



**Poverty and Homelessness Board**

## **PHB Executive Committee Meeting**

*Pat Walsh Chair, Dan Bryant Vice Chair,*

*Lucy Vinis Eugene Mayor, Pat Farr Lane County Commissioner,*

*Sean Van Gordon Springfield City Councilor, Kris McAlister Community Member*

**Thursday, May 18, 2017**

**12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.**

***Note different location than Monthly PHB at MLK***

**HHS Charnelton Building**

**151 W. 7th Avenue, Eugene**

**Human Services Division Room 530**

# **AGENDA**

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| 11:45 a.m. | Arrival and Lunch  |
| 12:00 p.m. | Welcome and Agenda Review  |
| 12:05      | Review Executive Committee Charge  |
| 12:15      | Update re: Employment Committee Startup  |
| 12:30      | Review PHB Strategic Plan and Action Plan  |
| 12:50      | Operation 600 Action Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <i>Financials</i></li><li>▪ <i>Strategic Plan</i></li><li>▪ <i>Action Plan</i></li></ul> |
| 1:20       | Plan for All Member PHB meeting on June 15   |



*helping people • changing lives .....*

# **Lane County Poverty & Homelessness Board**

# **Strategic Plan**

## **2016-2021**

*Approved on April 21, 2016*

# Executive Summary

The plight of poverty and homelessness affects the lives of thousands of individuals and families who live in Lane County. The solutions to this growing problem are as myriad as the causes. Government agencies, nonprofit and civic organizations, schools, and churches all contribute resources through a wide variety of programs and assistance.

In an effort to facilitate better-coordinated efforts, the Poverty and Homelessness Board (PHB) was formed in 2014. It is an action-oriented group of elected officials, community stakeholders, and individuals who represent low-income and homeless people's concerns in Lane County.

The PHB serves as the administrative board for the Lane County Community Action Agency and as the oversight board for the Lane County Continuum of Care. It provides advice to the regional Human Services Commission and the Lane County Board of Commissioners with the goal of reducing and preventing poverty and homelessness in Lane County.

## PHB's Mission

Create innovative partnerships and programs that use best practices to reduce poverty and homelessness in Lane County. The PHB works to generate community and legislative support and other resources for housing and services to achieve its goals.

The PHB has identified three areas of strategic focus to guide its work to alleviate poverty and homelessness over the next five years:

- 1. Increase availability and access to coordinated, supportive housing, shelter, and services**
- 2. Prevent homelessness and poverty**
- 3. Inform and enhance public awareness and advocacy efforts**

To address these concerns and help define a path of coordinated action various agencies and organizations serving Lane County, the PHB has defined a set of five-year goals and supporting strategies. The strategies are built on the assumption that the core human services, supportive housing and healthcare services, supported by the community, will continue to be in place as a foundation to meet basic needs. Together, they will effect a significant improvement in the lives of the most vulnerable, chronically poor and homeless people in our community.

## Increase Availability and Access to Coordinated, Supportive Housing, Shelter, and Services

Over the next five years, the PHB partners will coordinate with other agencies in Lane County to create an additional 600 units of supportive housing for chronically homeless people, including veterans, youth, those who experience mental illness, domestic violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and those exiting the criminal justice, foster care and child welfare systems. This effort will include 200 Housing First

units in various configurations and with appropriate support services and 100 units of housing and rental assistance for veterans. In addition, the PHB will create a long-term plan to identify targeted needs and funding sources to develop an additional 300 units of supportive housing.

The temporary emergency housing needs of those who are homeless are ever-present and require different solutions based on unique needs. During the next five years, the PHB will work to create 300 emergency shelter beds for homeless singles, both seasonal and year-around; 30 emergency shelter units designed specifically for homeless families with children; 40 safe parking spaces for homeless people who live in their vehicles; an emergency medical care shelter; and a shelter dedicated to homeless individuals experiencing acute mental illness.

### **Prevent Homelessness and Poverty**

Prevention is at the center of all long-term strategies to eliminate homelessness and poverty. The PHB's goals include increasing the stability of low-income families with children in the seven Lane County neighborhoods with the highest concentration of poverty. Efforts will focus on ensuring those families live in safe, reliable housing and have opportunities for adequate employment income to meet their basic needs. To help prevent new generations from entering a life of poverty and homelessness, particular efforts will be made to reduce first-time homelessness among low-income families with children and school-aged youth by 30 percent by 2021.

### **Inform and Enhance and Public Awareness and Advocacy Efforts**

Most residents of Lane County encounter someone nearly every day that lives in homelessness and poverty. Some aspects of homelessness and poverty are highly visible while others are largely hidden from public view. Because the problems are extremely complex and interconnected, however, it is easy to form misunderstandings and misconceptions. The PHB believes that successful long-term efforts to reduce and eliminate poverty and homelessness in Lane County will require heightened public awareness, a well-informed understanding, and broad community support. The PHB will focus concentrated efforts to dispel myths and broaden community understanding of the multiple issues related to homelessness and poverty. In addition, the PHB will advocate for changes to state and federal policies and procedures that will remove barriers to service delivery and support more collaborative efforts. To turn advocacy into action the PHB will use a collective impact approach bringing volunteers, nonprofits, faith, businesses and government together around shared goals and strategies.

