevent an individual or family from falling into poverty or homelessness.
- We in Westchester should not be held responsible for fixing the homeless problems by letting these rvs remain in our neighborhoods every night. They are the cause of our increase in crime. It is unsafe to even walk by them. Urine, feces, needles, meth labs. There is no hope in our eyes as politicians and police look the other way. We pay a lot of money in taxes to live here. I think a lot of political seats should be reevaluated especially before the next vote.
- Thank you for your leadership and the work you are doing! We appreciate the chance to share comments and be a part of the process.

- Increase funding for homeless or near homeless families. Continue to have a strong focus on prevention. Increase affordable housing to prevent homelessness. Agree with the direction you are going. Good work.
- Thank you for leading an inclusive community-driven planning process aimed at identifying the most strategic and effective path for ending homelessness in Los Angeles County. Our County is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to foster and sustain regional partnerships to develop and implement a comprehensive homeless prevention plan for families and individuals.
- In March 2016, the Los Angeles County Commission on HIV wrote a letter to the Board of Supervisors highlighting the role that safe and affordable housing plays in saving the lives of people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS. A copy of that letter is attached. We are writing to reaffirm our voices and commitment to ensuring that the needs of people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS are integrated on the Homeless Initiative Plan and its implementation.
- The National HIV/AIDS Strategy 2020 recognizes the provision of safe, affordable, and permanent supportive housing as a structural approach to reducing the risk of HIV transmission at community and societal levels. Los Angeles County, with the Homeless Initiative, is now poised to lead the Nation in developing a model for unfettered access to comprehensive medical and social services for people living with and at risk for HIV/AIDS. Thank you for your continued leadership.
- Re: Concurrence with the Los Angeles County HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) Comments on the Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness

Dear Supervisors:

The Los Angeles County Commission on HIV (COH) supports the recommendations submitted by the Los Angeles County HOPWA Advisory Committee (LACHAC) on Los Angeles County's Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness. We are concerned that the strategies do not prioritize people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) into housing, which is an integral part of reducing the transmission of HIV in Los Angeles County and moving towards an AIDS-free generation. Below, we provide a summary of homelessness and HIV/AIDS in Los Angeles County, comments on the importance of prioritizing PLWHA into housing, and a recommendation for how to achieve this goal.

As of 2014 there were an estimated 58,000 persons living with HIV/AIDS in Los Angeles County, representing 41% of all HIV/AIDS cases in California, and of those 58,000 people, 10,629 (18.1%) are undiagnosed. In addition, 75% of PLWHA live below 300% of the Federal Poverty Line (FPL), and homeless individuals account for 10.8% (4,960) of the diagnosed cases of HIV/AIDS in LA County. These numbers are exacerbated by the structural challenges to accessing housing and supportive services and the high cost of living in LA County.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has documented the link between housing instability and both delayed HIV diagnosis and increased risk of acquiring and transmitting HIV infection. In addition, homelessness and unstable housing are strongly associated with inadequate access to healthcare and poor health outcomes. It is important to note that as an infectious disease without a cure, HIV/AIDS continues to be a critical public health issue, and there is a disproportionate risk of transmission and lack of healthcare among the homeless and unstably housed. For PLWHA and those at a high-risk of contracting HIV, stable housing is the most effective health intervention, over time having a bigger impact on preventing transmission and retaining PLWHA in

medical care than demographics, health status, insurance coverage, mental illness and substance abuse, or other supportive services. Retention in and continuity of medical care leads to reduced viral load (the amount of virus in the blood), which means that PLWHA are less likely to transmit HIV, and the overall County expenditures on healthcare decrease. Stable housing is also linked to more frequent HIV testing and fewer transmissions, and this three-pronged benefit of housing PLWHA will help bring LA County one step closer to realizing an AIDS-free generation.

Recommendation

Based on this evidence, it is paramount that the County includes in its recommendations a strategy to prioritize PLWHA into housing. Both the County and City of Los Angeles primarily prioritize homeless individuals into housing through the Vulnerability Index “Service Prioritization and Decision Assistance Tool (VI-SPDAT)”, which uses a scoring system to assess the chronicity and medical vulnerability of homeless individuals. To date, HIV/AIDS is weighted extremely low because the serious public health aspect of HIV/AIDS as a transmittable and incurable disease has not been factored into the scoring system. Thus, current methodology for prioritizing housing exacerbates the vulnerability of homeless and unstably housed individuals living with HIV/AIDS who do not qualify as chronically homeless. This, along with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s new definition of chronic homelessness, will leave many homeless persons with HIV/AIDS on the street and unhoused. However, there is a clear and simple opportunity for the County to prioritize PLWHA into housing while continuing to house the chronically homeless. LACHAC recommends that LA County include HIV/AIDS as an automatic high acuity designation for the Coordinated Entry System (CES) prioritization for housing in Los Angeles County. The reduction in transmissions of HIV and lower healthcare costs to the County that would result are important benefits for the community.

