



THREE YEAR PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS IN WORCESTER

**DEVELOPED BY THE CITY MANAGER'S
TASK FORCE ON HOMELESSNESS**

**THE HONORABLE JORDAN LEVY, CO-CHAIR
WILLIAM J. MULFORD, CO-CHAIR**

NOVEMBER, 2007



CITY MANAGER'S TASK FORCE ON HOMELESSNESS

November 16, 2007

Dear City Manager O'Brien:

Pursuant to your charge that your Task Force on Homelessness identify new strategies to coordinate resources for the homeless in Worcester, we are pleased to present to you for your consideration this *Three Year Plan to End Homelessness in Worcester*.

The membership that you selected for this Task Force took your charge seriously and spent countless hours in committee and subcommittee meetings as well as at the public hearings. We were delighted to work with the members, all of whom contributed to this report:

Senator Edward Augustus	Mr. William Breault	Ms. Grace Carmark
Dr. Matilde Castiel	Mr. James Cruickshank	Ms. Jill Dagilis
Mr. Paul Fenner	Mr. Charles Gagnon	Councilor Barbara Haller
Ms. Colleen Hilferty	Mr. Denis Leary	Rev. Michael McFarland
Mr. Ed McKeon	Mr. Robert Nemeth	Mr. Francis Pisegna
Mr. Clarence Plant	Mr. James Walsh	Bishop Walter Weekes

As co-chairs we wish to thank each committee member for their untiring commitment, expertise and willingness to join with us in developing this comprehensive plan. It has been our honor to be able to serve you, the City Council and most importantly the homeless population of our community in developing this most challenging plan.

You promised us the support of all of the various departments and whatever resources we needed to do the job. That has certainly been the case and we have been impressed with the knowledge and dedication of everyone assigned to the project. We wish to thank the following City employees for their assistance:

Mr. Don Anderson	Acting Commissioner James Gardiner
Mr. Michael Gilleberto	Mr. Scott Hayman
Ms. Frances Manocchio	Dr. Leonard Morse
Sgt. Anthony Petrone	

The Task Force formally began its work in a meeting on April 5, 2007 and subsequently met 7 times. The Task Force subdivided into committees focused on the following aspects of homelessness: Best Practices, Data, and Siting. The subcommittees met a total of 12 times to review information and discuss various solutions. In addition, two public hearings were held in September, 2007. A total of 18 individuals testified at those

hearings. As you know, we also met with you and your staff on two occasions to discuss our progress. We also met with the City staff assigned to the Task Force on two occasions to evaluate our progress and to plan next steps. With the assistance of Dr. Jerry Schlater, we composed a plan to end homelessness based on our discussions and findings. We wish to thank Dr. Schlater for his talents and assistance in preparing this document for your consideration. We also wish to thank Michael Gilleberto from your office for his tremendous assistance in coordinating this entire process.

In our work, we have attempted to address all of the homeless constituencies and not just focus upon chronically homeless single individuals. We have embraced the “Housing First” model which received wide support from the committee members as well as those testifying at the public hearings. We believe that our recommendations represent a way to address the homeless issue that is both practical and achievable. The *Three Year Plan to End Homelessness in Worcester* is a new approach away from the failed twenty or more years of a philosophy centered on emergency sheltering. We have also taken the liberty of placing the agenda for the continuation of this effort by your office, along with a projected cost to accomplish this goal. Thank you once again for the opportunity to serve both you and our community.

Sincerely,

Jordan Levy
Co-Chair
Task Force on Homelessness

William J. Mulford
Co-Chair
Task Force on Homelessness

**City of Worcester
City Manager's Task Force on Homelessness
Three-Year Plan to End Homelessness in Worcester**

Overview

This Task Force is committed to ending homelessness in Worcester within three years. It is committed to ending homelessness for individual adults and adolescents, for families and for the chronically homeless. It is not interested in producing another study or report that, however well intended, ultimately fails to have a significant impact upon the problem. Further, we believe that previous efforts to address homelessness in Worcester have been short-sighted in targeting only sub-populations among the homeless such as homeless individuals or the chronically homeless. Our commitment is to end all homelessness in Worcester.

This bold effort cannot be successful by approaching the problem in the same way that we have over the past 20 years. In fact, the Task Force is proposing a complete paradigm shift in how Worcester approaches the problem of homelessness. Instead of relying on homeless shelters, we propose to implement a Housing First strategy. When people become homeless, we will help get them back into appropriate housing immediately with the supports that they need to stay there.