## Poverty and Homelessness in Lane County - What are the Facts?

### Poverty

On any given day, on any given street in Lane County, on average, one of every five people you meet are living in poverty. Despite the fact that Lane County is home to a major state university and a highly regarded community college, along with several large industrial employers, its poverty rate of 21.5% is still higher than the Oregon statewide average of 16.6%. A Lane County family of three whose income is at or below 100 percent of the federal level lives on an annual income of \$19,790 or less. The high poverty rate coupled with the high cost of rent creates an environment in which it is difficult for thousands of households to maintain stable living situations.

**78,203 Lane County residents live on an income below 100% of the federal poverty level.**

*--2104 U.S. Census data*

### Insufficient Affordable Housing

The housing market in Lane County is not unlike many other counties across the country. The economic recession of 2007 and the resulting tight mortgage market led to increased demand for rental housing. Demand pushed rental rates higher while the supply of available rental units decreased. While mortgage lending for homebuyers has eased somewhat in recent years, many households with healthy incomes are still choosing to rent rather than buy.

Moreover, in Lane County, the presence of the University of Oregon creates additional demand for rental units by students. The construction of new multi-family rental units in Lane County has been largely concentrated near the university campus, and the rents are relatively high, well above what families with poverty-level incomes can afford.

### Who Are the Homeless?

The sub-population of Lane County residents who are in poverty *and* are homeless live on little or no regular income. The life circumstances that led to their homelessness are many and varied; however, mental illness, drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence, and involvement in criminal activity all play significant roles. In 2014, 11,668 homeless individuals sought social services through the Lane County Human Services Division.

During the 2015 Annual Homeless Point in Time Count, 656 individuals were staying in emergency shelters; 101 were living in "transitional housing;" and 716 men, women, and children were living *without* shelter. The count included 210 homeless veterans; 100 of them were living unsheltered. Nearly 400 of the homeless were identified as suffering from mental illness; 206 were believed to have chronic alcohol or substance abuse issues. Finally, 23 homeless youth under age 18, were youth unaccompanied by an adult.

**Of the 1,473 homeless people counted in Lane County on January 25, 2015, 697 were chronically homeless.**

*- Lane County 2015 Annual Homeless Point in Time Count.*

**2,154 homeless students attended public schools in Lane County during the 2013-14 school year (including doubled-up or homeless).**

*--Oregon Department of Education*

## The Cost of Homelessness

The problems associated with homelessness are expensive for the community. People without shelter often require medical care that is frequently accessed in hospital emergency departments, one of the most expensive points of medical care at an average of \$200 to \$1,800 per visit. Emergency mental health care is even more expensive. A day of in-patient mental health care at Sacred Heart Medical Center's Johnson Unit costs between \$2,500 and \$2,900. Unfortunately, people living without shelter and who may be experiencing drug or substance abuse problems or mental illness frequently run afoul of the law and end up incarcerated and involved in the criminal justice system. Both bring additional expenses to the community that could have been averted through better access to housing and supportive services.

## What is Being Done?

Government agencies, nonprofit organizations and the faith community together provide a variety of housing programs aimed at assisting those in poverty and homelessness in Lane County. Emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, rapid-rehousing and extreme weather shelter are all part of the mix. Each is different and uniquely designed to accommodate a different segment of the population depending on its particular needs.

**During the winter of 2014-15, 948 individuals slept in our Extreme Weather Shelter Program, Egan Warming Center, on sub-freezing nights.**

- **Emergency Shelter** is short-term, generally up to 60 days, and might include large communal settings or a single unit for a family without stable housing. Seasonal emergency shelters provide protection from the elements when temperatures drop below 30 degrees during winter months.
- **Transitional Housing** provides rent assistance and supportive services for up to 24 months and facilitates the movement of homeless households to permanent housing.
- **Permanent Supportive Housing** provides long-term, community-based housing and support to homeless households that include individuals with disabilities.
- **Rapid Re-Housing** provides homeless households with rent assistance and supportive services for up to 24 months with the goal of moving into permanent housing and long-term stability.
- **Safe Havens** are supportive housing units that serve those who are often referred to as "hard-to-reach" homeless persons with severe mental illness and other debilitating behavioral conditions.

## **Solutions**

The current inventory of housing for homeless individuals in Lane County includes 870 units of Rapid Re-Housing, transitional, and permanent housing, and 481 year round emergency shelter beds. With all types combined, only about 10% are designed to accommodate households with children. Based on the 2015 Point in Time Count, a minimum of at least 600 additional housing units would have to be added to house all of the homeless individuals in the county. Experience has proven that emergency shelters alone are not the optimal solution for helping people escape homelessness.

At the same time, however, shelter capacity needs to be expanded if the supply of available private market and affordable housing, coupled with supportive services, is insufficient to meet demand. For some people, access to permanent housing is all they need to escape homelessness. Others need supportive services to be successful in gaining permanent housing.

### ***Housing First***

Housing First is an approach to quickly and successfully connect individuals and families experiencing homelessness to permanent housing without preconditions and barriers to entry, such as sobriety, treatment or service participation requirements. *Housing First* offers people immediate access to permanent housing along with services appropriate to their needs. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, this model yields higher success in treatment outcomes, higher housing retention rates, lower returns to homelessness, and significant reductions in the use of crisis services, hospitals, and jails.