The Los Angeles Commission on HIV sincerely appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on Los Angeles County’s Draft Recommended Strategies to Combat Homelessness. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the COH office at 213-639-6714. Thank you.

- Thank you for putting out the public notice that you are looking for community input on the HHH funds. I, and my very mobilized neighbors, live in Westchester where we have the second largest encampment of RVs and tents in the city next to skid row. I was successful in getting the LA times out to do an article on this area a couple of months ago. Our community’s concerns are two-fold:
 1. We do not want this encampment moving into our neighborhoods once LAX shuts down the encampment to make way for the LAX consolidated rental car facility.
 2. We are a very compassionate community and want to make sure that our homeless within our community are given the best of public services and opportunities. Many of our neighbors regularly go to Manchester Square and Skid Row to provide necessities to those living in these area.

Manchester Square is unique in that housing the homeless can be measured and quantified. There is a limited number of people in the encampment that have to leave at a designated time. This is ground zero and where efforts can be tried and then moved towards other parts of the city without a hard deadline to leave. It is a fertile creative outlet for filmmakers, LA Times, and all of the news outlets to monitor. Having lost complete faith in our Councilman, Mike Bonin, our neighborhood council and city government, a group of very knowledgeable and experienced group has found each other on next-door.com. This online site currently has 11,000 members online and growing within the Westchester/Playa Del Rey communities. The neighbors working together towards these ends each have an impressive CV. One is a retired judge who before becoming a judge was a social worker on skid row. Grey Schmidt has spent the

past 25 years housing the homeless mentally ill in outreach and in transitional care programs. We are advised by is a leader in Santa Monica who works in affordable housing, an International Faith Based organization, the DMH. Doris Davis is a faith-based leader who leads an Interfaith organization in Culver City. We are also consulting and being inspired by an entrepreneur who worked at Space X as well as documentary film makers and You Tube producers.

Academically, we are helped by OTIS artists and professors in Intentional Community and Community Activist Programs. We are inspired by Loyola University that provides a solid bedrock of Social Justice to our community. I am an artist/activist/writer who worked 10 years in sales and marketing at Conde Nast Publications on Vanity Fair Magazine and 25 years working for the Academy Awards, Grammy Awards, and many other reality and award show programs. I have also negotiated contract issues with UTLA and SAG AFTRA, as well as successfully suing LAUSD twice. Following are the ideas we will champion. We are working toward getting documentary filmmakers to document what happens at Manchester Square. Following is the result of extensive conversations with those who have successfully helped the homeless with housing and a collective collaboration of ideas and ways to EFFICIENTLY and EFFECTIVELY provide housing:

1. It is imperative to listen to the mental health and outreach people who are boots on the ground and not in upper management. They will tell you that what the homeless need is a relationship with program providers based on trust. This trust is built on time to build consistent, predictable, and routinely scheduled visits by the SAME people. This will be the only way that the homeless will buy into moving into permanent housing.
2. Eliminate the inordinate and ridiculously LARGE and PROHIBITIVE amounts of paperwork. We need an ARMY of mental health and outreach people who actually want to do this great work but are forced to sit at their desks and fill out forms instead of spending A LOT of time with the homeless on the street.
3. Transitional housing programs were eliminated. My husband had a very successful program where he currently works that was cut. In this program, people were re-trained and helped to learn forgotten skills while forging for basic survival on the street. These skills included, cooking, laundry, keeping a check book, paying rent; all the things that those of us who have a home take for granted.
4. This transitional housing can occur in temporary intentional communities staffed with those trained in transitional care. In Portland, they have an incredible place called Dignity Village that provides a place that has laundry, services, bathrooms, a kitchen. It also has a large room that can house 60 people on cots who are just coming off of the streets.
5. Our homeless situation was declared a state of emergency. That was a political posturing only. The emergency is still there and growing. If it were a FEMA situation we would see temporary housing on public lands to give the necessary relief to people: bathrooms, showers, food, services, phones computers. If the city is going to call an EMERGENCY, they need to respond and act like it is one.
6. Once the city takes this emergency seriously and doesn't use and exploit the homeless to developers and politicians that want to feign compassion for the homeless to appeal to the liberal LA base, then the situation needs to be triaged with common sense and affordable housing.
7. Crate homes, \$1,000 Ikea homes that come in a box adobe homes, trailers, RVs, and Tiny homes and other alternative housing ideas can be are placed on empty lots as a transitional base before the residents can be moved into permanent housing. These solutions are actually great proactive

alternatives that can become communities and a place to live.

8. To open up section 8 housing and land for the homeless, landowners need to have incentives to do so: no property tax and those things that make it lucrative to make this a profitable venture. There is 1.2 billion for 45,000 homeless, that is 26,000 per person. This money can be used for incentives for EXISTING structures, there is NO necessity to build expensive homes. In LA, we need to move towards out of the box solutions for housing. The exercise in housing the homeless could lead the way in providing solutions for teachers, nurses, firefighters, service workers and others who are being forced out of the LA rental an property market.

