



**STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL ON
HOMELESSNESS
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 140
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

Thursday, June 7, 2012

10:00 AM

AUDIO LINK FOR THE ENTIRE MEETING. (12-2728)

Attachments: [AUDIO](#)

Present: Chairperson Zev Yaroslavsky, Vice Chairperson William Fujioka, Member Leroy Baca, Member Cynthia D. Banks, Member Ronald L Brown, Member Philip L. Browning, Member John A. Clarke, Member Lee Smalley Edmon, Member Jonathan Fielding, Member Lisa M. Garrett, Member Mitchell H. Katz, Member Jerry Powers, Member Sean Rogan, Member Joseph N. Smith, Member Marvin J. Southard, Member Sheryl Spiller and Member Mike Arnold

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Welcome and Introductions Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairperson, and William T Fujioka, Vice Chairperson. (12-2629)

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Yaroslavsky at 10:14 a.m.

Council members from various stakeholder Departments and Agencies, introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Statement of Proceedings from the meeting of March 28, 2012. (12-2636)

On motion of Chairperson Yaroslavsky, seconded by Vice Chairperson Fujioka, this item was approved.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS](#)

II. REPORTS

3. Presentation and Project 50 Cost Analysis by Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Manuel Moreno and Elizabeth Boyce. (12-2630)

Chairperson Yaroslavsky provided a brief background regarding cost avoidance to demonstrate and validate the need for permanent housing for the mentally ill and provide a road map for a Countywide effort.

Vice Chairperson Fujioka added how Project 50 has changed the lives of more than just the 50 people it was assisting. The Project has impacted the lives of everyone it touched. It has now expanded to assist over 600 people.

Elizabeth Boyce of the Chief Executive Office, provided the framework of the Project 50 implementation. The County assigned a homeless liaison within each Department to address homelessness. Chairperson Yaroslavsky hosted a conference with several national experts who helped. Flora Gil Krisiloff ensured that the staff assigned to homelessness wanted to take on the challenge and develop model programs, but needed the flexibility and creative space to do so. At this conference, Project 50 was conceived and a motion quickly followed that directed staff to develop and implement Project 50.

Project 50 was aimed at the sickest and most vulnerable individuals living on the streets of Skid Row, who were mostly chronically homeless and essentially offered immediate access to housing with no expectations of sobriety or following strict rules. Once housed intensive integrated supportive services were wrapped around each resident. There were dozens of barriers that had to be removed for each resident every step of the way, within our own departments, within the housing agencies, rules and regulations that had to be reworked.

There were conference calls every day for many months and endless leadership meetings. With the assistance of several partners, the Project has since grown close to 1,000 housing units using this model within Los Angeles County. This model delivered in various ways such as, within one building or scattered site, critical components which include identifying and engaging the chronically homeless, having access to permanent housing units, implementing an intensive and integrated supportive services team that has at a minimum experience in case management, health, mental health and substance abuse services to provide and maintain permanent housing for our chronically homeless neighbors.

Manuel Moreno of the Chief Executive Office – Service Integration Branch, presented a Power Point Report of the Project 50 Cost Analysis and responded to questions posed by Council members. The purpose of the study was to provide the Board of Supervisors with information on the cost effectiveness of Project 50, a permanent supportive housing model created by the Board and funded by the County’s Homeless Prevention Initiative (HPI).

His presentation highlighted the following areas of the report findings:

- 1. Information of the methodology and data that was used;**
- 2. Results of the Project 50 group;**
- 3. Comparison of the cost of services provided to Project 50 participants, two years before and two years post-program engagement;**
- 4. Comparison of the cost of services provided to Project 50 participants, one year before entering the program and the first year while in the program;**
- 5. Cost savings that were generated by the Project 50 model.**

Over the two-year study period, Project 50 yielded total cost offsets of \$3.284 million, which is 108% of the money the program actually spent (\$3.045 million) in providing its participants with permanent housing and supportive services.

- First year savings was \$1.2 million**
- Second year savings were estimated to be \$2.08 million**

Project 50 returned to the County more than the amount invested in the program, generating a surplus of \$4,774 per occupied unit over a two year period. Project 50 provided participants with the only consistent and comprehensive services they had ever experienced to address a myriad of chronic health, mental health and substance abuse issues. Project 50 was not a one-size fits all model, but was tailored to the service needs of the individual through a very attentive and nurturing service model. The key to Project 50’s success was the deployment of permanent supportive housing. Therefore, housing first plus integrated services and intensive case management, amounts to a homelessness prevention strategy that is both humane and fiscally prudent.

Mary Marx was acknowledged in leading Project 50 and continues to provide valuable support.

Ms. Marx also responded to questions posed by the Council.

Ms. Krisiloff noted, one of the over-arching symptom of Project 50 participants is severe mental illness.

After discussion, by common consent, there being no objection, the report was received and filed.