### ***Human Rights and Alternatives***

Human rights and alternative community strategies should be pursued in tandem with Housing First and the other strategies in the PHB Strategic Plan. While these strategies are not prioritized or incorporated into the strategic plan it is recognized the City of Eugene Human Rights Commission and other community based non-profits and advocacy groups should continue to pursue solutions that are inclusive of people living in poverty, people who are homeless including minority communities and underrepresented groups.

- Decriminalization of homelessness
- Restorative Justice
- Community Courts with alternative sentencing
- Legal protections (fair housing)
- Alternative legal places to live e.g. rest stops, micro-shelters, safe spots, unsanctioned camps, legal overnight parking, small size tent encampments (10 per camp)

## STRATEGIC GOALS

### 1. Strategic Focus: Availability and Access to Coordinated Supportive Housing, Shelter, and Services

**GOAL 1.1: Create 600 additional housing opportunities throughout Lane County by 2021 for chronically homeless individuals and people with particular needs, including: veterans, youth, domestic violence survivors, those with mental illness, drug and alcohol abuse problems, and those exiting criminal justice, foster care and child welfare systems.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Develop 100 Housing First units, including a 50-unit apartment building with on-site behavioral health services, and 50 micro-apartment housing units with mobile support services by 2019.	Lane County/ HACSA/ Non-Profits	Facilities
b. Dedicate 100 units of Housing First, including 50 scattered site HUD housing vouchers and HACSA units, and 50 units integrated into low-income housing developments for special populations by 2019.	HACSA/ Non-Profits	Facilities
c. Develop assertive engagement “wrap around” services and supports for 150 scattered site and integrated Housing First units by 2019. Promote successful housing outcomes and move more individuals to independent living.	Lane County & Trillium Behavioral Health	Services
d. Develop and dedicate an additional 100 units and rental assistance for Veterans to meet the goal of ending veteran homelessness.	HACSA/St. Vincent DePaul/VA	Facilities
e. Create a long-term, supportive housing production and operations plan for 300 units for individuals and family households.	HACSA/ Eugene/ Springfield/ Non-Profits	Facilities
f. Develop tactics to help reduce risk to private landlords and help incentivize them to rent to people with special needs.	Rental Owners Assoc.	Services

**GOAL 1.2: Create additional emergency shelter and respite care for homeless individuals, youth and families with children awaiting housing by 2021.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Create 300 beds of emergency shelter for homeless singles including 150 year-around beds and 150 beds of winter season shelter.	Lane County/ HACSA	Facilities
b. Create 30 units of year-around emergency shelter for homeless families with children, including domestic violence survivors with children.	Lane County/ HACSA	Facilities
c. Create 40 Safe Parking spaces for homeless persons who live in their vehicles.	Lane County	Facilities
d. Create 16 infirmiry beds of emergency shelter to provide immediate medical triage, assessment, and care.	Trillium, local hospitals	Facilities
e. Create 20 beds of crisis respite for persons experiencing acute mental illness.	Lane County	Facilities
f. Develop ACT Team and multidisciplinary services for shelter and supportive housing.	White Bird/CHC	Services
g. Expand Rapid Re-housing funding and services to more quickly move people into housing.	State of Oregon/ HUD	Services



**GOAL 1.3: Increase opportunities to enhance services for frequent users through service integration and coordination, and the development of new partnerships.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
Create a Frequent Users Systems Engagement (FUSE) Workgroup as part of an initiative to break the cycle of incarceration and homelessness among individuals with complex behavioral health challenges who are the highest users of jails, hospitals, emergency medical, homeless shelters and encampments, and other crisis service systems.	Inter-governmental	Services/ Ad Hoc Work Group

**2. Strategic Focus: Prevent Homelessness and Poverty**

**GOAL 2.1: Increase the stability of low-income individuals and families in Lane County. Ensure they are stably housed and have adequate employment income and/or benefits to meet their basic needs.**

*Note: A draft action plan for goals 2.1-3 should be developed by the PHB Services Committee and submitted to the PHB by October 1, 2016.*

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Develop nutrition, employment services and affordable childcare for residents at affordable and supportive housing programs.	Non-Profits	Services
b. Develop transportation options for program participants.	LTD	Services
c. Expand rental assistance programs.	HACSA DHS	Services
d. Support the preservation of existing affordable housing.		

**GOAL 2.2: Reduce homelessness among low-income families with children and school age youth, as measured by the Oregon Department of Education, by 30 percent by 2021.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Develop a homeless diversion program families and unaccompanied youth in conjunction with the school districts (i.e. periodic homeless, precariously housed, doubled up). Identify flexible funding to address critical barriers to stabilization.	McKinney Vento Schools 15 <sup>th</sup> Night Initiative	Services

**GOAL 2.3: Increase employment opportunities, education, and employment and training activities for participants who are in poverty, and/or homeless with special needs.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Support collaboration among job partners to develop employment and training programs for individuals who are homeless or in supportive housing with significant barriers to employment.	Lane Workforce Partnership LCC DHS Goodwill St. Vincent Voc Rehab	Services/ Ad-Hoc Work Group
b. Implement employment training programs. Identify resources for targeted employment programs for people who are unstably housed.		

**GOAL 2.4: Increase access to integrated health care for persons who are unstably housed, homeless or are community members in supportive housing.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Support collaboration among community health care organizations that serve people who are homeless and supportive housing community members.	CHC Lane County VIM White Bird Clinic Occupy Medical	Ad Hoc Integrated Workgroup TBA
b. Develop expanded outreach and site based healthcare for people who are homeless and supportive housing community members.		