9. Then, the Homeless must say yes to moving into permanent housing. If they are offered housing and refuse, they should no longer be able to live in squalor on our streets. Allowing homelessness, sleeping in cars, etc., enables people to stay where they are and also supports criminal activities like prostitution and drugs. Mike Bonin has his offices on the corner of Manchester and Lincoln right near Westchester Park. He ignorantly believes that he is helping the homeless by allowing them to live outside steps from his office. Last summer, 5 homeless people died in that park, steps from his office. If you can't help those who are right out of your door, then you certainly cannot wear a halo or get bragging rights to helping the homeless. His office could have reached out and given priority helping those right outside his door.

Our community is very disappointed that only one person has been housed since last October by the LAHSA, the county, PATH. It is presented that this kind of cooperation is unprecedented. Yet, since October until this year, only one person has been placed in housing. There is no continuity of care. Grey Schmidt, on his own, has housed 8-12 homeless. This number is the same for the person at DMH who also houses the homeless mentally ill. He has housed 8-12 homeless.

We do not have the luxury of time to fund another study, host another luncheon, give another impassioned speech. This is a true STATE OF EMERGENCY! It would be a disgrace if we treated people similarly situated after a disaster. It goes without saying that there needs to be GREAT accountability with the money that the voters are entrusting you with.

Thank you for giving serious consideration to these things that are actually proven to work. They are common sense and tried and true methods used by boots on the ground licensed professionals.

- 1.Develop a plan for spending(should be in phases): appoint a fiscal expert to monitor spending--not diverted, and bids for services are sound. 2.Assist veterans first, including funds to the VA to boost its efforts to provide services. 3. Recognize & provide services necessary to the populations making up homeless(those who want shelter & employment, mentally ill, drug users, don't want to come in). 4. Recognize & support existing encampments & organize them to function better(use the Portland, Ore. model(LA Times 4.9.17)--this is an interim step toward getting them permanent shelter, reinstate "tiny houses", enhance the existing tent cities by cleaning up and installing toilets & trash containers, institute the composting model used by pipeline protesters (LATimes2.12.17). 5. Don't expect people w/o employment to pay rent in "low cost housing" projects. Include Measure HHH in the funding mix so it is clear what we are spending our money on--no unnecessary overlaps. 6.Get Jose Huizar off homeless projects as he seems to be an impediment (i.e. Boyle Heights effort).
- As far as the clean sweep, it does not work! Think of it like this If you teach a man to fish, he learns to feed himself forever. If you house along with supportive services, you will teach the homeless, how to have the

most productive life they are capable. Clean sweeps remove and replace with new homeless, while the only future the homeless who were in the last clean up have no where to go, when release. with no hope in sight or problem solved.

- The structure of the contracting process is stringent and leaves little opportunity for grassroots, smaller non-profit organizations and faith-based organizations. Most of these organizations have budgets of less than \$1 million, many less than \$500,000. Yet, these organizations provide neighborhood supports and opportunities that many larger organizations are unable to provide. I am recommending that the oversight committee look at establishing a small agencies fund in several of the initiative areas so that these organizations can receive funding for the work that they do in the community.
- Haven Hills calls on the committee to strategically implement Domestic Violence (DV) services into the homelessness initiative. For too long, services for DV survivors have been reduced or eliminated from public budgets. In 2016, DV was reported as the 4th highest reason for homelessness, as reported by LAHSA, yet the current systems do not support this population through its outreach, general screening, housing models, or general supportive services. Instead, the burden has been on DV Service Providers to serve more, with ever-decreasing resources to thousands of women, men, and families. Domestic violence is linked across all our social issues - whether the cause or effect - its impact is great and is our responsibility to help stop the cycle of abuse and prevent an individual or family from falling into poverty or homelessness.
- HASC appreciate the time and effort that's been invested in developing a draft expenditure plan for Measure H. While this work is valued we remain concern with the low upfront investment being made in interim/bridge housing (B7). For this strategy to be truly effective we must look at both inpatient discharges and ED discharges in order to truly prevent people from re-entering homelessness. Recuperative care will likely benefit individuals who are discharged from an inpatient unit and who later can enter bridge housing as part of the continuum of care; while homeless individuals who are discharged (60%) from an ED can benefit from bridge housing. Failure to increase the funding allocation is not moving the needle given the project length of stay and size of the homeless population. Placement is a major challenge for discharge planners. Finally, placement into bridge housing should be reserved for those actually exiting an institution and not assign individuals who exited an institution a month or two ago. Such individuals might be better suited for placement in an emergency shelter bed. Mental health is mentioned in the strategies ...but it remains unclear how funds will improve access and the delivery of service to people who are chronically mentally ill. It's important to address this upfront and not delay discussion given the sizable population of homeless who suffer from mental illness until how dollars will be operationalized.
- Please host webinars during non-working hours to include families and those with full-time jobs the ability contribute and comment during these meetings. The public including those working normal business hours are funding these strategies and should have the opportunity to provide input. The Community Web Meeting hosted on 4/25 did not allow enough time for all public questions and comments to be answered nor did it allow questions to be asked via voice. Please extend the duration of future webinars. I disagree that the public meetings held had diverse stakeholders (http://homeless.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Work-Group-Roster_Final_AO_4-17-17.pdf) as per the homeless.lacounty.gov website. Virtually all participants of the working groups are involved directly with homelessness already. Participants with an outside view from the public or other agencies not associated with homelessness should be included in the working groups.