Attachments: [SUPPORTING DOCUMENT](#)

- 4. Report by Los Angeles County Interdepartmental Council on Homelessness (LACICH) Work Group on the following:**

Update - Lesley Blacher

Focus on Youth Sub-Population - Flora Gil Krisiloff

Presentation of Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Youth Development Services - Harvey Kawasaki

Discussion - Rigoberto Rodriguez (12-2631)

Lesley Blacher reported since the March meeting, the Los Angeles County Interdepartmental Council on Homelessness (LACICH) workgroup has met 3 times.

The first meeting in April was a brain storming session in which some of the concepts that emerged from the Homeless Resources Inventory that departments completed in preparation for the kick-off of the LACICH were further researched at this workgroup meeting. The four key points essential for strengthening homeless service coordination and integration across County Departments arose during the meeting and consisted of the following:

- 1. Integrated Health and Human Services Teams - Multidisciplinary team of mental health, health, substance abuse at a minimum, who work together as one team, one unit to assess and holistically address homeless individuals/families housing and supportive service needs.**

2. **Housing and Supportive Services Alignment - Once individuals/families are housed, we need to wrap supportive services around them to keep them housed. Supportive services such as mental health, health, substance abuse should be delivered at a frequency and intensity to address the needs of the particular individual/family.**
3. **Centralized Data System - Need to have a coordinated data system to track and better serve homeless individuals/families.**
4. **Enhanced Funding Integration - Identify funding and revenue sources that a County Department might be utilizing that could benefit or be used by other Departments (such as non-capped Federal entitlement) as well as those funding streams that can be aligned with housing and supportive services.**

At the second meeting in May, using the four areas discussed above as a starting framework for the development of a plan for our four focal populations – chronically homeless, homeless veterans, families and youth – we decided that we should focus our attention on youth. Also at this meeting, there was discussion on how departments target and/or serve youth, including how are youth defined in terms of age ranges. Some Departments defined youth between the ages 14-24, others 18-24, or 21 & under. The workgroup looked at what kinds of integrated teams were being used by the Departments; what is working; and what are the challenges. The key outcome from those discussions is that youth should be provided with permanent and supportive housing.

At the last workgroup meeting held May 31, 2012, the workgroup wanted to hear more about what was being done locally to provide permanent supportive housing both from a provider and departmental perspective. The workgroup heard Presentations from two providers (Step up on Second & First Place for Youth) about their housing models for youth. Harvey Kawasaki from the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) also made a presentation about the Department's housing programs. His presentation offered the basis for great discussion. As a result, the workgroup requested Mr. Kawasaki to make a presentation today regarding the housing model/services DCFS currently provides for their youth & the vision for the future.

Ms. Krisiloff gave a summary of why the workgroup decided to focus on youth. She reported the County has the least knowledge in terms of moving youth off the streets and in to more permanent housing. At the Federal level, the focus is on homeless youth. The definition of a "youth" is an unaccompanied person under 18 or between 18 to 24 years old. The Los Angeles Homeless Service Authority (LAHSA) 2011 Homeless Count identified 3,959 homeless youth, of which 3,593 were between the ages of 18-24 and 366 were under 18 and unaccompanied.

Harvey Kawasaki from DCFS, referred to the Transitional Housing Programs Matrix for Transitioning - Age Youth (16-24) in his report. He reported on:

- Where DCFS is with its housing programs to avoid homelessness for foster youths (Probation and DCFS foster youths);
- What is the Department's current state on housing; and
- Where is the Department is going on the interdepartmental collaboration on homelessness.

Mr. Kawasaki also responded to questions posed by the Council. Part of the Board/CEO self sufficiency's group goal is to take and analyze all the housing programs that the County has and to add legislative changes as part of the recommendations. He hopes to show on his follow-up report in two years, that transitional programs have become more permanent.

In addition, Chairperson Yaroslavsky requested that Mr. Kawasaki and DCFS research revenue streams and Federal entitlements that are not capped and ways that can benefit other County Departments.

After further discussion, by common consent, there being no objection, the report was received and filed.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

5. Next steps and closing remarks by Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairperson and William T Fujioka, Vice Chairperson. (12-2632)

The workgroup will be meeting over the Summer. The next meeting full Council meeting will be held on September 13, 2012 where a roadmap for ending homelessness for the four subpopulations will be provided along with an inventory of proposed legislative changes.

At the meeting to be held on November 15, 2012, the workgroup will present a final roadmap for the focal population.

Matters Not Posted

6. Items not on the posted agenda, to be presented and (if requested) referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Council subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (12-2633)

No matters were posted.

Public Comment

7. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Council on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Council. (12-2634)

No members of the public addressed the Council.

Adjournment

8. Adjournment for the meeting of June 7, 2012. (12-2635)

The meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Yaroslavsky at 11:45 a.m.