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INTRODUCTION

Too often, we perceive unaccompanied homeless adults as living outside mainstream society. They are the other, the ones we do not acknowledge as we walk by. Over fifteen thousand individuals experience homelessness over the course of a year in Washington, D.C.¹ This staggering number includes families, minors, and single adults. Single adults are called “unaccompanied,” meaning they enter the shelter system without children or a spouse. They navigate services, housing, and employment alone. Unaccompanied homeless adults include veterans, survivors of domestic violence, the mentally ill, people suffering from substance abuse, and the working poor who simply cannot afford housing in Washington, D.C.² They enter the shelters for a number of different reasons: some have experienced a temporary crisis such as the loss of a job, while others face long-term struggles with substance abuse or mental illness.

This report identifies specific gaps in resources for unaccompanied homeless adults in D.C. and provides recommendations to address those gaps. In a series of group and individual interviews, we heard the personal experiences of unaccompanied homeless adults and their visions for what can be done to better serve the population. Because these individuals navigate the system first-hand, they truly know its strengths and weaknesses.

Through these conversations, unaccompanied homeless adults provided illuminating and concrete ideas for change. Service providers who work day-to-day with these individuals also shared their viewpoints and their expertise. Because unaccompanied homeless adults and service providers identified the gaps in resources, this report analyzes a broad range of issues, including housing, employment, service provision, and federal funding. We hope that, by relaying their voices and crafting recommendations that directly speak to their concerns, this report will spark dialogue and new thinking to improve the lives of the unaccompanied homeless adults living in our nation’s capital.

The second part of the report explains the background of the report and our sources of information. Next, it analyzes the gaps in resources and presents recommendations to address specific issues identified by unaccompanied homeless adults and service providers. The first gap identified by the unaccompanied homeless adults is the lack of assistance programs for personal crises that may trigger homelessness. Next, the report examines the lack of affordable housing in D.C. – both a cause of homelessness and a barrier to exiting homelessness – and presents recommendations to increase the number of affordable housing units. The report then explores the lack of sufficient employment opportunities and makes recommendations for improving the employment situation of unaccompanied homeless adults. The next gaps identified relate to information accessibility and case management, and shelter conditions and oversight, and the report proposes recommendations for improving resources for unaccompanied homeless adults in those areas. The report lastly considers the importance of community in assisting unaccompanied homeless adults to exit homelessness and presents recommendations for increasing inclusion in the mainstream community and maintaining community amongst the homeless. Throughout the report, we highlight sources of funding available to the D.C. government and local service providers from various federal agencies.
BACKGROUND

“I've tried everything; I don't know what else to do,” said one man as he described his multi-year struggle to stay employed while living in a shelter. This statement captures the unfortunate reality for unaccompanied homeless adults with no clear exit from a number of problems.

This section attempts to present the landscape of gaps in resources, as identified by homeless and formerly homeless unaccompanied adults. While some of the gaps reflect macro issues in D.C. that extend beyond homelessness, such as the lack of affordable housing and high unemployment, those have nonetheless been included to preserve the picture painted by the individuals with whom we spoke. The individuals and organizations in the homeless services community have a deep understanding of the challenges and complexities of the gaps and recommendations discussed below. This report does not attempt to supplant that understanding; instead, it attempts to add perspective in two ways. First, in lieu of creating an objective, exhaustive catalogue of the causes of homelessness and the barriers to exiting homelessness, this report allows individuals who have personally experienced homelessness to identify gaps in the system. Second, as individuals outside the homeless services community, the authors of this report bring a new and different perspective to the challenges, and offer recommendations to bridge the identified gaps, which incorporate both the voices of the homeless and the service provider communities. The recommendations and conclusions drawn in this report are our own and do not reflect the position of SOME, Inc.

Sources of Information

Much of the information contained in this report comes directly from individuals experiencing homelessness and the service providers who work on this issue. The goal of this report was to speak directly with unaccompanied homeless individuals and service providers who wanted to share their ideas and their concerns, not to conduct a sociological study. Group and individual interviews — essentially conversations with those on the ground — were the primary resource used to develop this report.

All of the individuals interviewed self-selected and participated voluntarily in the conversation. The interviews were held at service providers’ facilities, so the participants already had some connection to the larger homeless services network. We asked each individuals and focus group a similar set of questions, but allowed for time to discuss unexpected ideas.

CONVERSATIONS WITH UNACCOMPANIED HOMELESS ADULTS

The interviews took place in October and November 2013; they generally lasted between one and two hours. The group interviews were conducted in various locations around the District and hosted by different service providers. The organizations included Isaiah House, Bedford Falls, and the Coalition of Housing and Homeless Organizations (COHBO). The participants ranged from homeless individuals active in advocacy and organizing, those suffering from mental illness and substance abuse, and groups made up entirely of women. In total, twenty-five people were interviewed in a group setting.

Individual interviews also served as an integral source of information. Again, service provider organizations provided the locations for the discussions, including Miriam’s Kitchen, Thrive D.C., and the Community for Creative Non-Violence (CCNV). The fifteen individuals interviewed included visitors to...
local food kitchens, such as men living in shelters, and those suffering from mental illness or substance abuse.

All of the participants, whether in a group or an individual interview, were asked a similar set of questions (Appendix 1). The questions focused on (1) what could have kept them from becoming homeless, (2) what they identified as the barriers to exiting homelessness, and (3) their suggestions for addressing the challenges.