Problems with Past Practice

Background

The most recent census of the homeless in Worcester County conducted by the Central Massachusetts Housing Alliance, Inc. (CMHA) found 452 persons in homeless families with children and 471 homeless individuals at a single point-in-time on January 30, 2007. Among single adults who were homeless, 116 met the criteria for chronic homelessness (homeless for more than a year, or have had four or more episodes of homelessness in the past three years). Trends indicate that homelessness in Worcester and Worcester County has increased by approximately 10% for each of the past two years. The principal reasons for the increases appear to have been higher housing costs that make housing less affordable and reductions in the availability of state and federal housing subsidies.

Programmatic efforts over the past 20 years to reduce homelessness in Worcester have helped thousands of homeless individuals and families. However, these housing and service programs have not been successful at reducing homelessness in Worcester. The average daily census at the PIP Shelter now is about the same as it was in 1987. The census in family shelters has grown more than fourfold in that same time period.

Homeless shelters were originally designed only to meet emergency housing needs, and the service model assumed that homeless families and individuals would quickly move back into mainstream housing. However, as the incidence of homelessness has increased

steadily over the past 20 years and our programs to move the homeless out of shelters have met with limited success, the shelter system itself has become part of the problem.

Increasingly, shelter beds are being used to provide long-term housing. The PIP Shelter recently reported that 65% of its average daily census was chronically homeless persons, up from approximately 50% three years ago. The average length of stay in family shelters is currently about six months, and an increasing part of the challenge for families is to manage their lives for long periods in these mostly congregate settings.

Problems with the Shelter Model

Shelters were designed to be short-term solutions to a short-term problem that, instead, has become intractable. Although shelters continue to meet the most basic needs of homeless individuals and families, and help many to move beyond homelessness, there are inherent problems with the shelter model:

- Shelter environments are not normative – residents are no longer self-sufficient, lose self-esteem, and may become dependent
- Congregate shelters, because of the close proximity and loss of privacy to residents, sometimes cause conflict among residents
- In large shelters for homeless individuals, vulnerable persons may be abused and substance use among residents unwittingly promoted
- Normal daily living in a shelter is “on hold” because of uncertainty about both present and future
- Homeless individuals and families facing the most challenges stay the longest, and use an ever-increasing percentage of bed days.
- Shelters in Massachusetts funded by the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA) have traditionally been funded through either cost-reimbursement or unit-rate reimbursement methods. Neither provides a financial incentive for shelters to reduce capacity.

Problems with Programs Designed to Help People in Shelters

In the 1980’s, The Worcester Transitional Housing Consortium (Y.O.U., Inc, and Friendly House) developed the first transitional housing program for homeless families and Community Healthlink, Inc., the first transitional housing program for homeless adult individuals in Worcester using federal McKinney Act funding at an annual cost of about \$700,000. Since then, federal funding for housing and service programs for the homeless in Worcester County has increased almost every year. This year, the Worcester County Continuum of Care, through the Central Massachusetts Housing Alliance, Inc. (CMHA), applied for and should receive federal McKinney funding in the amount of \$5,184,669 for 21 homeless housing and service programs in Worcester County. Despite this substantial increase in federal resources, the problem remains essentially unchanged.

Although these programs have helped thousands of homeless individuals and families, there are several problems that limit their effectiveness:

- Participant Selection for Housing Programs

A principal problem with housing programs for the homeless is that they have largely targeted individuals and families judged through assessment processes to be most likely to become stable in their housing. This approach results in the selection of participants with fewer problems and barriers to housing rather than those with more. Although helpful to those selected, this approach does not attack the core of the homelessness problem -- the sub-populations of chronically homeless individuals at the PIP Shelter and families in shelters who face the most challenges to obtain affordable permanent housing. The inevitable result is a core problem of homelessness that is never eliminated, no matter how many new housing programs are implemented.

- The Continuum of Care Model

The federal McKinney Act promotes the Continuum of Care Model. This concept has been used too much as an “ideal service pathway” for the homeless, as opposed to its more appropriate use as an array of services and housing. When conceived as a pathway, service providers are expected to help homeless families and individuals to move along the pathway; e.g., by moving from the street to shelter to transitional housing to permanent housing. The pathway concept implies a need for achievement and readiness to move to the next stage. We believe this use of continuum is a disservice to the homeless because it creates instability in their lives (the need to move), demands compliance with program rules (at each stage), and builds artificial barriers to entry to permanent housing (the need to traverse prior stages).

- Systemic Problems

The system of housing and services for the homeless is complex, and the components are not well-coordinated. Some components operate independently, others are coordinated within a system of care within an agency or network of agencies, but overall coordination of the system of housing and care is lacking. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Each housing and service program controls its own intake and discharge of participants.
2. There is insufficient movement of individuals out of the system of housing and services that limits the effectiveness of system resources.
3. There is no Coordinating Authority for the system and accountability rests principally with individual program funders that are often not system-focused.