**3. Strategic Focus: Inform and Enhance Public Awareness and Advocacy Efforts**

**GOAL 3.1: Increase public understanding of poverty and homelessness issues and how they're being addressed.**

*Note: A workgroup of the PHB will be formed by June 1, 2016 to address Goal 3.1*

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Develop a brand and communication plan for PHB.	PR firm	Ad-Hoc Work Group
b. Promote the capabilities of the Coordinated Entry System, in conjunction with HMIS, to identify the characteristics or trends of individuals in the homeless system.	Non-profits	HMIS
c. Educate and engage the community on poverty and homelessness issues through social media (highlight best practices).	University of Oregon	

**GOAL 3.2: Advocate for support to reduce poverty and homelessness.**

Strategy	Potential Partners	PHB Committee
a. Align and coordinate legislative agendas (early) with other groups that are working on similar efforts or have common interests. Develop a one-page "leave behind" sheet with key talking points. Coordinate with federal and state agencies.	Housing Alliance Assn. of Counties League of Oregon Cities Oregon Opportunity Network	Legislative, Ad-Hoc Work group TBA
b. Align and coordinate policy agendas among cities in Lane County and the county government.		
c. Participate and collaborate with public, private, and community organizations to advocate for support.		



# Poverty & Homelessness Board

## CHART NOTES STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT

October 28, 2016. 9:00 AM- Noon

Springfield Justice Center

### ACTION STEPS TABLE FOR EACH STRATEGY

All 3 Action Steps Groups will complete this table for each strategy!

[Group 1/ Goal 1.2](#)

[Group 2/ Goal 2.3](#)

[Group 3/ Goal 3.2](#)

### 1. ACTION STEPS GROUP 1:

Facilitators: [Pearl Wolfe/ Lisë Stuart](#)

Members: [Dan Bryant, Janet Thorn, Kris McAlister, Shawn Murphy, Anne Williams, Erin Fijfield, Ken Beeson\(guest HSC Board\)](#)

***GOAL 1.2: Create additional emergency shelter and respite care for homeless individuals, youth and families with children awaiting housing by 2021.***

a. Create 300 beds of "low barrier" emergency shelter for homeless singles including 150 year-around beds and 150 beds of winter season shelter.

Action Steps	Facility vs. scattered sites at existing Providers i.e. bed at Willamette Family Treatment Services) Multiple-sites throughout Lane County –or- Focus on one site Program design- research Site development (zoning etc.). Design considering mental health Finances (sources) Form committee
Who	Start with existing Shelter-Supportive Housing committee Invite St. Vincent de Paul, Looking Glass, Eugene Mission, ShelterCare, Emergency Shelter, Laurel Hill Center, Lane County Behavioral Health, cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Faith community, SSRA, Community Alliance of Lane County (CALC)  Names: Anne Williams, Dan Bryant, Kris McAlister (staff: Pearl Wolfe, Steve Manela, Stephanie (?) Erin F.(?)
Timeline	First meeting in February
Progress Measures	Develop sites over time
Resources Needed	Research: Review other sites in other communities Work w/Emergency Shelter experts and Mental Health experts in our community (Eugene Mission, Egan, ShelterCare, Laurel Hill, Ann's Shelter (new effort for Springfield single women's shelter through Ebbert Memorial, in development) Financial
Obstacles	Length of stay- limit? Roll out number of beds over time, start slowly and grow project Siting Level of acuity

Desired Results	150 season could be Alternative Model such as Dusk to Dawn Expand on Egan model: open closed facility for warming gyms, closed schools Plan over time years 1-5 Criteria (eligibility) Sites- building Funding Adopt low-barrier units Research: can buildings expand to take ??; research models such as Albany, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle (Dan Bryant) Research local and other funding Other community stakeholders Point person
-----------------	--

<i>b. Create 30 units of year-around emergency shelter for homeless families with children, including domestic violence survivors with children.</i>	
Action Steps	Facility size and model Different for families
Who	Same as 1.2a but include Lane County school liaisons
Timeline	Committee by February 1
Progress Measures	Same as 1.2a
Resources Needed	Same as 1.2a
Obstacles	Same as 1.2a Eligibility – keep family together ( i.e. Keep male children over 12 with family) Families with special needs
Desired Results	Same as 1.2a

## 2. ACTION STEPS GROUP 2:

Facilitators: [Robin Scott/ Lyn Oliver](#)

Members: [David Heavirland, John Radich, Kristina Payne, Noreen Dunnells](#)

**GOAL 2.3: Increase employment opportunities, education, and employment and training activities for participants who are in poverty, and/or homeless with special needs.**

*a. Support collaboration among job partners to develop employment and training programs for individuals who are homeless or in supportive housing with significant barriers to employment.*