CONVERSATIONS WITH SERVICE PROVIDERS
To present a complete picture, we also conducted interviews with members of the Washington, D.C. homeless services community. The interviewees included government representatives, nonprofit service providers, and people working within the private sector. In total, nine people were interviewed and the questions were tailored to their area of expertise. We also conducted one group interview with service providers in COHHO.

EXTERNAL RESEARCH
The interviews served as the foundation to identify the gaps and think about recommendations. Our external research, including some expert presentations, put some of the D.C.-specific information into a broader context, and encouraged a “think big” approach to the recommendations. Expert presentations were focused on permanent supportive housing and affordable housing models. Written external research sources included materials prepared by service providers and academic studies concerning the homeless in Washington, D.C. and other jurisdictions. To collect federal funding information, we relied on the federal agencies online program descriptions and budgetary information. The federal agencies we surveyed include: the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), the Department of Labor (DOL), and the Department of Justice (DOJ).

Framework for Analysis
At the most basic level, individuals become homeless because they cannot maintain housing. That is, individuals, after paying for other essentials, such as food, transportation, and utilities, simply do not have enough income to devote to housing and cannot make rent (or mortgage) payments. The gaps identified in the next section fall on a continuum from homelessness prevention, when additional resources might have kept an individual from becoming homeless, to barriers to exiting homelessness, when gaps in resources keep an individual trapped in homelessness, despite their best efforts. This report focuses on three broad areas within homelessness prevention: (1) the difficulty of overcoming personal crises, (2) high housing prices and a lack of affordable housing units, and (3) the lack of living wage jobs. The macro issues of affordable housing and employment impact the entire continuum in reality, but in this report they are treated solely as homelessness prevention issues. At the other end of the continuum, a separate set of barriers complicates the transition out of homelessness. The barriers to exiting homelessness, addressed in this report, include: (1) ineffective access to information and overburdened case management, (2) undesirable shelter conditions and limited shelter oversight, and (3) the difficulty of maintaining community as individuals transition out of the system.
GAPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Personal Crises

A range of personal crises can cause an individual to lose his or her home. Personal crises are more likely to derail individuals who do not have accumulated wealth or another viable safety net. These individuals live on the margins, paycheck to paycheck. First, losing a job, even for a brief period of time, can cause a renter to fall behind on payments and, without assistance, eventually be evicted. One man spoke about the series of events, beginning with the loss of his work truck, that led him to enter the shelter system.\(^6\) Substance abuse, another personal crisis, can draw an individual away from employment and stable housing. One woman explained that, as her addiction progressed, she just could not “hold a job or keep it straight.”\(^7\) Eventually, she did not have enough money to keep her apartment.\(^8\) Finally, some tenants do not understand their rights when they face eviction or an issue with a landlord.\(^9\)

Unanticipated health care issues can pose two problems. First, medical costs can eat up an individual’s savings, if any, leaving the person unable to meet their housing costs. Second, a health problem can cause a disability, which effectively leaves an individual unable to earn an income, either temporarily or permanently. Similarly, mental and behavioral health issues can require expensive treatment and make it difficult to sustain employment. These challenges may compound over several years and lead to chronic homelessness, meaning the individual has a disabiling condition and must have experienced homelessness continuously for at least a year or four times in a three-year period.\(^10\)

GAP: LACK OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS ADDRESSING PERSONAL CRISSES

Those at risk of homelessness or transitioning out of homelessness need strong financial assistance to retain or access housing.\(^11\) For homelessness prevention, individuals may need help with overdue rent or utility payments to maintain housing. In the contexts of both homelessness prevention and exiting homelessness, getting an apartment may have significant cost barriers such as the first month’s rent, the last month’s rent, and a security deposit. One woman spoke in frustration as she described the challenge of finding an apartment, explaining that even when an individual is lucky enough to find an affordable unit, several obstacles remain, including the landlord’s application fee and the competition from other renters.\(^12\) Unaccompanied homeless adults also indicated that some individuals may need permanent support for a disability or other reason.\(^13\)

For many of the crises discussed above, there are public programs that provide temporary assistance with housing costs. However, when the general topic of government-sponsored rental assistance programs came up for discussion, one group dismissed the programs because of the long processing times: by the time an application is reviewed, the desired unit may have already been leased to another renter.\(^14\) In addition, unaccompanied homeless adults simply do not qualify for several of the temporary assistance programs.
RECOMMENDATIONS

**Fund the Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) and Rapid Rehousing Pilot Programs Through Fiscal Year 2015**

The Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) covers overdue rent, related eviction fees, and new renter costs such as a security deposit. In order to be eligible, though, ERAP has the added requirements that you must have a child under 19, an adult over the age of 59, or a person with a disability in the household.\(^5\) In October 2013, the Department of Human Services (DHS) launched a $500,000 ERAP pilot program accessible to unaccompanied homeless adults who do not have a disability and are not over the age of 59.\(^6\) The homeless individuals interviewed did not mention the ERAP pilot because it is still in the early stages of implementation.

Washington, D.C.’s Family Rehousing and Stabilization Program (Rapid Rehousing) provides housing placement assistance, short-term financial assistance, and case management services.\(^7\) Rapid Rehousing models the federal program, the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program (HPRP), which provided a similar set of services.\(^8\) The federal program, open to a limited number of unaccompanied homeless adults, was discontinued in 2012 after a three-year trial period.\(^9\) With the exception of a $400,000 pilot program for unaccompanied homeless adults, launched in October 2013, D.C.’s Rapid Rehousing only applies to families in the shelter system.\(^10\) This pilot program is also in the early planning and implementation stages.