- Restrictive Eligibility Rules

The federal McKinney program adds new restrictive rules almost every year that limit our ability to respond to those individuals and families most in need. Chronically

homeless individuals in shelters, e.g., are disqualified for permanent supportive housing if they are placed temporarily in transitional housing. Families are no longer eligible for transitional housing if they are being evicted from an apartment. They must first go into a shelter. In addition, new McKinney programs now target only chronically homeless individuals. There has been no new funding of programs targeting families for the past five years.

The Task Force Plan

Goal 1. Paradigm Shift to Housing First

The Task Force on Homelessness takes the position that problems with the current system require a radical re-thinking of how we serve homeless families and individuals. We believe that Housing First is such a transformational strategy. Although new and revolutionary, this approach is beginning to establish itself through successful pilot programs across the country.

Housing First is the name given to a strategy for housing the homeless that promotes rapid re-housing for homeless individuals and families. The implication in the name is that housing should come first, followed by necessary services to stabilize the family or individual in their permanent housing environment. The existing “readiness model”, in contrast, selects participants for permanent housing who have already demonstrated success in shelter or transitional housing programs. Housing First thus reverses the sequence of the traditional “readiness” model. The premise of the model is that housing is a basic human need, and should not be a reward for demonstrating clinical success in shelters or other service or housing programs (Massachusetts Housing and Shelter Alliance, 2007). This premise is consistent with psychological theories of motivation that there is a hierarchy of human motives, and that higher level needs such as work and self-esteem are difficult to achieve in the absence of first meeting basic needs such as food and housing (Maslow, 1954).

Housing First also refers to the strategy of avoiding homeless shelters entirely. Rapid housing placement immediately upon becoming homeless, or when homelessness is imminent, is preferable to shelter placement because it avoids an unnecessary step in the process. The Task Force uses Housing First in both contexts – housing before services and rapid re-housing.

The model promotes a combination of affordable housing with outreach-based or home-based services. Housing can be in apartments or Single Room Occupancy Units, and the housing units can be scattered-site (dispersed widely throughout the community), congregate (shared living space among families or individuals), or clustered (separate units located near each other), dependent upon program model and funding level for services. The cost of housing is subsidized with federal, state or private funds, and program participants usually pay about 30% of their income as rent.

The service model is typically “low threshold”, meaning that families and individuals do not need to accept services, or need to agree to only the most basic contact with service

staff. The Task Force is insistent that sufficient services be available for implementation of the model in the Worcester area, and that services can be accessed at least on an emergency basis 24-hours/day for those programs targeting the chronically homeless.

Although the Housing First model is relatively new, research across the country in early and pilot implementations have demonstrated that model programs improve the housing stability, health and quality of life of participants; and, that total costs are actually reduced. Cost savings have been demonstrated for programs that target chronically homeless persons through reductions in the utilization of hospitals, shelters, emergency medical and psychiatric services, substance abuse detoxification services, and prison stays (Culhane, Metreaux, and Hadley, 2002; Martinez and Burt, 2006; Massachusetts Housing and Shelter Alliance, 2007). Other studies showed that active substance abusers can be stably housed (Padgett, Gulcur, and Tsemberis, 2006), and that shelter use is reduced (Metreaux, Culhane and Hadley, 2003).

The Task Force recommends that new federal, state, city, and private resources should be utilized to implement Housing First programs. Existing programs, where feasible, should be converted to Housing First to increase the cost effectiveness of existing resources.

Objective 1.1 Increase Affordable Housing and Develop New Permanent Supportive Housing for the Homeless Using the Housing First Model

The Task Force recognizes that homelessness is attributable first and foremost to a shortage of affordable housing. For both families and individuals there are a myriad of precipitating events to homelessness, but the ability to pay for housing is most often decisive. Increasing the supply of affordable rental housing is, therefore, critical to any plan to end homelessness.

For homeless individuals and families where disabilities or the lack of appropriate skills and supports are impediments to stable housing, we must provide affordable supportive housing where services can be provided for as long as necessary to reasonably ensure that housing will be stable.

Objective 1.2 Eliminate Homeless Shelters within Three Years

The Task Force proposes that the Housing First model be implemented not only for programs to help people exit shelters, but that Housing First eventually replace homeless shelters entirely for both families and individuals.

As shelters are phased out over the next three years, they would be replaced with Assessment and Triage Centers where newly homeless or at-risk families and individuals are rapidly assessed, given extended assessment and brief respite if necessary, and then immediately placed into housing using the Housing First model. This model eliminates shelters, but also retains the safety net for the homeless.