- Increase funding for homeless or near homeless families. Continue to have a strong focus on prevention. Increase affordable housing to prevent homelessness. Agree with the direction you are going. Good work.

- Introduction

The City of Azusa (City) is committed to addressing the unique and challenging issues created by the increasing homeless population in Azusa. The City has implemented two programs that are on the frontline of the issue; first is the Police Department's Homeless Assistance Liaison Officer (HALO) program and the other is the Library's Neighborhood Connections program.

While passage of Measure H by the voters in Los Angeles County in March was truly a monumental achievement, now the difficult task of allocating funds to various programs and services begins. As the Board of Supervisors undertakes this challenge, the City wishes to remind the Board of Supervisors that no matter what programs are developed, there will always be a need to maintain focus on those who have significant influence and frequent contact with the homeless population. To that end, it is imperative that Measure H include funding for front line contact and communications. For Azusa, our frontline is the HALO and Neighborhood Connections programs. As such, the City is requesting Measure H funding to enhance and expand these two programs.

Background

In the two years prior to the Metro Goldline extension opening, the Azusa Police Department started to forecast and develop strategies to address homeless related issues. City leadership and Staff realized we could not address homeless related issues in the traditional policing model. We had to look at the issue with a much wider perspective since being homeless is not a crime.

In 2011, the Azusa Police Department experienced 399 documented contacts with homeless individuals for various reasons. Much like the rest of the Los Angeles County, the City started to experience an increase in homelessness in the years that followed. With the completion of the Metro Goldline in March 2016, Staff recognized that an even larger increase in homelessness was possible. In fact after the Metro Goldline opened, the City received over 1275 calls for service concerning homeless individuals. This is a 219% increase from 2011.

In response to the surge in homelessness, the City decided to implement a citywide approach to the issue. First, the Police Department created the HALO program. The HALO team sought out the best practices as it relates to homeless related issues and challenges. One of the top priorities of the HALO team is to assist the homeless with resources and placement by working closely with County and private resources. To complement this strategy, the HALO team began working with the Azusa Library, Neighborhood Connections program which offers one-on-one assistance to those in the community who are in need of assistance.

The Library's Neighborhood Connections program was developed from a grant the Library received from the California State Library in 2015. Through this grant, the Library was able to hire a Community Resource Specialist (CRS) with experience working with government agencies and social service providers including Azusa Pacific University's (APU) Social Work program to identify social services available within this region. Neighborhood Connections serves as a clearing house of information and services. Individuals can meet with the CRS to learn about what services and programs are available. While Neighborhood Connections meets a variety of needs among the public, the most pressing need and frequent request has been, and continues to be, housing – both homelessness and landlord/tenant issues. It represents 28% (121 individuals) of requests through December 2016. The CRS works closely with

the HALO program. HALO works with the community to allay their fears and misunderstandings of homelessness, as well as to reduce homelessness in the area. Once officers identify individuals in need of homeless related needs, the CRS meets with them to assess their needs and determine eligibility for assistance through a myriad of social programs. The CRS provides the help to successfully connect them, which sometimes means multiple appointments and follow up. In addition to Azusa's HALO program, the Azusa Police Department will be entering an agreement between the Azusa, Covina, Glendora and West Covina Police Departments to conduct a regional HALO program servicing all four community's increasing homeless related issues. This will be funded with limited, one time money, from the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). This program will spread law enforcement resources among the four cities to help address this very challenging issue facing all of our communities. Based on the funding, the cities involved will dedicate one full workweek per month for approximately 16 months, to focus on homelessness, which will commence in June, 2017. The program funds will be exhausted in December of 2018.

Conclusion

One thing that is very clear is that homelessness and homeless issues are increasing, as are the demands on public resources and services. Through the HALO program and Neighborhood Connections we have recognized that HALO Officers and the Community Resource Specialist are on the frontline for providing assistance to homeless individuals in our community. They are and will be the primary points of contact for referrals for intake into housing and resources available.

With voters passing Measure H, the City of Azusa and Azusa Police Department are seeking assistance from Los Angeles County to help fund programs in the City of Azusa to better serve and direct homeless individuals into new programs that will be developed as a result of the measure. Working with the County Board of Supervisors collaboratively will help insure those living on the streets get the assistance needed to further reduce homelessness in our communities.