These two temporary assistance programs, ERAP and Rapid Rehousing, provide limited assistance to unaccompanied homeless adults. The pilot programs for unaccompanied homeless adults, recently launched by D.C., received one-time funding in fiscal year 2014. To allow time to thoroughly evaluate these pilot programs, however, D.C. should allocate additional funding in fiscal year 2015 to extend the programs. These pilot programs have the potential to highlight the unique needs of unaccompanied homeless adults and identify how to modify the existing programs to meet their needs. After a comprehensive review of the pilot programs, the government can consider whether to permanently expand the two programs to unaccompanied homeless adults.

**Implement Local Rent Supplement Pilot Program for Unaccompanied Homeless Adults**

For extremely-low income D.C. residents, defined as those earning 30% or less of Area Median Income (AMI), the Local Rent Supplement Program (LRSP) makes up the difference between the actual cost of a rental unit and what a resident can pay.\(^11\) A resident is required to pay no more than 30% of their monthly income, the affordability threshold defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).\(^12\) The program provides three types of vouchers: tenant-based, project-based, and sponsor-based vouchers.\(^13\) A tenant-based voucher goes directly to the recipient resident and the voucher follows the resident to any rental unit less expensive than Fair Market Rent (FMR) in D.C.\(^14\) Project-based vouchers remain with a specific unit.\(^15\) The unit is usually in a development targeted at low-income residents and the development may choose to provide the residents with supportive services.\(^16\) Finally, sponsor-based vouchers go directly to the landlord or nonprofit who provides housing.\(^17\) The vouchers can be used for any unit administered by that landlord or nonprofit, however, that party must provide supportive services to the residents.\(^18\) Since its inception in 2007, the LRSP has experienced funding
fluctuations for a variety of reasons. However, when the LRSP is fully funded and used in conjunction with other affordable housing development efforts, it can be a powerful tool to make housing accessible to some of D.C.’s most vulnerable residents.29

Currently, this powerful tool primarily benefits families.30 Individuals qualify for the LRSP only if they are handicapped31 or displaced either by a federal project or by a federally designated disaster.32 Further, individuals with a felony conviction can only qualify for the sponsor-based vouchers, not the tenant-based or project-based vouchers.33 Even for the sponsor-based vouchers, an individual with a felony conviction must demonstrate an intent to receive case management services.34 Because many of the unaccompanied homeless adults who do not meet these criteria still need assistance to pay D.C.’s high housing costs, the LRSP’s eligibility requirements should be relaxed in order to serve as an effective resource for unaccompanied homeless adults. One approach would be to pilot a program with more inclusive eligibility requirements. Similar to the ERAP and Rapid Rehousing pilot programs for unaccompanied homeless adults, this approach would gauge the LRSP’s effectiveness in serving a new population. If the LRSP proves to be effective as a pilot, it could then be implemented on a larger and permanent basis.

Expand and Better Use Department of Human Services’ Permanent Supportive Housing Units
DHS’s Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), which uses a Housing First model,35 places homeless individuals in housing first and then offers services as needed.36 PSH provides formerly homeless persons with a lease and a key, and the option of receiving holistic support services.37 Services often include life skills training, health care, substance abuse counseling, job training, and mental health care.38 The individual has the choice to either accept or reject the support and regular case manager check-ins.39

Washington, D.C. adopted the Housing First model of PSH in 2009 and approximately 1,300 persons are currently housed through this program.40 DHS funds the program and local private and nonprofit organizations help administer the program across D.C.41 PSH is a cost-effective solution to assist the chronically homeless. To house an individual for a year, PSH costs only two dollars more than an emergency shelter.42 An individual in PSH is less likely to experience expensive hospital and jail overnights. In fact, when these overnight expenses are considered, PSH costs less than if the individual was in a shelter or on the street.43 PSH is also a more humane and long-term solution than the alternatives.44 Given the significant benefits of PSH, greater funds should be allocated toward this program to assist unaccompanied homeless individuals, making it possible to increase the number of PSH units and ensure that every unit is always occupied.
ASSOCIATED FEDERAL FUNDING

Federal funds can be used to help D.C. address the gaps identified in this section. Some of these funds have already been accessed by D.C., those that have a black border, but there are also potential new resources, which have an orange border. Detailed information about federal programs is in Appendix 2.

A number of federal programs provide funding, which could address the gap in assistance for personal crises. The government or a local service provider has not accessed these potential sources. For housing, the Emergency Solution Grant (ESG), administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), provides flexible funding for a number of homelessness prevention and exit tools, including Rapid Rehousing. Section 202 and Section 811, designated to fund housing for the low-income elderly and disabled respectively, have not been accessed by D.C. These relatively new programs, implemented in fiscal year 2010, represent potential avenues to provide housing and supportive services to these specific populations. D.C. already accesses the formula funds available through Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), but the competitive funding may be another potential resource for funds to address personal crises.
Affordable Housing

GAP: LACK OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Housing in Washington, D.C. is expensive, and low-income residents cannot afford it. The median Fair Market Rent (FMR) in D.C. is $1,176 for an efficiency, and $1,239 for a one-bedroom apartment. The federal government generally defines housing as “affordable” if a household or individual pays no more than 30% of his or her monthly income in rent. To afford an efficiency unit at $1,176, an individual would have to make an annual salary of $47,040. However, approximately 31% of D.C. residents fall well below this income threshold, reporting less than $35,000 in income. In addition, Washington, D.C. lacks sufficient affordable housing units to meet the demand. The D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute tracked a decline of affordable housing units from 63,645 units in 2000 to 17,640 units in 2010. With 135,187 D.C. residents reporting less than $30,000 in income in 2010, the number of units available is not sufficient to meet the demand.