We are aware that the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA) is currently planning to implement pilot Housing First programs for homeless families. It is the intent of the Task Force that the City of Worcester and key area service providers work with DTA to achieve this model conversion as soon as practicable.

Objective 1.3 Close the PIP Shelter

The City of Worcester, the PIP Shelter, and the Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance should develop and implement a plan to phase out the shelter within three years.

The City of Worcester should use Code Enforcement as leverage to facilitate this process if needed. Census reduction to currently established legal occupancy limits could be phased in with the opening of new housing programs for the chronically homeless. PIP Shelter guests should be placed into new supportive housing in waves or cohorts, with the concomitant number of shelter beds simultaneously closed. Over a period of three years or less, in combination with a DTA strategy of Housing First, the census of the PIP Shelter will be reduced to zero. The DTA should also provide financial incentives to the PIP Shelter to reduce its shelter capacity, and reasonably protect the shelter against financial losses during the phase-out period.

To expedite this model conversion, the City of Worcester should advocate with the DTA, its legislative delegation, the Lieutenant Governor, and Governor for The PIP Shelter to serve as the first pilot program in the Commonwealth for conversion of shelters for homeless individuals to the Housing First model.

Objective 1.4 Develop Assessment and Triage Services for Families

Assessment and Triage Services should be developed for newly homeless families. The Service(s) for families should be converted from existing shelter programs with existing DTA funding and have the capacity to house families that need an extended period of assessment prior to their direct placement into housing.

Objective 1.5 Develop an Assessment and Triage Service for Homeless Individuals that includes Aggressive Outreach and Case Management

The Task Force recommends the development of a new Assessment and Triage Service for Homeless Individuals that includes 12 beds for extended assessment or respite. The assessment function would include screening for eligibility in other service systems and insurance coverage to facilitate appropriate referrals. The service should also include an Aggressive Outreach component that can identify and bring street homeless into the service system. This service could build upon existing resources of the McKinney-funded HEART program operated by Community Healthlink. Once operational, it should also serve as the admitting service for the PIP Shelter that would become a closed-referral program to facilitate its census reduction.

Although case management services should be available for all homeless, a more realistic goal is to develop targeted case management resources for the chronically homeless, and ensure that this staff has admitting authority for all system housing and service programs designed to serve the chronically homeless. This would also ameliorate current system problems by facilitating admissions into housing programs for the chronically homeless.

Additional funding for this service should come from the Commonwealth and the City of Worcester. The City's involvement in this critical service would facilitate its oversight and accountability role in ending homelessness in Worcester.

Goal 2. Expand Homeless Prevention Resources

There is great potential cost savings in preventing families and individuals from becoming homeless when they are imminently at-risk. The Task Force believes, therefore, that prevention is the most cost-effective strategy to address homelessness. This is particularly true for families where economic problems are most always paramount in precipitating homelessness. Spending small amounts of money to retain families in housing has been demonstrated to be an effective tactic in preventing homelessness (CMHA, 2007). It is ironic, then, that prevention efforts have been allocated the fewest resources in our current system of homeless housing and services.

Objective 2.1 Increase Availability of Flexible Funds and Case Management Services to Prevent Homelessness

Flexible funds for such expenses as utility and rent arrearages can prevent homelessness for those imminently at-risk. This will also require additional case management resources.

Objective 2.2 Increase Educational Efforts and Develop an Early Warning System to Target Persons At-risk of Homelessness.

Educational efforts with area landlords can preserve tenancies through mediation and intervention services in conjunction with the Worcester Housing Court. Educational efforts with first responders such as schools, health care providers, neighborhood centers, and food pantries can encourage appropriate prevention referrals.

Goal 3. Improve Service Strategies

The housing and service system for homeless families and individuals can become much more effective with improved service strategies.

Objective 3.1 Target the Chronically Homeless

Unless we give top priority to housing the chronically homeless, we will continue to work only at the edges of the problem of single adult homelessness. This sub-population that represents approximately 10% of homeless single adults uses more than half of all

shelter bed days and other community resources. It is also reasonable to target the near-chronic population as a prevention or early intervention strategy.

Objective 3.2 Improve the Housing and Service System

Changes are needed in the operation of core services for the homeless and system coordination. Policies and procedures need to be developed to improve admission and discharge practices and movement of persons into and out of the system. A comprehensive review of existing publicly funded housing programs should be undertaken to determine if program outcomes could be improved by conversion to the Housing First model. The City of Worcester should have a significant ongoing role in oversight of system operations through its funding of the Worcester County HMIS and the Assessment/Triage Service.