- Community Clinic Association of Los Angeles (CCALAC) believes that it is critical to include clinics in these planning and implementation discussions early on. It is often the case that failure to do so result in insurmountable barriers that prevents clinics's ability to participate in these initiatives. Federally qualified health centers operate under complex systems and requirements, which must be taken into consideration in these discussions.
- While E7 recognizes the need for agency capacity building, the strategy restricts the ability to build up agency wide infrastructure because the investment is made in the context of the Coordinated Entry System. For agencies operating in multiple SPAs, this presents a problem that could be addressed with increased investment in capacity building throughout the other strategies involving program implementation.
- It was disheartening to again see that women are again not called out in the funding requests. As the fastest growing population it would have been encouraging to see them at least mentioned. Other than transitional housing for DV there was nothing about jobs, permanent housing or services that take into account the needs of women.
- What is the County and oversight committee doing to ensure that allocated Measure H funds do not simply fund various County or City agency positions that had previously been cut or eliminated? The Measure H funds should go to non-profit organizations doing the work in the community.

- This comment applies to all proposed housing programs. I suggest proportioning a percentage for the individual; Addressing the cause of their homelessness. If it is an addiction, then provide access to rehabilitation. If it is unemployment, then provide job skills training, education, or secured employment. If it is mental health, then provide access to mental health doctors. Whatever the cause of their homelessness may be, it must be identified and addressed. If this is done, we will not only address the direct cause of their homelessness, but will have these individuals reinvest in their self-worth and dignity and take ownership of their well-being.
- Providence appreciate the time and effort that has been invested in developing a draft expenditure plan for Measure H. We strongly encourage the county to increase investments in interim/bridge housing (B7). For this strategy to be fully effective, we must look at both inpatient discharges and ED discharges in order to provide beds for those experiencing homelessness. Recuperative care will likely benefit individuals who are discharged from an inpatient unit and who later can enter bridge housing as part of the continuum of care; while homeless individuals who are discharged from the ED can benefit from bridge housing. Placement into bridge housing should be reserved for those actually exiting an institution and not assign individuals who exited an institution a month or two ago. These individuals might be better suited for placement in an emergency shelter bed. Providence also recommends that the county account or how all of these strategies will improve access and the delivery of services to individuals who are chronically mentally ill.

Providence Little Company of Mary Medical Center San Pedro has completed construction on a 5,000 square foot freestanding outpatient crisis stabilization unit under the license of and on the main campus of the medical center. The Outpatient Center for Crisis Stabilization is licensed to treat voluntary and involuntary psychiatric patients for up to 23 hours. The unit is designed to accept patients who are medically cleared in an Emergency Department and then transferred by ambulance to the unit. The CSU allows us to immediately move patients from the ED into a relaxing, therapeutic environment where they can move about freely and upon arrival receive care from a psychiatrist and care team. Once the patient is able to discuss their situation with our team, an outpatient plan can be developed to return the patient to their community for the services they need, whenever possible avoiding an inpatient psychiatric hospitalization. State and county approvals are pending before the Outpatient Center for Crisis Stabilization becomes operational.

- The Los Angeles LGBT Center, as the largest provider of social services specifically geared to the LGBT community, including our extensive programing for LGBT homeless youth, would like to thank the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Office, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority and all those who have put in the tremendous work to ensure that the Los Angeles County Homelessness Initiative and Strategies to Combat Homelessness reflect the needs of our diverse and impacted community members.

We are particularly appreciative of the intentional inclusion of services specifically targeted to Transition Age Youth (TAY) in the Strategy Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth (E14). Strategy E14, entitled "Create a Coordinated System", reflects some of the specific services that youth experiencing homelessness truly need to survive and includes "youth collaboration, transitional housing, SPA level homeless liaisons at LACOE, family re-connection models and access/drop-in center enhancements. In America, up to 1.6 million youth experience homelessness each year and up to 40% of those youth identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (Choi, 2015). In addition, about 65% of agencies that provide services to young people experiencing homeless identified lack of funding as the main barrier to

sufficiently address the nuanced needs of LGBT youth (Choi, 2015). Considering the need for an array of housing services that are population-specific, we are looking forward to seeing how Strategy E14 will be used to create specific services for LGBT TAY.

Although we greatly appreciate the specific dollars that will be allocated to TAY-focused programming under Strategy E14, we recommend that all strategies have a specific lens to ensure that they are meeting the needs of our County's homeless population, including those who identify as LGBT. Historically, young people are poorly served by adult providers as their needs are significantly different, so we would like to stress the importance of fully funding E14 and, also, other strategies where funding for TAY is set aside. Further, we request that for each strategy that has services targeted for youth including strengthening CES (E7), expanding housing navigation (E7), enhancing the emergency shelter system (E8), expanding rapid rehousing (B3), enhanced support services in PSH (D7) and creating prevention resources (A5), bridge housing for young people exiting institutions including foster care and probation the specific details of that focus (B7), including what funds will be allocated towards youth populations be specified and provided to the public.

Thank you again for the incredible efforts and intentional focus on youth in the Los Angeles County Strategies to Combat Homelessness, particularly Strategy E14. We look forward to continuing to work with Los Angeles County Homeless Initiative to ensure that the LGBT community in Los Angeles County experiencing homelessness receive the services and housing they need.