The D.C. Housing Authority (DCHA) manages subsidized housing programs designed to address this unmet need. The programs include: the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP), formerly known as Section 8, public housing placements, and the LRSP (discussed above). The HCVP provides portable, tenant-based vouchers and non-portable, project-based vouchers to subsidize rent payments for very low-income households (50% AMI). In addition, at least 75% of the total units must be reserved for those who are extremely low-income (30% AMI). For the public housing units, DCHA administers and maintains fifty-four apartment communities in D.C. DCHA maintains multiple wait lists for the HCVP and the public housing units. Several interviewees reported that they had been on these wait lists for three years, seven years, or even eleven years, all without ever receiving a placement. On April 12, 2013, DCHA closed the wait lists to new applicants as the agency considered how to expedite approximately 70,000 existing applicants. A report by the Office of the Inspector General highlighted the need to reevaluate policies for updating and purging the lists to avoid the staggering waiting period of about 28 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS
The shortage of affordable housing in Washington, D.C. presents a challenge to both preventing and exiting homelessness. The wait lists associated with the subsidized housing programs cited by the interviewees and documented by the Office of the Inspector General cannot be addressed in a timely manner without expanding the affordable housing stock. At least one affordable housing expert has speculated that the shortage of affordable housing is beyond a billion dollar problem. As D.C. continues to grow, we must decide, as a community, if socioeconomic diversity will remain a priority. If it is a priority, low- and moderate-income residents will need support to continue living in D.C. In addition to providing direct assistance to individuals, D.C. must, in the long-term, substantially increase the affordable housing stock. The recommendations below focus on three existing tools to increase the affordable housing stock: the Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) program, the Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF), and the Public Land Redevelopment Program (PLRP), and we also introduce an innovative rental income taxation structure.
Strengthen Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) and Target Extremely Low-Income Residents

Broadly, Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) gives an incentive to a developer to designate a number of units as “affordable” or below-market units. Currently, in D.C., the IZ regulations apply to any new rental or condominium building with at least ten units or renovations to buildings increasing building size by 50%. For these buildings, developers can receive a 20% zoning density bonus for designating 8-10% of the units as “affordable.” IZ was initiated in 2006, but as of December 2012, IZ had created only fifteen affordable units in D.C. A number of units are in the pipeline, but IZ must be strengthened to ensure these units become available quickly to meet the existing need.

IZ could be an effective tool for creating affordable housing specifically for unaccompanied homeless adults, if it targeted extremely low-income households at 30% AMI. Currently, developers can receive the positive density bonus by creating units affordable to very low-income households at 50% AMI, and low-income households at 80% AMI. This spectrum of affordability does not directly address the needs of unaccompanied homeless adults. As of January 2013, 45% of unaccompanied homeless adults reported no income, which automatically places them in the extremely low-income category, below 30% AMI. In addition, only 20% of unaccompanied homeless adults were employed as of January 2013. D.C. could mandate that a minimum number of the units created by IZ be reserved for extremely low-income residents, which would include more of the unaccompanied homeless adult population. The number of units designated for extremely low-income households would need to be calibrated carefully because the program may become too costly to developers. To remedy any potential resistance, developers could receive an added positive incentive, beyond the prescribed density bonus, if they target extremely low-income households.

Stabilize and Increase Funding for the Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF)

D.C.’s Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF), first financed in fiscal year 2001, provides financial assistance to nonprofit and for-profit developers to create residential housing affordable to low- and moderate-income individuals. Currently, D.C. transfers 15% of the deed recordation and transfer taxes from all real estate transactions to the HPTF. This funding mechanism makes the HPTF highly variable based on changes in the real estate market. From fiscal year 2007 to fiscal year 2010, in the midst of the recession, the HPTF experienced an 80% decline in dedicated resources. This volatility introduces uncertainty for developers and others interested in making use of the HPTF, and could discourage affordable housing efforts. As one of the largest and most flexible contributors to affordable housing in Washington, D.C., the HPTF needs to be a stable source in order to expand effectively the affordable housing stock for lower income residents, including unaccompanied homeless adults.

The 2008 Housing Production Trust Fund Stabilization Amendment Act (the Amendment) would have established a “floor” or minimum level of funding for the HPTF. While the D.C. City Council unanimously approved the Amendment, the resources to stabilize the HPTF were never dedicated during the appropriations process. Advocacy efforts to dedicate the minimum level of resources to the HPTF should be continued and expanded by engaging coalition partners, especially coalitions comprised of homeless and formerly homeless unaccompanied adults.
In addition to a funding “floor,” there may be additional revenue sources for the HPTF beyond the deed recordation and transfer taxes. For example, the National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) could supplement or be added to the HPTF. In 2008, the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) established the NHTF to develop and maintain rental housing for the lowest income Americans.69 Due to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's financial challenges, however, the program's funding was suspended.70 In 2012 alone, $382 million would have gone to the NHTF.71 National advocacy efforts to remove the suspension on funding and move toward a $5 billion NHTF investment would result in an estimated $18 million for D.C.72 Long-term, this new source of funding could lessen the strain on the local HPTF.