Objective 3.3 Strengthen Skills and Supports for the Homeless

Homeless families and individuals frequently have marginal skills and inadequate supports to help them prevent or extricate themselves from homelessness. Service providers can help the homeless build skills in basic living areas such as vocational training, budgeting, parenting, household management, hygiene, and nutrition. Similarly, we can offer supports to assist them in becoming stable in housing with job placement, child-care, after-school programs, transportation, and connection to other needed community services.

Goal 4. Improve Oversight and Accountability of the Housing and Service System by the City of Worcester

Federal McKinney programs for the homeless are required to be monitored by grantees. For state- and city-funded programs, performance monitoring is the responsibility of the funding entities, but results of these efforts are rarely communicated beyond the vendor agency involved.

The Task Force believes that The City of Worcester should have an important oversight role for all homeless housing and service programs that occur within Worcester; and, should, ultimately, be accountable for implementation of this plan. The oversight and accountability function should be exercised through the City Manager.

Objective 4.1 Help Coordinate and Monitor the Performance of Worcester Housing and Service Programs for the Homeless

The City of Worcester should have an important role in coordinating and monitoring the performance of the system of housing and services for the homeless in Worcester, and should dedicate new staff resources for this purpose:

- The City should help coordinate housing and service programs in conjunction with the CMHA through a leadership role in the Continuum of Care Planning Process.
- The City should help fund and monitor the performance of the Assessment/Triage Service for Homeless Individuals that will provide the City with valuable information regarding housing and service system performance.
- It should continue to monitor the performance of housing programs it funds through the federal McKinney program and act, as necessary, to improve performance.
- It should also continue funding of the Worcester County Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) that provides valuable data about the number and demographic characteristics of the homeless and service statistics.
- The City should also compile, analyze, and act on program monitoring reports obtained from funding agencies for all homeless housing and service programs. This process will facilitate its oversight role.

Objective 4.2 Develop a City Commission on Homelessness

The City of Worcester should create a Commission on Homelessness to recommend policy regarding the problem of homelessness. Its responsibilities should include:

- Implementing, monitoring, and updating this plan as necessary
- Conducting periodic reviews of the needs of homeless individuals and families
- Recommending City budgetary expenditures to end homelessness
- Advocating to meet the needs of the homeless

Staff support for Commission activities should be provided by the City of Worcester.

Goal 5. Ensure that Programs are Sited Responsibly

The Task Force recognizes that siting housing and service programs for homeless individuals and families is problematic, especially for programs serving persons with disabilities, substance abuse histories and past incarceration. The PIP Shelter has been a particular flashpoint in this regard.

The Task Force also recognizes that the federal Fair Housing Act and several provisions of Massachusetts law prohibit discrimination in housing against the disabled. Further, the Dover Amendment prohibits zoning ordinances that bar use of land for educational purposes by nonprofit educational corporations. The Task Force believes that the City of Worcester should actively support the siting of appropriate programs to help ensure the success of this plan.

There are several strategies that can encourage the appropriate siting of programs:

Best Practices

The Task Force encourages nonprofits that intend to site programs in Worcester to employ what are generally considered best practices that include notification of appropriate officials and neighbors, responding to questions and concerns, and may include Good Neighbor Agreements (see Attachment A).

Agencies serving the homeless are encouraged to site programs not only in Worcester, but throughout Worcester County and beyond to reflect the fact that Worcester serves homeless individuals and families whose residency prior to homelessness was not in Worcester. However, the Task Force also recognizes that as a major metropolitan area where community services required by the homeless are principally located, Worcester will have a disproportionate share of housing and services for the homeless.

Incentives and Disincentives

Neighborhoods should be encouraged to accept housing and services for the homeless through incentives provided by the City of Worcester. Neighborhood incentives could be patterned after those provided to Greenwood St. residents of Worcester relative to siting of the landfill, and could be funded using the federal Community Development Block Grant.

Siting programs in Worcester has also been difficult in the past in part because of the loss of property tax revenue that so often accompanies the implementation of programs by nonprofit agencies. To address this challenge, the Task Force supports legislation that would reimburse the City by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for any loss of revenue caused by the conversion of taxable city property to non-taxable use by nonprofits. Funds to support this reimbursement should come from financial disincentives levied against communities throughout the Commonwealth that do not do their fair share hosting nonprofit programs.

Role of the Business Community and Colleges

The Worcester business community and local colleges also have important roles in supporting the siting of programs for the homeless and implementation of this plan more generally. The downtown business community stands to benefit greatly from closing the PIP Shelter and eliminating street homelessness that will make downtown a more inviting place to live, work and play. The business community can have significant impact through their active support of this plan and their assistance in developing new single person housing. Their support through creating new jobs will also be essential to help ensure housing stability for newly housed homeless individuals and families.