- Many sex and labor trafficking victims are in unstable housing after they escape their trafficking situations. However, the federal definition of homelessness does not account for unstable housing situations of trafficking victims, such as couch surfing or unsafe housing. There should be a consideration for access to homeless housing programs for trafficking victims, even when they are not necessarily sleeping on the street but are in unstable, unsafe housing which still leaves them as vulnerable to being re-exploited.
- The idea of the Housing Innovation Fund is great. Why not consider funding innovative work and pilots after year 1?
- 20% of LA's homeless people indicated a recent connection to DV in last year's Homeless Count, and nearly 2/3 of all women indicated a past history of domestic violence. This would seem to support the notion that 20% of Measure H dollars (at least) would be spent on housing DV victims. This would include having DV agencies represented in 20% of the Advisory Committee meetings. However, out of 50 or so members, I understand that there are only two representatives from DV organizations, making them very under-represented at these meetings. I would like to see nominations of more people on to the RAC and the Advisory Committee meetings, so that we can truly represent the large numbers who are homeless or at risk of being homeless as a result of DV.
- I agree that people who want housing should have it available for them. No one should be living in their RV or car on our public highways. This causes a great Health problem from inadequate sanitation, and a Safety concern for vehicles using the highway (including bicycles) for legitimate purposes.
- Missing:(1) Funding for engagement of community to prevent NIMBY. Developers need direct funding to hire staff, community organizers to educate specific neighborhood residents and local government.. Each siting is unique; a guide or tool box is not needed; funding to go door to door and gain understanding and cooperation takes staff time and will enhance our chances of successful siting of PSH. (2) Gap funding for existing PSH where diminished funding or cuts has left supportive service staff depleted. (3) Need to

include housing opportunities for persons diagnosed with HIV; Need to assure higher acuity recognition for this population

- Each strategy should include 2-3% COLAs each year otherwise the nonprofits have to absorb the additional costs of staffing, benefits and rent costs.
- People with lived experience must lead this conversation. Homelessness disproportionately impacts people of color and women. Why are these groups not at the table? How do you solve problems without understanding the needs, issues and context of the people who are impacted by homelessness.

We have come to this point by neglecting the people who are most impacted continuing to neglect and omit those impacted wastes this amazing golden opportunity to change our society and a whole lot of money.

- I am very concerned about the concentration of homeless in the LAX area, and the lack of support this has received. Currently we are taking the brunt of the problem that has been allowed to fester, including the RV problem. The city has allowed loopholes in the ordinance, allowing RVs to be parked on certain streets at certain times. First, the city needs to support parking RVs in public city lots to keep this from being a problem for any one neighborhood AND provide the proper water and waste disposal to keep this from being the public health hazard that it has become in Westchester/LAX area. Secondly, the city needs to exempt AirBNB rentals of RVs from any of the allowed RV parking. AirBNB is currently taking advantage of the city's generous RV parking rules and advertising "Glamping" (Glamorous Camping) in Los Angeles for RV owners to sell nights in their unused RVs on a city street of the renter's choice. This was not the intent of the RV ordinance and the loopholes of renting RVs on city streets needs to be closed immediately. Secondly, as far as the type of housing, it needs to be quick and there needs to be oversight. It was sickening to see "affordable housing" in Santa Monica built only to see it go to pay back favors to their city council-union supporters, etc. One of the unions sent out a flyer to the starving actors to apply for affordable housing and "good luck". Affordable housing should not be based on a luck of the draw for putting your name in. There needs to be boots on the ground in LA to find the most desperate of homeless families on the streets who are accepting of help and get them in first. The other thing LA should think about is helping to reconnect some of the homeless with family members outside of LA. Many may have lost touch and those reconnections could come with assistance, if someone would just take the time to forge a relationship and get the trust working. Hawaii considered plane tickets home for some of their transient residents, and with the cost of living so high in LA, we should consider re-housing in other areas outside of LA where the individual may find it more affordable AND where they may have family support. I would also like to see LA consider using shipping containers converted for emergency housing. This is an emergency. We have people living on the streets. In any other state of emergency, we would have organized tents, showers, water, food and help from FEMA. Why is this any different? Why is this taking so long? We cannot wait 3 years to build. We need permission to use government land and set it up as immediate emergency with FEMA like support, and then build longer-term supportive housing out of shipping containers which are like single apts. No one neighborhood should take on this challenge the way Westchester has. We are sandwiched between many smaller cities which do not allow what LA allows and many people are getting stuck in our neighborhood, the gateway to Los Angeles, therefore we all have a responsibility to make this gateway welcoming to our guests who pay millions to our city in taxes.
- Please include housing resources for underserved communities such as victims of domestic violence, those with substance abuse, mental health, and HIV