**Increase Transparency of the Public Land Redevelopment Program (PLRP) and Target Extremely Low-Income Residents**

The Public Land Redevelopment Program (PLRP) allows D.C. to designate public land, such as vacant buildings, unused schools, and public libraries, as “surplus property,”73 if the land is not being used by D.C. With the right incentives, this surplus property could then be used to develop affordable housing. Current incentives for developers to participate in the program include a discounted purchase price and tax credits, such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit.74 The PLRP serves as an effective affordable housing tool because it makes use of otherwise neglected surplus property and this surplus property can be purchased at below-market prices. While the details of the program are beyond the scope of this report, the Coalition for Smarter Growth and other advocates have done comprehensive research on this program. Among their recommendations, increasing the program's transparency and targeting vulnerable households at 30% AMI stand out as top priorities.75 If these priorities were implemented, the PLRP, an innovative tool, has the potential to expand the affordable housing stock for unaccompanied homeless adults.

**Implement a Rental Income Taxation Program**

Another recommendation to increase the number of affordable housing units is to create a program with positive and negative incentives by taxing rental income differently from other income. Lessors who lease higher percentages of affordable units would be rewarded with a lower tax rate, while lessors who lease lower percentages of affordable units would be required to pay a higher tax rate.76 Such a framework could be implemented in a variety of ways such as a simple to administer two-tier system, a sliding scale model, and a benchmark model.

A two-tier system would tax lessors at two different rates depending on whether they leased the required number of “affordable” units. Lessors with, for example, 10% “affordable” units, would be taxed at a prescribed lower tax rate. The lessors that do not meet this base level of “affordable” units would be taxed at a higher rate, most likely above the current corporate tax rate. This system provides a positive incentive, a lower tax rate, for those who meet the base level of “affordable” units. Those who fail to meet the affordability threshold would experience a higher tax rate or a negative incentive. The drawbacks of this two-tier approach are that lessors may not have an incentive to either (1) exceed the minimum number of “affordable” units to obtain the tax relief or (2) make the designated units rental price lower than the definition of “affordable.” This approach, however, would be simple to administer, would lower some rental prices, and would eventually add to the “affordable” housing stock.
To remedy the first drawback of the two-tier system, the model could use a sliding scale approach. The tax rate would vary depending on the number of “affordable” units the lessor designates. With this approach, a lessor with 100% “affordable” units would pay a significantly lower rate than the lessor with 20% “affordable” units. This approach creates an incentive to classify more units as “affordable,” but still does not alleviate the concern that a lessor will not have an incentive to lower the rental price beyond the prescribed definition of “affordable.”

A final alternative would be to employ a tax framework that focused on the rental income itself. The basic premise would be that each lessor would compare its total rental income against a benchmark to determine the lessor’s tax rate. The higher the lessor’s total rental income compared to the benchmark, the higher the taxes the lessor must pay. The benchmark could be determined by what would be “affordable” to a household making a specified percentage of AMI. This approach creates incentives for lessors to offer lower rents at any price point, not just the “affordable” price point. The lessors pay lower taxes by lowering the rent across the board instead of shifting units that are not “affordable” into units that are “affordable.” Consequently, there is no particular incentive for lessors to move units across the threshold from not “affordable” into “affordable.” This framework might also inspire more opposition from high-end developers and lessors. While neither the two-tiered nor the sliding scale approach delineates between units that are just above the affordability threshold and more expensive units, the benchmark approach does, by effectively taxing more expensive units at a higher rate.
ASSOCIATED FEDERAL FUNDING

Federal funds can be used to help D.C. address the gaps identified in this section. Some of these funds have already been accessed by D.C., those that have a black border, but there are also potential new resources, which have an orange border. Detailed information about federal programs is in Appendix 2.

HUD offers a number of large, well-known block and formula grants that D.C. has consistently accessed to address the gaps in affordable housing. Some of these large programs, such as the Home Investment Partnerships and the Choice Neighborhood grants, broadly target affordable housing and issues of socioeconomic diversity. In the past, D.C. has received planning grants from Choice Neighborhood, but the Choice Neighborhood implementation grant is a large, untapped resource for D.C. There are also a number of competitive grant programs that target special populations such as the elderly (Assisted Living...
Conversion Program (ALCP) and Section 202), the disabled (Section 811), and those affected by HIV/AIDS (HOPWA), which D.C. could access in the future. By drawing down on these new potential resources, other general funding from the larger formula and block grants could be used for less visible sub-groups in the population of unaccompanied homeless adults.

**Employment**

From the perspective of unaccompanied homeless adults, employment and housing are effectively two sides of the same coin. For an individual at risk of homelessness, his or her employment will determine whether and how much the individual can pay for housing. Conversely, the price of available housing in Washington, D.C. combined with available subsidies, determines the level of income, and thus the employment, that it is necessary for the individual to have housing.

Thus, one challenge for preventing and exiting homelessness is acquiring and sustaining employment that provides enough income to pay for housing. This challenge has many components, including high unemployment, low wages, and for those in the shelter system, the inflexible shelter policies.

**GAP: LACK OF SUFFICIENT EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

In September 2013, Washington, D.C. had an unemployment rate of 8.6%, nearly 1.4% above the already high national average. That same month, 31,342 people in D.C. were actively seeking employment without success. All unemployed individuals, including the many unemployed unaccompanied homeless adults, face stiff competition for jobs and struggle to find work. Two individuals lamented their long wait outside D.C.’s new Wal-Mart branch for a chance to apply for employment, only to walk away empty-handed.