Local colleges should provide housing opportunities for homeless individuals and families. In addition to dedicating housing units for use by homeless individuals and families, colleges could partner with local nonprofits to provide supportive housing and learning opportunities for their students at the same time.

Summary Table of Objectives, Time Frames, Responsible Parties and Targeted Funding Sources

Objective	Time Frame	Responsible Party	Targeted Funding Source/ Projected Cost*
Objective 1.1.1 Develop 60 units of permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless using the Housing First model.	60 units (20 units/ year for 3 years)	G. Carmark/ CMHA	HUD McKinney \$13,500/unit/year total \$810,000/yr
Objective 1.1.2 Develop 90 units of permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless using the Home and Healthy for Good program	90 units (30 units/ year for 3 years)	Sen. E. Augustus	Commonwealth of Massachusetts \$13,500/unit/year total \$1,215,000/yr
Objective 1.1.3 Develop 90 units of permanent supportive housing for chronically and near-chronically homeless individuals using a more intensive service model through CHAIN initiative	90 units (30 units/ year for 3 years)	D. Ekstrom/ CHL	Health Foundation of Central Massachusetts \$16,000/unit/year total \$1,440,000/yr
Objective 1.1.4 Develop 30 units of permanent supportive housing for families with a disabled parent using the Housing First model.	30 units (10 units/ yr for 3 years)	G. Carmark/ CMHA	HUD McKinney Convert existing transitional housing units
Objective 1.1.5 Develop 30 units of units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals using the Housing First model.	30 units (10 units/ yr for 3 years)	G. Carmark/ CMHA	HUD McKinney Convert existing permanent supportive housing units
Objective 1.1.6 Develop 300 units of single-person housing with services to be used as an alternative to shelter for homeless individuals.	300 units (100 units/year for 3 years) 60 new units public funding 60 project based housing choice vouchers 180 units private funding	S. Hayman/ City of Worcester	Mass. DHCD/ Mass. Housing/ CEDAC/ City of Worcester HOME Funds/ Worcester Housing Authority/ RCAP Solutions \$75,000/unit total \$4,500,000 new public funding
Objective 1.1.7 Increase state MRVP rental subsidies for Worcester homeless families by 150	150 vouchers (50/yr for 3 years)		Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Objective 1.2 Eliminate homeless shelters within 3 years and convert to Housing First model	Reduce shelter beds from current census		Commonwealth of Massachusetts DTA Conversion to

Objective	Time Frame	Responsible Party	Targeted Funding Source/ Projected Cost*
	by 33.3% per year for 3 years		Housing First
Objective 1.3 Close the PIP Shelter within 3 years	Reduce shelter beds from current census by 33.3% per year for 3 years	J. Cuddy/ SMOC	Commonwealth of Massachusetts DTA Conversion to Housing First
Objective 1.4 Develop assessment and triage services for families	Convert existing family shelter(s)		Commonwealth of Massachusetts DTA Conversion to Housing First
Objective 1.5 Develop an Assessment and Triage Service for Homeless Individuals that includes Aggressive Outreach and Case Management Components	Lease existing institutional or commercial space		Commonwealth of Mass./ City of Worcester \$800,000/yr
Objective 2.1.1 Increase availability of flexible funds to prevent homelessness through expansion of RAFT Program and Emergency Shelter Grants	Add funds to serve additional 100 families annually	G. Carmark/ CMHA	Commonwealth of Massachusetts DTA Conversion to Housing First
Objective 2.1.2 Expand case management resources for prevention of homelessness among families by two FTE staff	Add staff Year 1	G. Carmark/ CMHA	Private foundations/ Commonwealth of Mass./ City of Worcester \$80,000/yr
Objective 2.2 Increase Educational Efforts to Develop an Early Warning System to Target those At-risk of Homelessness.	Develop during Year 1	G. Carmark/ CMHA	No cost
Objective 3.1 Target the chronically homeless	Begin immediately		No cost
Objective 3.2.1 Improve admissions/discharge practices in existing housing programs to increase movement in and out of system	Initiate changes Year 1		No cost
Objective 3.2.2 Convert existing housing programs to	Initiate changes Year 1		No cost