Action Steps	Create an inventory of programs targeting homeless and employment: Robin Scott and Diana Alldredge Recruit workgroup AKA Ad Hoc Employment PHB subcommittee. The group will email Diana contacts at each of the identified organizations below. Convene workgroup Send Heartland Working to End Homelessness Employment Program Best Practices Series article to group
Who	Workgroup to likely include: Sponsors, OURS, VA Catholic Community Services, St. Vincent de Paul, Goodwill, Centro LatinoAmericano, DHS, 211, NEDCO, FertiLab Thinkubator: John Radich, Dave Heavirland obtain names
Timeline	Ad Hoc Employment PHB subcommittee to meet late January 2017 A list of contact names for target agencies to be collected within 2 weeks Dave Heavirland and Robin Scott to work on format for inventory questions about existing programs to be sent out by Diana this month. Diana to aggregate collected information into a handout that will be available for late January meeting.
Progress Measures	Collected inventory Gap analysis
Resources Needed	Time and participation Advocates Community navigators (actual people)
Obstacles	Ongoing sustainable funding, many pilot programs have come and gone
Desired Results	Unified system to connect people in poverty and/or homeless to employment opportunities

*b. Implement employment training programs. Identify resources for targeted employment programs for people who are unstably housed.*

Action Steps	Review GAP analysis from 2a. Review of best practice models (e.g. Heartland Working to End Homelessness Employment Program Best Practices Series) Create community buy in, work in collaboration with PHB Legislative Advocacy Committee
Who	Ad hoc Employment PHB Subcommittee
Timeline	June 2017
Progress Measures	Clearly identified training opportunities Clear employment training/ support navigation first step(s) for homeless/ those in poverty Community buy-in
Resources Needed	New funding and/or targeted initiatives utilizing existing funding
Obstacles	How to fund Restricted funding Competition
Desired Results	Diversified employment/ training support and opportunities for homeless/ those in poverty

### 3. ACTION STEPS GROUP 3:

Facilitators: Steve Manela/ Andrea Russell

Members: Kitty Piercy, Pat Farr, Jacob Fox, Michael Kinnison

#### GOAL 3.2: Advocate for support to reduce poverty and homelessness.

*a. Align and coordinate legislative agendas (early) with other groups that are working on similar efforts or have common interests. Develop a one-page "leave behind" sheet with key talking points. Coordinate with federal and state agencies.*

Action Steps	PHB Legislative Committee will decide what to bring forward Educate and engage Policy Bodies Create talking points on urgency – governor, state legislators Emergency proclamation, press conference w/3 jurisdiction Springfield, Eugene, Lane County Mayors Round Table Arrange transportation for people who are homeless – to Salem
Who	Jacob Fox, Pat Farr talk to Mayor Christine Mayor Kitty Piercy talk to income Eugene Mayor Lucy Vinis Pat Farr, Jacob Fox go with city, county board with legislative agenda to talk with Sid to open conversation with Springfield Mayor Christine Lundberg Steve Manela, Jacob Fox and City of Springfield for public comment on Housing Alliance
Timeline	By January 2017 November County legislative committee put action steps on agenda 3 city councilors
Progress Measures	Proclamation signed on by ___ % of cities in Lane County Meeting to narrow down
Resources Needed	IGR people Organization transportation/food for people to lobby at legislature in Salem Mayor Vinis buy-in to plan Support
Obstacles	Bogged down in details (time to complete tasks)
Desired Results	Legislature and government understand still in housing crisis Universal understanding of urgency Resources to move forward

*b. Align and coordinate policy agendas among cities in Lane County and the county government.*

Action Steps	Summit "Operation 600" Use Proclamation as a tool from 3.2 (a) Joint Lane County/ City of Eugene/ City of Springfield initiative for 600 Housing First housing units like Project 365 Finding resources to put together for types of needed housing: tax credits, financing options
Who	Meeting of City/County/Housing Authority to forge initiative: Steve Manela, Michael Kinnison Broaden Investors: Pat Farr, Mayor Lucy Vinis, and Board of Commissioner Pat Farr and Jacob Fox get Springfield City Council and Mayor on board
Timeline	Over 5 years - 2017-2022 – to complete initiative Operation 600 Emergency declaration by January 2017
Progress Measures	Launch of Operation 600
Resources Needed	Management/engagement of senior leadership
Obstacles	No buy-in Has to matter to participants
Desired Results	Launch and progress toward Operation 600 goal

<i>c. Participate and collaborate with public, private, and community organizations to advocate for support.</i>	
Action Steps	Summit (organization of advocacy groups) Commit resources “like Homeless Connect” – volunteers in community
Who	Organize & collaborate summit: Jacob Fox, Steve Manela, Michael Kinnison Engage Margaret Salazar: Pat Farr will contact Engage city involvement: Mayor Kitty Piercy
Timeline	Agreement of Operation 600
Progress Measures	Agreement of Operation 600 Involve individuals identified
Resources Needed	Dedicated staff person
Obstacles	No buy-in Staff capacity
Desired Results	Support for Summit initiatives

# 2016 Summary of System Performance Measures Lane County OR-500 CoC

---

Submitted for Lane County Poverty and Homelessness Board approval May 18, 2017

---

**This is the second year of reporting System Performance Measures.**

## **Purpose of System Performance Measures**

- Develop a common understanding of system intent and goals as well as the projects that make up the Continuums system (CoC projects and other homeless projects)
- Focus on measuring the cumulative impact of projects, not just their individual impact
- Measure Lane County's progress toward preventing and ending homelessness
- Provide data to HUD to use to gauge progress on Federal goals
- Identify areas for improvement
- Meet the McKinney-Vento, as amended by HEARTH, requirements
- Use as a tool to evaluate project-type and specific project effectiveness for resource prioritization and new project development.