Securing employment becomes even more challenging for those unaccompanied homeless adults with criminal backgrounds. Returning citizens routinely experience discrimination and stigma due to their backgrounds. One man with a criminal history described an almost ten year struggle to find adequate employment. Even with the assistance of a service organization, finding employment remains a challenge. One woman with a criminal history, a participant in the Jubilee Jobs Program, was referred to a local university to apply for a job. Upon arriving, the woman sat in a waiting room for hours, only to be sent away after a quick look at her credentials revealed her criminal history. An all-female group interview presented the challenge as the “lack of a second chance” or opportunity to start anew, even after they had taken positive steps toward reintegration.

Unaccompanied homeless adults and those at risk of homelessness also face the problem of effectively low wages. One former construction worker previously earned $16.50 per hour, but found it difficult to secure another comparable job. He noted that it is impossible to afford housing while earning only the minimum wage, the rate paid by many service and retail jobs. An individual working full-time at the minimum wage in D.C. can expect to earn about $1,375 per month before taxes. This is not enough income to pay for housing in D.C., where the average efficiency apartment costs $1,176. Many individuals interviewed lamented the recent failure of the local “Living Wage” bill, noting specifically that the existing minimum wage meant nothing to D.C.’s residents given the high rental prices in Washington, D.C.
Unaccompanied individuals in the shelter system who are either employed or actively seeking work experience even greater challenges due to current shelter policies and procedures. For example, the vast majority of guests are not given access to a locker to store their belongings while they search for jobs or carry out other activities. When lockers are provided, the lockers may be limited to individuals who have resided in the shelter for at least three weeks. Individuals reported that many low-barrier shelters follow a “first in line” procedure that allocates beds on a first-come, first-served basis. Most shelters open at 7:00 p.m. Often, lines form hours before that time and individuals who arrive later are unable to secure a bed. Individuals interviewed valued the shelters that reserved beds for employed guests. Without this flexibility, participants found it difficult to sustain a regular work schedule or look for employment and live in a shelter.

RECOMMENDATIONS
With the adoption of the “One City, One Hire” program in 2011, Washington, D.C. has already begun to address the serious unemployment problem. One City, One Hire delivers three main services. First, it acts as a placement agency, connecting D.C. employers with job openings to pre-screened District residents. Second, the program provides incentives to employers in the form of wage subsidies, tax incentives, and pre-employment training. Finally, the D.C. offers training to unemployed residents, from interview skills and job readiness training to on the job training through a period of subsidized employment. The One City, One Hire program could be improved for unaccompanied homeless adults. Specifically, the program could better target these individuals by: extending employer incentives to hire unaccompanied homeless adults, increasing the visibility of the program, and strengthening employment-training programs.

Incentivize the Hiring of Vulnerable D.C. Residents
One way to increase employment among unaccompanied homeless adults and those at risk of homelessness is to maintain incentives for employers to hire these individuals. Currently, D.C. does this in two ways. First, through the One City, One Hire placement service (discussed more fully below), D.C. essentially acts as a headhunter, helping to reduce the costs of hiring for employers. Second, D.C. helps employers who do hire a qualifying D.C. resident to receive the federal Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC). The WOTC provides tax relief to employers who hire members of vulnerable populations, including TANF recipients, veterans, returning citizens, and designated community residents. Many unaccompanied homeless adults are also members of these same vulnerable populations.

The WOTC, then, is a crucial incentive for D.C.’s employers. The WOTC, however, is set to expire at the end of 2013. While the mechanics of federal legislation are beyond the scope of this report, both D.C. and its service providers should advocate to extend the Work Opportunity Tax Credit.

Match Employment Skills With Available Jobs
Some unaccompanied homeless adults need skills and training to obtain higher paying employment, in order to afford housing. Others among the population already have the requisite skills, yet still have difficulty finding work that uses those skills. The placement arm of One City, One Hire is an attempt to bridge this gap. The placement program works by connecting unemployed D.C. residents to employers with hiring needs. D.C. residents sign up and submit their resumes. At the same time, employers sign
up and submit their hiring needs. Then D.C., through the Department of Employment Services (DOES), submits a pre-screened list of qualified resumes to the employer.

Unfortunately, One City, One Hire’s placement program has not been as effective as advertised. The program was adopted with the explicit goal of getting 10,000 D.C. residents hired within one year. Two years into the program, only 7,000 residents had been hired. The model for One City, One Hire, Atlanta’s “Hire One” program, achieved success more quickly. There, 10,000 Atlanta residents were hired in less than four months. One City, One Hire partnered with 870 employers over 15 months. Atlanta’s Hire One partnered with 1,100 employers over four months. Yet Washington, D.C. is bigger than Atlanta (632,000 residents for D.C. versus 444,000 for Atlanta). D.C. is also growing faster than Atlanta; Washington, D.C. has gained 31,000 residents since 2010 while Atlanta has gained only 21,000.

The success of the placement program is limited by the participation rate of both employers and residents. Employers are not likely to sign up unless the pool of residents is big enough. If employers do not sign up, then residents are less likely to sign up because there are not enough employers. The feedback also works in the other direction creating strong network effects. Given these effects, high visibility and the best possible reputation are critical for the success of the placement program.