Objective	Time Frame	Responsible Party	Targeted Funding Source/ Projected Cost*
Housing First where feasible			
Objective 3.3.1 Develop 300 job opportunities for homeless individuals and families	300 jobs (100 jobs/year for 3 years)	Hon. J. Levy	Worcester businesses No cost
Objective 3.3.2 Provide child care and after-school programming for all homeless families	Provide 200 child care/after-school slots for homeless families		Commonwealth of Massachusetts DTA Conversion to Housing First
Objective 3.3.3 Provide 50% subsidized bus passes for homeless families	100 families/year		City of Worcester/ WRTA \$3,000/yr
Objective 4.1 Help coordinate and monitor the performance of Worcester housing and service programs for the homeless	Year 1 0.5 FTE staff or equivalent		City of Worcester \$35,000/yr
Objective 4.2 Develop a City Commission on Homelessness	Year 1 0.5 FTE staff or equivalent		City of Worcester \$35,000/yr
Objective 5.1 Support legislation by the Commonwealth that reimburses Cities for the loss of taxable income from property converted to use by nonprofits; and, penalizes communities that do not accept their fair share of nonprofit programs	Year 1		Commonwealth of Mass. No cost
Objective 5.2 Involve local businesses and colleges in siting programs and developing new housing for the homeless	Year 1	Hon. J. Levy	Worcester businesses and colleges No public funds

Total Annual Cost = \$4,418,000
Total One-time Cost = \$4,500,000

*Total annual costs are at full implementation after 3 years. Costs during implementation years are roughly proportional. Total one-time costs can be spread over 3 years. Costs do not reflect savings achieved in other expenditures for the homeless population through reduction in public services used by individuals and families receiving supportive housing. Costs associated with conversion of the shelter system to Housing First should be offset by reductions in spending for homeless shelters by the Massachusetts DTA.

Summary of New Costs by Targeted Funding Source

ANNUALIZED COSTS

Objective	Purpose	Source	Unit Cost	Annualized Cost at Plan Completion
Objective 1.1.1.	SHP- 60 units	McKinney Funds	13,500	\$ 810,000.00
State Funds				
Objective 1.1.2	Home and Healthy-90 units	Commonwealth	13,500	\$ 1,215,000.00
Objective 1.5	Assessment/Triage	Commonwealth DTA		\$ 400,000.00
Objective 2.1.2	Case Management Families	Commonwealth DTA		\$ 80,000.00
				\$ 1,695,000.00
City Funds				
Objective 1.5	Assessment/Triage	Tax Levy/CDBG/ESG		\$ 400,000.00
Objective 3.3.3	Bus Passes	WRTA/City of Worc.		\$ 3,000.00
Objective 4.1-4.2	City Staff	Tax levy/CDBG/ESG		\$ 70,000.00
				\$ 473,000.00
Private Funds				
Objective 1.1.3	CHAIN-90 units	Health Foundation	16,000	\$ 1,440,000.00
TOTAL ANNUALIZED COSTS				\$ 4,418,000.00

ONE TIME CAPITAL

Objective	Purpose	Source	Unit Type Cost	One Time Capital
State Funds				
Objective 1.1.6	Single Person Housing	State	50,000	\$ 3,000,000.00
City Funds				
Objective 1.1.6	Single Person Housing	City HOME	25,000	\$ 1,500,000.00
TOTAL ONE TIME CAPITAL COSTS				\$ 4,500,000.00

References

Central Massachusetts Housing Alliance. Ending Family Homelessness in Worcester, 2007

Culhane, D., Metreaux, S, and Hadley, T. Public service reductions associated with placement of homeless persons with severe mental illness in supportive housing. *Housing Policy Debate*: 13 (1): 107-163, 2002.

Martinez, T., and Burt, M. Impact of permanent supportive housing on the use of acute care services by homeless adults. *Psychiatric Services*: 57(7), 992-999.

Maslow, A.H. *Motivation and Personality*, 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Massachusetts Housing and Shelter Alliance, Inc. Home and Healthy for Good. October, 2007

Padgett, D., Gulcur, L. Tsemberis, S. Housing first services for people who are homeless with co-occurring serious mental illness and substance abuse. *Social Work Practice*: 16(1) 744 – 83, 2006.

GOOD NEIGHBOR AGREEMENT

BETWEEN _____

AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Description of Housing Program and Provider _____

The Neighborhood Advisory Committee is a group of neighboring businesses and individuals committed to ensure and promote the safety and quality of life in the neighborhood.

Both parties share a common desire to:

- Create a peaceful, safe, and beautiful neighborhood;
- Share open and honest communication;
- Help each other address concerns and solve problems;
- Promote and benefit the neighborhood.

In order to accomplish these goals, the two parties voluntarily and freely agree to commitments described in this agreement. This Good Neighbor Agreement represents the good faith wishes and intentions of the parties involved, but is not intended to be a legally binding document.

I. Property

Property owners have a responsibility to keep their properties well-maintained and attractive. It is desirable for property owners and residents to show pride in the community by caring for public spaces, and by assisting the neighborhood's service organizations, such as schools, charitable organizations, etc., with improving the landscape. In order to maintain property at the highest possible values,

_____ will:

- A. Maintain the building and grounds in good condition, and promptly make any repairs needed;
- B. Keep the building and grounds clean and neat in appearance;
- C. Maintain a well-lighted facility and grounds;
- D. Install and maintain attractive lawns, trees, gardens, and other landscaping that contribute to the beauty of the neighborhood;

- E. Encourage residents to become involved in volunteer efforts to help clean and improve the neighborhood's public spaces and the grounds outside nearby service organizations.