## **About this Report**

- The data in this report (official versions- not local) will be submitted on or prior to May 31, 2017 to <http://www.hudhdx.info/>.
- This report represents data strictly as entered in the HMIS system for all projects in the project type categories regardless of funding or association with Lane County Human Services Division.
- There are no target goals for the measures. These measures compare data from just our community to past years.

### **Key:**

**Prior Year= 2015** (10/01/2014 to 09/30/2015)

**Current Year= 2016** (10/01/2015 to 09/30/2016)

### **Acronyms:**

ES	Emergency Shelter
HMIS	Homeless Management Information System (ServicePoint)
PH	Rapid Rehousing and Permanent Supportive Housing
PSH	Permanent Supportive Housing

TH	Transitional Housing for Homeless
RRH	Rapid Rehousing (Short to Medium Term Rental Assistance)
TH	Transitional Housing for Homeless
SO	Street Outreach



## Summary of Measures

### 1a: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the average and median length of time persons remain homeless

### 2: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the percent of persons who return to homelessness

### 3.1: Change in PIT Counts

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless

### 3.2: Change in Annual Counts (Number of Homeless Persons)

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless

### 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects

- Desired Outcome: Increase in the percentage of adults who gain or increase income
- Desired Outcome: Increase in the percentage of adults leavers who gain or increase income

### 5: Number of Persons who Become Homeless for the First Time

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the number of persons who become homeless for the first time

### 7a: Successful Placement from Street Outreach

- Desired Outcome: Increase in percentage of people who exit SO permanent housing, temporary destinations (except street), and some institutional destinations

### 7b1, b2: Successful Placement in or Retention of Permanent Housing

- Desired Outcome: Increase in percentage of people who exit to or retain permanent housing

---

### Not Reported (definition not used in Lane County or State of Oregon)

### 6a, 6b, 6c: Homeless Prevention and Housing Placement of Persons Defined by Category 3 of HUD's Homeless Definition

- Desired Outcome: Reduction in the percentage of Category 3 people who return to homelessness

## Measure 1a: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

**Desired Outcome:** ↓ Reduction in the average and median length of time persons remain homeless

(↑ indicates negative outcome; ↓ indicates positive outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** Total Persons Served: Participants in All Emergency Shelters (ES) and Transitional Housing (TH) projects regardless of funding. Note- participants in ES and TH are considered homeless until permanently housed.

**Calculation:** Average/median total days persons were homeless (including unsheltered periods) during a 1 year period prior to system exit (leavers) or end of the reporting period (stayers). Include additional days actively enrolled, if enrolled in project at the beginning of the reporting period.

This measure is of the client's entry, exit, and bed night dates strictly as entered in the HMIS system.

Measure Name	Total Persons Served			Average Length of Time Homeless			Median Length of Time Homeless		
	2015	2016	difference	2015	2016	difference	2015	2016	difference
Persons in Emergency Shelter	3044	3509	↑ 465	52	58	↑ 6	9	10	↑ 1
Persons in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing	3252	3700	↑ 448	71	71	↔ 0	11	12	↑ 1

Report: 0700 - Length of Time Persons Homeless-Metric 1

**NOTE:** The large difference in Emergency Shelter was driven, in part, by the following:  
The Eugene Mission began their HMIS participation in March, 2015 (half way through the 2015 reporting year)

This report is the same with and without categorizing sanctioned camps and car camping program as Street Outreach projects

## Measure 2: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

**Desired Outcome:** ↓ Reduction in the percent of persons who return to homelessness

(↑ indicates negative outcome; ↓ indicates positive outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** Participants who exited any Street Outreach (SO), Emergency Shelters (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Permanent Housing (PH) [PH includes Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)] project to a Permanent Housing destination

**Calculation:** Percentage who returned to Emergency Shelter or Transitional Housing projects within 6 or 12 months or 24 months of their exit date & Percentage who returned to ES, SH, TH or any Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH) project in 6, 12 months or 24 months (includes PH because these projects require the participant to enter from homelessness.)

### Street Outreach Exits

Someone who exits a Street Outreach project has a **38%** chance of returning to homelessness and entering an Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Rehousing project within two years.

Exit from Street Outreach	Persons		Percent of Returns to Homelessness		
	2015	2016	2015	2016	difference
Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	16	16			
Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0-180 days)	2	1	6%	6%	↔ 0%
Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181-365 days)	3	1	6%	6%	↔ 0%
Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	2	4	6%	25%	↑ 19%
<b>TOTALS - Returns in 2 Years</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>↓ 6%</b>

### Emergency Shelter Exits

Someone who exits Emergency Shelter has a **37%** chance of returning to homelessness and entering or reentering an Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Rehousing project within two years.

Exit from Emergency Shelters	Persons		Percent of Returns to Homelessness		
	2015	2016	2015	2016	difference
Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	227	233			
Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0-180 days)	38	48	17%	21%	↑ 4%
Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181-365 days)	23	19	10%	8%	↓ -2%
Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	19	19	8%	8%	↔ 0%
<b>TOTALS - Returns in 2 Years</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>↑ 2%</b>

## Transitional Housing Exits

Someone who exits Transitional Housing has a 6% chance of returning to homelessness and entering or reentering an Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Rehousing project within two years.