One City, One Hire, however, currently lacks sufficient visibility. All the interviewees mentioned employment as one of the principal challenges facing unaccompanied homeless adults, yet not one person mentioned the One City, One Hire program. The program has not been the subject of a Washington Post story since 2012.

Visibility can be improved in a variety of ways. One way is to increase the program’s social media presence. This social media presence may promote visibility among employers and broaden the number and types of jobs available through the program. It could also increase visibility among some service providers and unaccompanied homeless adults, alerting them to the program. A social media blitz was part of the program’s initial push, but that effort has ceased. The One City, One Hire Twitter page shows no updates since 2011, and the DOES Facebook page shows one update in the past twelve months. Another avenue to increase visibility and better target unaccompanied homeless adults is to hold programs in the shelters or at service providers’ facilities. For example, DOES could hold a Resume Writing Workshop or an Interview Skills training session at a shelter to both train homeless individuals and increase publicity for One City, One Hire’s placement service.

Beyond visibility, it is important that One City, One Hire, like any placement service, uses an individual’s existing skills and actively targets employment that uses those skills. Currently, as part of the prescreening process, DOES reviews applicants’ resumes for existing skills. Based on the applicants’ existing skills, the placement service should target employers with a need for these skills. DOES should focus its employer outreach efforts to maximize the opportunities available to vulnerable, yet skilled, program applicants including unaccompanied homeless adults.
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**Calibrate Training Programs to Ensure that Participants Receive Marketable Skills**
D.C. residents need more training programs that give them the skills necessary to achieve employment that pays a living wage. Too many of D.C.’s training programs focus on low-skilled, entry-level jobs which do not allow individuals to earn sufficient income to pay for housing. While the One City, One Hire program provides a variety of training services through its “one stop” job centers, its most important training tool for unaccompanied homeless adults is Project Empowerment. Project Empowerment provides basic job coaching and employability training, as well as up to six months of subsidized employment. The program, however, is too narrowly targeted. The qualification requirements exclude anyone with a high school diploma or GED, and anyone under age 22 or over age 54. Additionally, to qualify, unaccompanied homeless adults must meet two of three other conditions: a documented history of substance abuse, a felony conviction, or a verified history of jobs cycling—an inability to maintain a job for two or more consecutive quarters in the past two years.

In Project Empowerment’s period of subsidized employment, the D.C. pays 90% of the wages of an employee for a training period of up to six months. In theory, all parties should benefit: the employer gets manpower during the training period, the employee learns marketable skills, and D.C. simultaneously decreases unemployment while increasing economic output. Unfortunately, there are questions about the training period’s efficacy in practice. Some participants worry that employers are simply using free labor without teaching employees skills that will help them secure other employment. The subsidized employment program needs safeguards to ensure that employers are providing employees transferable skills. Safeguards could include an employee review of the subsidized employment period, coupled with sanctions for employers who fail to provide marketable skills, such as suspending the employer from the One City, One Hire placement program.

Additionally, only those residents who qualify for Project Empowerment can take advantage of the period of subsidized employment. D.C. should provide vocational training programs that update existing skill sets (such as construction, plumbing, or automobile maintenance) for the current job market. It is also important that these training programs include computer and software skills for all. Technology moves at a rapid pace, and unaccompanied homeless adults who may have been out of the workforce for a significant period of time often have not had a chance to acquire or maintain the necessary technological skills.

**Give Citizens with a Criminal Background an Equitable Chance to Compete for Employment**
Some unaccompanied homeless adults have a criminal background and therefore face special difficulties in achieving employment. When an employer finds out that a job applicant has a criminal record, it often discounts the applicant regardless of the applicant’s skills or qualifications or the relevance of the record to the position in question. One City, One Hire helps connect employers with the federal Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which provides tax relief for employers who hire returning citizens, but more can be done.

It is important to support “Ban the Box” or similar legislation. “Ban the Box” legislation prevents employers from asking about criminal history on an initial job application and limits the context in which the employer may otherwise inquire into criminal history. This legislation would allow citizens with a
criminal background to compete for employment on equal footing. D.C. already has “Ban the Box” legislation for government jobs, but the legislation should be expanded to the private sector.127

Make Allowances in Shelter Procedures for Job Seekers and the Currently Employed

The interviewed individuals noted that the strict procedures, such as “first-in-line” and the residency requirements for lockers, make it difficult for individuals to maintain or actively seek employment.128 We recommend creating allowances in these shelter procedures for those difficulties, to enable individuals to maintain or seek employment while staying in a shelter.

Current shelter residents who are presently employed, as well as active job seekers, should be exempt from some common shelter requirements. It may be necessary for currently employed individuals and active job seekers to verify their status; if exemption from certain requirements is seen as a privilege, some individuals may want to claim it even without jobs. A recent pay stub or employer-issued identification should be sufficient to show current employment, and emails or letters can confirm a job interview. We recognize that employment verification will be challenging for those residents who have short-term jobs, seasonal jobs, or other informal jobs.

Individuals currently holding a job may have difficulty lining up for a shelter bed sufficiently early because of their work hours. When this difficulty arises, it creates a dilemma for these individuals: leave work early and risk losing your job, or stay at work and risk spending the night on the street. Similarly, a job interview may be scheduled after normal work hours. Requiring these individuals to stand in line thus imperils their employment and hinders one of the primary goals of the homeless services system: to encourage those individuals who are able to return to self-sufficiency. Thus, shelters should allow current jobholders to get a bed without lining up at the appointed time if the jobholders give proper documentation.