The Neighborhood Advisory Committee will:

- A. Make note of the condition of the building and grounds, and report to _____ when property issues require attention;
- B. Help develop and participate in volunteer activities to create a more attractive neighborhood.

2. Safety

Safety and security are essential for citizens to live peacefully and free from harm, and for neighborhoods to remain desirable and attractive. Property owners and residents share the responsibility of creating and maintaining a safe and secure neighborhood. In order to promote safety and security for all residents of the neighborhood,

_____ will:

- A. Establish a block watch program in conjunction with the police department, and other neighboring businesses and residents;
- B. Prohibit and actively discourage loitering around _____ and surrounding properties;
- C. Respond to all concerns that involve an emergency (defined as a grave or imminent risk to the health or safety of any person) immediately; as appropriate contact police or rescue squad and the supervisor on-call immediately.

The Neighborhood Advisory Committee will:

- A. Offer advice and support in developing a block watch program for the neighborhood;
- B. Review summary reports of program outcomes, incidents, and neighborhood concerns from _____;
- C. Provide comments and suggestions for improving safety at _____.

3. Conduct and Behavior

Conduct and behavior that is respectful of others contributes to the peaceful enjoyment of life in the community. Individuals have the freedom to act as they please, so long as those actions are lawful, and do not harm others or infringe upon their rights. Cooperation and respect between citizens are desirable qualities, and will be actively promoted in the neighborhood. In order to promote good conduct and behavior,

_____ will:

- A. Create and enforce house rules that encourage respect for others and prescribe lawful behavior for residents and guests;
- B. Discourage loud music and loud or offensive language in public;
- C. Prohibit all firearms on the premises;
- D. Investigate and respond promptly as indicated above to all concerns about resident behavior expressed by neighbors or other community members.

4. Communication

Communication between _____ and the neighboring community is important to develop and maintain positive relationships. Awareness of upcoming events offers the community ways to interact with residents and staff, and helps both parties become more integrated. Methods will be established to ensure routine communication, feedback, and monitoring of this agreement's commitments. In order to promote communication between the program and the neighborhood,

_____ will:

- A. Provide notice of upcoming events, and invite the community when appropriate;
- B. Meet with the Neighborhood Advisory Committee annually to report as required by this agreement, and to review program and facility design, policies, procedures, progress reports, and other relevant information;
- C. Respond promptly to all concerns expressed by neighbors or community members regarding residents, using the following procedure:
 - I. Staff taking such a call will determine if it is an emergency (defined as a grave or imminent threat to the health or safety of any person), in which case police or rescue squad will be contacted as appropriate, along with the supervisor on-call.
 - II. Staff will notify the caller of the initial plan for response and a suggested time frame for follow-up.
 - III. Staff will contact a supervisor within 24 hours to discuss the concern.
 - IV. The supervisor will review the issue, interview all persons involved, and gather additional information as needed to form a plan to resolve the concern within five business days.
 - V. The supervisor will make follow-up contact with the original caller and other parties involved as necessary within five business days (sooner if possible), and advise all parties of the plan and/or current status of investigation to resolve issue, within the boundaries of confidentiality.
- D. Provide written response regarding resolution of repeated issues, problems, or patterns of behavior that cause the community concern at annual meetings;
- E. Notify neighbors and others at least annually of procedures for raising issues and concerns which describe contact persons, resolution process, and time frames for resolution of issues;
- F. Notify the Neighborhood Advisory Committee of major changes proposed to the program or facility, and seek advice with regard to implementation.

The Neighborhood Advisory Committee will:

- A. Encourage the community to attend events and programs to interact with residents and staff at _____ when possible;
- B. Meet at least annually to monitor progress and commitments made within this agreement, and offer suggestions and advice to _____ with regard to facilities;
- C. Serve as a vehicle for communication between neighbors and the community and _____, including sharing or information, appreciation, issues, and concerns;
- D. Notify _____ of repeated issues, problems, or patterns of behavior that cause the community concern, and seek resolution;
- E. Seek resolution of community concerns with _____ prior to notifying the media or outside entities, whenever possible and appropriate.

5. Changes to Agreement

This agreement may be changed or modified from time to time upon mutual agreement of _____ and The Neighborhood Advisory Committee.

AGREED:

_____ Name	_____ Organization	_____ Date
_____ Name	_____ Organization	_____ Date