Exit from Transitional Housing	Persons		Percent of Returns to Homelessness		
	2015	2016	2015	2016	difference
Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	269	362			
Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0-180 days)	6	3	2%	1%	↓ -1%
Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181-365 days)	6	6	2%	2%	↔ 0%
Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	10	14	4%	4%	↔ 0%
<b>TOTALS - Returns in 2 Years</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>↓ -2%</b>

## Permanent Housing (Permanent Supportive and Rapid Rehousing) Exits

Someone who exits a Rapid Rehousing or Permanent Supportive Housing project has a **18%** chance (25 out of 137 exits in 2016) of returning to homelessness and entering or reentering an Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Homeless Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Rehousing project within two years.

Exit from Permanent Housing (Permanent Supportive and Rapid Rehousing)	Persons		Percent of Returns to Homelessness		
	2015	2016	2015	2016	difference
Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	118	137			
Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0-180 days)	2	8	2%	6%	↑ 4%
Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181-365 days)	1	1	1%	1%	↔ 0%
Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)	8	16	7%	12%	↑ 5%
<b>TOTALS - Returns in 2 Years</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>↑ 9%</b>

## Measure 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

**Desired Outcome:** ↓ Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless

(↑ indicates negative outcome; ↓ indicates positive outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** People counted in the PIT (One Night Homeless Count) sheltered & unsheltered count conducted during the reporting period.

**Calculation:** PIT count total

This measures the change in PIT counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless person as reported on the PIT (as reported in to HUD via [www.HUDHDX.info](http://www.HUDHDX.info) ).

	2015 PIT Count		2016 PIT	Difference	
	Official 2015	Local 2015	Official (no local version)	Official 2015 and 2016	Local 2015 and 2016
<b>UNIVERSE: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons</b>	1473	1473	1451	-22	-22
Emergency Shelter Total	656	411	405	↓ -251	↓ -7
Transitional Housing Total	101	101	112	↑ 11	↑ 11
<b>Total Sheltered Count</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>517</b>	↓ -240	↑ 5
<b>Unsheltered Count</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>961</b>	<b>934</b>	↑ 218	↓ -27

### NOTE: Purpose of the Local Version Columns

Lane County adjusted the official count for local use in 2015. Egan Warming Center was open on 01/28/2015 to assist with the homeless count. 245 people were sheltered at Egan for one night who would have otherwise been unsheltered. This explains the -240 and +218 difference in the Official PIT Sheltered and Unsheltered totals in the above table.

### Measure 3.2: Change in Annual Counts (Number of Homeless Persons)

**Desired Outcome:** ↓ Reduction in the number of persons who are homeless

(↑ indicates negative outcome; ↓ indicates positive outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** People in Emergency Shelters (ES) and Transitional Housing (TH) during the reporting period

**Calculation:** Annual sheltered count total from HMIS

*This measures the change in annual counts of sheltered homeless persons in HMIS.*

	2015	2016	Difference
<b>UNIVERSE: Unduplicated Total Sheltered Homeless Persons</b>	3328	3806	↑ 478
Emergency Shelter	3110	3606	↑ 496
Transitional Housing	260	233	↓ -27

Report: 0702 - Number of Homeless Persons-Metric 3.2

**NOTE:** The large difference in Emergency Shelter was driven, in part, by the following:

- The Eugene Mission began their HMIS participation in March, 2015 (half way through the 2015 reporting year)

## Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects

**Desired Outcome:** ↑ Increase in the percentage of adults stayers who gain or increase income

(↑ indicates positive outcome; ↓ indicates negative outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** Adults in CoC Program-funded Transitional Housing (TH), Rapid Rehousing (PH-RRH), SSO (except SO), and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) during the reporting period

**Calculation:** Income at system exit (if during the reporting period) or annual assessment during the reporting period compared to income at the previous assessment

4.1: Percentage of adults who gained or increased employment income during the reporting period

4.2: Percentage of adults who gained or increased non-employment cash income during the reporting period

4.3: Percentage of adults who gained or increased income from any source during the reporting period

<b>Metric 4.1 – Change in earned income for adult system stayers during the reporting period</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	187	149	-38
Number of adults with increased total income	7	7	0
Percentage of adults who increased total income	4%	5%	↑ 1%

<b>Metric 4.2 - Change in non-employment cash income for adult system stayers during the reporting period</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	187	149	-38
Number of adults with increased total income	47	35	-12
Percentage of adults who increased total income	25%	23%	↓ -2%

<b>Metric 4.3 - Change in total income for adult stayers during the reporting period</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	187	149	-38
Number of adults with increased total income	51	41	-10
Percentage of adults who increased total income	27%	28%	↑ 1%

## Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects, continued

**Desired Outcome:** ↑ Increase in the percentage of adults leavers who gain or increase income

(↑ indicates positive outcome; ↓ indicates negative outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):** Adults who exited CoC Program-funded Transitional Housing (TH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), SSO (except SO), and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) during the reporting period

**Calculation:** Income at system exit compared to income at system entry

4.4: Percentage of adult leavers who increased employment income from entry to exit

4.5: Percentage of adult leavers who increased non-employment cash income from entry to exit

4.6: Percentage of adult leavers who increased income from any source from entry to exit

<b>Metric 4.4 - Change in earned income for adult system leavers</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	167	124	-43
Number of adults with increased total income	26	16	-10
Percentage of adults who increased total income	16%	13%	↓ -3%