- Will the committee take into account the fact that the Board of Supervisors will be deciding on these funding allocations prior to the release of HUD's NOFA? And the potential reallocation of additional transitional housing funding?
- There was significant feedback from the South LA TAY Community about the need for strong supportive services and wrap around services. Youth expressed the importance of housing but housing must be accompanied with wrap around supportive services. Many of these services are not seen as valued elements by funding entities, making it difficult for service providers to offer comprehensive services.
 - Provide Post Transition Age youth services
 - Provide wrap around services for TAY families
 - Ensure access to health and dental care
 - Transportation resources
 - Localized and more accessible services (mobile case management)
 - Parenting classes
 - Health and wellness programs -self-care
 - Educational support and resources
 - Job training & placement
 - Provide support groups
 - Mental health services
 - Knowledgeable staff that care are important-
 - Integrated approach to services
 - Eliminate barriers such as punitive housing rules
 - Accountability plan that will involve youth with lived homeless experience
 - Evaluation after first year before funding is released
 - Lived homeless youth experience on Measured H Oversight Committee
 - Simplified contracting requirements and rules
 - Reliable and consistent payment and reimbursement practices
 - Integrate County services and other services to provide comprehensive wrap around services for TAY
 - Fund culturally relevant and responsive capacity building
- The City of Covina is appreciative of this opportunity to provide comments regarding the recently voter-approved Measure H revenue funding strategies. The primary issue of concern is there is no evidence that the twenty-one (21) proposed funding strategies would result in Measure H funding being provided to Los Angeles County cities, who are at the forefront in experiencing the impacts of homelessness as well as having long received emotional pleas on the impacts of the homeless challenge from Los Angeles County voters who voted for Measure H.

None of the \$355 million expected to be collected annually in tax payments by Los Angeles County taxpayers appear to be allocated at the City-level; to be used for purposes designated by local cities to help resolve at the point of the problem, of homeless people sleeping on city streets and in city parks. While many aspects of the homeless problem need to be addressed on a regional/County scale, other aspects; including the impact on local residents and businesses must be considered on a local/City scale. It is proposed that the County Board of Supervisors add a category for funding, such as for a Municipal Block Grant program, to be funded with Measure H funds. Cities will then be able to address the problem of homelessness locally, by working with local non-profits and faith-based organizations, or perhaps by funding a police officer to focus on the problem, or by establishing a work-training program, etc. Use of the funds will be determined locally to address local concerns, but would conform to Los Angeles County

generated goals and objectives. The voters of Los Angeles County passed Measure H to resolve the issue of homelessness and will expect all levels of government, as well as non-profits and businesses, to work together to find a solution to this problem. Before the options are presented to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Revenue Planning Work Group needs to consider this huge gap in the provision of funding and include cities in the solution.

- My focus is on organizations, nonprofits and public agencies, who would add capacity quickly to expand or enhance services with Measure H funding. I imagine organizations that already provide services in the Approved Strategies would be involved, but few will know about growing fast. Growing capacity while providing responsive services of consistent quality is challenging, requiring new skills of most organizations. I want to see Measure H succeed beyond any measure (pun intended). Organizations will need support for rapid capacity building involving growing a different mindset that places results over allegiance to beliefs or ego. A rapid learning cycle, for failing fast and adjusting efforts in real time, is needed at the scale of funding. Thus, it's important to acknowledge the need for high-quality capacity building support for the sustainable success of funded program activities.

Two global thoughts come to mind: 1) Infusing the entire effort with the mindset to support grantees as customers and collaborators, which encourages all involved organizations to work for the best OVERALL outcomes, would go a long way to create a structure designed for success. This will set a positive, can-do tone initiative-wide, and be incredibly motivating to organizations ready to do their part. What an amazing opportunity for the County to practice design thinking! 2) Defining, then incorporating (i.e. not making it optional) capacity building support in the funding would bake into the initiative the County's commitment to the public to show success at scale. What may I offer to help? I'm ready to roll up my sleeves. Thank you so much for reading, and for all your hard work on behalf of the LA region.

- I would propose that some money NOT be allocated to the various strategies and instead be set aside in a big pot/or bank account. Every city would be able to draw funds out of it (up to a certain limit). The money would be available for providing things for the homeless or poor. Things like providing bathrooms, showers, lockers, shelters, etc. The money could not be spent on things such as surveillance cameras. (Rules would be drawn up as to what it could or couldn't be spent on, how much is available to, etc) As it is now, a person needing services can go to the Union Stations or get signed up with CES which provides services. But individual cities are struggling for funds for all the things they need to run a city. Too often, cities don't take providing for the poor (say bathrooms) seriously, perhaps they just don't have funds. The reason I propose one big pot, because then it could be regulated better. Cities would apply for funds.
- I don't see a place to comment on E-5, the "decriminalization" policy. I have one concern to express: though there is a true humanitarian crisis evident given that people have resorted to living in tents, there is also a growing crime problem emanating from several encampments in Hollywood. When one discusses this with law enforcement or city attorney, it appears there is confusion about exactly what can be done for suspected drug sales, prostitution or drug and weapons possession. The metrics section says: "success will be measured by a reduction across the County in policies and practices which criminalize homelessness." I don't disagree with this statement, but there needs to be a concomitant commitment to enforcing laws to ensure that behaviors emanating from encampments are not jeopardizing the safety of our neighborhoods.
- Vacant units in market rate buildings should be immediately used for housing of the homeless population, with a focus on bringing families into these units first. Money should be spent immediately on housing homeless persons in temporary rental units at this time, while awaiting the construction of new units.

Monies should absolutely NOT be held back for new construction. Many lives will be lost if we hold the money back to give to the developers rather than using it to immediately relieve the existing homelessness issue by placing persons into rental units and vacant market rate units.

- Thank you for all your work on this. It is incredible how much has been put together in this short of a time frame. Agencies will need support to scale up so quickly with this short of a time frame. We are grateful for the 12% indirect costs associated with contracts. We request that these contracts cover 100% anticipated program costs (as opposed to the 80% traditionally covered by LAHSA contracts; we simply cannot scale our private dollars that quickly). Additionally growing programs this quickly will require us to increase administrative, security and custodial services as we will be significantly increasing our daily foot traffic. Traditionally, these have been positions paid for through our private donations. To successfully scale up, we request that these safety and staffing concerns also be considered. Finally, when funding agencies, we request staff salary reimbursements at living wages that also cover the cost of employee benefits. How can we hire qualified employees and retain them if we are unable to pay them the wages that they deserve.
- To be successful, implementation of Measure H will require an unprecedented scaling of services provided by homeless service providers, including DV shelters and supportive services, as well as shelters and supportive services to human trafficking victims of both genders (including adults and children), homeless children and teens, including those unaccompanied by parents or guardians) and homeless Veterans and their children, and partners or family members. By Federal Law, and also by adoption of the CBOS, any grantee organization with a federally approved indirect rate must be reimbursed at that federally approved federal rate amount; individual offices of the County are not permitted to otherwise restrict administrative overhead costs for organizations with this designation, issues by the cognizant Federal office of the applicant organization. For agencies that do not have a federally approved indirect rate, beyond LAHSA's intention to increase allowable admin. costs to 12% for its contractors, what other steps are the lead agencies for each Measure H strategy taking to ensure that there are sufficient financial resources devoted to supporting the nonprofit infrastructure that will be needed to support this scaling up and rapid expansion. A 2% increase in allowable admin. costs is just a drop in the bucket and will not adequately support the growth in middle management, including supervisory responsibilities, that will need to occur at service provider agencies. For many agencies this may not be sufficient to support essential back office functions or provide the resources necessary for these agencies to identify and provide operationally needed office space, for example, for new hires. How are these essential costs factored into each of the eligible Measure H strategies?
- 1. Please consider funds for infrastructure 2. Compensation parity with how much goes to county vs. community based agencies.
- Hello, we'd like to submit two general comments. First, we hope that a thorough tracking system will be put into place to provide accountability for funds spent and record successes to share with interested stakeholders. Specifically, we'd like to be able to answer the question, "How has Measure H helped the homeless population of Signal Hill?" Second, prior to the passage of Measure H, local agencies were doing their best to address homelessness and associated issues. The results of these efforts took various forms. We hope the County Homeless Initiative will collaborate with existing agencies/efforts/initiatives to maximize resources, reduce redundancy, and include all interested community partners.

- We are a 501C charity that provides financial assistance to those in need as well as a Homeless Outreach Program each month. We could use help in funding our operation because it is based solely on donations. We are not able to help everyone because of a lack of funding.
- I have worked in public child welfare for over twenty years, for DCFS and foster family agencies. This comment is to ensure that the population served in child welfare is included in discussions on agendas, services, and service delivery. Homelessness impacts children and families at all points of engagement in the system: investigation, detention, reunification, and permanency. Is there any conversation around targeting families prior to having their children legally removed or families whose only barrier to reunifying with their children is the housing issue? It would be impactful if the initiative was able to support a reduction of children entering or and increase in children safely exiting the foster care system.
- HASC appreciate the time and effort that's been invested in developing a draft expenditure plan for Measure H. While this work is valued we remain concern with the low upfront investment being made in interim/bridge housing (B7). For this strategy to be truly effective we must look at both inpatient discharges and ED discharges in order to truly prevent people from re-entering homelessness. Recuperative care will likely benefit individuals who are discharged from an inpatient unit and who later can enter bridge housing as part of the continuum of care; while homeless individuals who are discharged (60%) from an ED can benefit from bridge housing. Failure to increase the funding allocation is not moving the needle given the project length of stay and size of the homeless population. Placement is a major challenge for discharge planners. Finally, placement into bridge housing should be reserved for those actually exiting an institution and not assign individuals who exited an institution a month or two ago. Such individuals might be better suited for placement in an emergency shelter bed. Mental health is mentioned in the strategies ...but it remains unclear how funds will improve access and the delivery of service to people who are chronically mentally ill. It's important to address this upfront and not delay discussion given the sizable population of homeless who suffer from mental illness until how dollars will be operationalized.