<b>Metric 4.5 - Change in non-employment cash income for adult systems leavers</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	167	124	-43
Number of adults with increased total income	41	32	-9
Percentage of adults who increased total income	25%	26%	↑ 1%

<b>Metric 4.6 - Change in total income for adult system leavers</b>	<b>2015 Counts</b>	<b>2016 Counts</b>	<b>Difference</b>
UNIVERSE: Number of adults (system stayers)	167	124	-43
Number of adults with increased total income	46	44	-13
Percentage of adults who increased total income	35%	35%	↑ 1%

Report: 0703 - Employment and Income Growth for CoC Funded Projects Metric 4



## Measure 5: Number of Persons who Become Homeless for the First Time

**Desired Outcome:** ↓ Reduction in the number of persons who become homeless for the first time

(↑ indicates negative outcome; ↓ indicates positive outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

### Population Scope (Universe):

5.1: People in Emergency Shelters (ES) and Transitional Housing (TH) during the reporting period.

5.2: People in Emergency Shelters (ES), Transitional Housing (TH) and any Permanent Housing (RRH or PSH) during the reporting period

**Calculation:** Total number who did NOT appear in any ES, SH, TH or PH project in HMIS in the 24 months prior to their entry date

Metric 5.1 - Change in the number of persons entering ES and TH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS (FIRST TIME HOMELESS)			
	2015 Counts	2016 Counts	Difference
UNIVERSE: Persons with entries into ES or TH during the reporting period	3087	3537	450
Of persons above, count those who were in ES or TH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.	690	1039	349
Of the persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES or TH in the previous 24 months. (Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.) <b>FIRST TIME HOMELESS</b>	2397	2498	↑ 101

Report: 0704 - Number of Persons First Time Homeless, Metric 5

Metric 5.2 - Change in the number of persons entering ES, TH, and PH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS (FIRST TIME HOMELESS)			
	2015 Counts	2016 Counts	Difference
UNIVERSE: Persons with entries into ES, TH or any PH during the reporting period	3608	3985	377
Of persons above, count those who were in ES, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.	851	1180	329
Of the persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, TH or any PH in the previous 24 months. (Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.) <b>FIRST TIME HOMELESS</b>	2757	2805	↑ 48

Report: 0704 - Number of Persons First Time Homeless, Metric 5

## Measure 7a: Successful Placement from Street Outreach

**Desired Outcome:** ↑ Increase in percentage of people who exit SO permanent housing, temporary destinations (except street), and some institutional destinations

(↑ indicates positive outcome; ↓ indicates negative outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):**

7a.1: People who exited Street Outreach during the reporting period

**Calculation:** Percentage who exited to permanent housing, temporary destinations (except street), and some institutional destinations

Metric 7a.1 - Change in exits to permanent housing destinations	2015 Counts	2016 Counts	Difference
UNIVERSE: Persons who exited Street Outreach	4	93	89
Exited to temporary & some institutional destinations	0	0	0
Exited to permanent housing destinations	4	7	3
Percentage successful exits/retention	100%	8%	↓ -92%

Report: 0706 - Permanent Housing Placement-Retention Metric 7

**Note:** Street Outreach Projects did not begin using ServicePoint HMIS until late in 2015. This report only looks at HMIS data. The “↓ -92%” is entirely due to Street Outreach joining HMIS in late 2015.

## Measure 7b: Successful Placement in or Retention of Permanent Housing

**Desired Outcome:** ↑ Increase in percentage of people who exit to or retain permanent housing

(↑ indicates positive outcome; ↓ indicates negative outcome; ↔ indicates no change)

**Population Scope (Universe):**

7b.1: People who exited Emergency Shelters (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), and Rapid Rehousing (RRH) during the reporting period

7b.2: People in any Permanent Housing (PSH only) except Rapid Rehousing (RRH) during the reporting period

**Calculation:**

7b.1: Percentage who exited to permanent housing destinations

7b.2: Percentage who remained in Permanent Housing (PH) or exited to other permanent housing destinations during the reporting period

Metric 7b.1 - Change in exits to permanent housing destinations	2015 Counts	2016 Counts	Difference
UNIVERSE: Persons in ES, TH, and RRH who exited	2202	3610	1408
Exited to permanent housing destinations	601	642	41
Percentage successful exits/retention	27%	18%	↓ -9%

Metric 7b.2 - Change in exits to or retention of permanent housing	2015 Counts	2016 Counts	Difference
UNIVERSE: Persons in PH-H, PSH, and PH-S who exited	559	588	29
Remained in applicable PH projects and or exited to permanent housing destinations	521	531	10
Percentage successful exits/retention	92%	90%	↓ -3%

## NOT REPORTED

### Measure 6a, 6b, 6c: Homeless Prevention and Housing Placement of Persons Defined by Category 3 of HUD's Homeless Definition

**Desired Outcome:** Reduction in the percentage of Category 3 people who return to homelessness

**Population Scope (Universe):**

6a.1: Category 3 people who exited CoC Program-funded Transitional Housing (TH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) to Permanent Housing (PH) during the previous reporting period

6b.1: Same as 6a, but exited two reporting periods ago

**Calculation:** Percentage who returned to Emergency Shelters (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), or any PH project within 6 or 12 months (universe a) or 24 months (universe b) of their exit date

Measures 6a, b and c not reported on in 2015 or 2016 because Lane County and the State of Oregon do not have funders who require this homeless definition.