One individual described the chaotic scene of shelter residents scrambling to compete for the bathrooms and showers before getting kicked out at 7:00 a.m., calling the commotion a rat race.129 The individual juxtaposed this scenario against the calming and revitalizing morning routine that housed individuals can enjoy. The lack of a morning routine puts individuals in shelters at a distinct disadvantage compared to their fellow employees who are able to enjoy a routine. Thus, shelters should allow current jobholders to use the bathroom and take a shower at designated morning times compatible with the individuals’ work schedules.

Finally, individuals who have a job and are currently staying in shelter may lack a place to store their personal belongings. While some might be able to store their belongings at work, others may not have space, or may fear discussing their homelessness with their employer. Thus, shelters should provide spaces such as lockers for current jobholders to store personal belongings during the day.
ASSOCIATED FEDERAL FUNDING
Federal funds can be used to help D.C. address the gaps identified in this section. Some of these funds have already been accessed by D.C., those that have a black border, but there are also potential new resources, which have an orange border. Detailed information about federal programs is in Appendix 2.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) provides funds to help nonviolent offenders and returning citizens. D.C., its courts, and service providers do not take full advantage of these funds. From 2011-2013, D.C. used some of the funds, but the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program may still be a valuable potential resource.

The (DOL) offers grant opportunities to both city governments and non-profit organizations to improve employment outcomes for homeless veterans, incarcerated veterans, and youth. Unfortunately, the District’s Department of Employment Services (DOES), has been labeled a “high risk” grantee by the Department of Labor, and DOES was thereby denied a recent $1.4 million funding opportunity.\textsuperscript{130}

Given the importance of employment for individuals at risk of homelessness, it is vital that Washington, D.C., as a whole, take advantage of all funding opportunities to improve employment outcomes for its
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citizens. DOES needs to do better for D.C. to thrive. DOES has not been able to deter fraud in its administration of unemployment insurance, giving out more than $800,000 in unearned benefits. The Department of Labor has worked with DOES to help solve the problem, but has been frustrated with the progress and is concerned about potentially bigger problems: DOES needs to return $8.8 million of unaccounted-for federal grants. To put D.C. residents back to work, every dollar is important. D.C. and its service providers must embrace the details necessary to serve its residents.

Information Accessibility

GAP: LACK OF ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION AND OVERBURDENED CASE MANAGEMENT

Another gap that became apparent during the interviews was that unaccompanied homeless adults were often not aware of, or connected to, existing services designed to meet their needs. For example, nearly all the interviewees mentioned periods of unemployment as one of the biggest challenges facing unaccompanied homeless adults, but not one person mentioned D.C.’s 2011 “One City, One Hire” initiative. The disconnect between an existing program designed to help vulnerable residents and the lack of awareness of the program among those residents can render an otherwise well-designed program ineffective.

Increased access to information can directly impact unaccompanied homeless adults. An experienced organization or individual with access to information can make a referral or otherwise assist an unaccompanied individual. As an example, newcomers to D.C. struggle to tap into existing resources when they enter the homeless services system. One man, upon moving to D.C. from Baltimore, found himself at a stalemate because he did not have D.C. identification or even an address to begin moving forward. He praised the service organization that persistently assisted him with all his needs simultaneously: acquiring D.C. identification, providing a reliable mailing address, getting health insurance, and applying for jobs. That organization successfully served as a one-stop shop to meet his essential needs.

For case managers, who connect unaccompanied homeless adults to vital resources, a lack of manpower can reduce the effectiveness of their services. The individuals interviewed recognized that some case managers, while effective, were simply overwhelmed and did not have the needed support. One woman learned that her case manager was simultaneously responsible for the personal needs of 50 other shelter residents. Unsurprisingly, the woman felt her case manager was overwhelmed, and generally could not assist her in a timely manner. Specifically, she found that the case manager was engaged and helpful when the two of them met face to face, but she found it difficult to get in touch with the case manager, who rarely returned her messages or phone calls. The difficulty of finding information and making referrals can also add to case managers’ burdens.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The community of government agencies and service providers need to share information more effectively. To do so, the community should implement and expand the Coordinated Entry System (CES) for unaccompanied homeless adults. As envisioned, the CES will standardize D.C.’s intake process, identify available services, and allocate those services to the individuals with the greatest need. Currently, for families, the District performs intake at a central, physical facility, but there is no equivalent for
unaccompanied homeless adults. Because discussions about the implementation of the CES are ongoing, this report does not take a stance on the best method of intake, how to address privacy concerns, or what system-wide decisions should be made with the information. Our recommendation is that the CES be an online resource, unlike the one used for families, and that the CES be further expanded to include a comprehensive resource manual.

As an expansion of the current vision, the CES should also serve as an online, interactive resource manual for service providers, government agencies, and homeless individuals. In essence, the CES should be a one-stop-shop for available homeless services in D.C. This increased information access will ease some of the burden on case managers. Case management, however, requires more manpower, and the number of case managers should be increased.

Implement the CES with an Online, Real-Time Resource Manual

The first step in improving information sharing is to implement an expanded version of the CES for unaccompanied homeless adults that: uses an online system for intake and includes a live resource manual.

An online system provides a number of advantages over a physical site like the Virginia Williams Center, currently used for families. An online system allows intake to be performed at all participating shelters in D.C., instead of requiring individuals to travel to a single, unified center. An online system also allows the information to be accessible to all of the service providers in D.C., which could be especially important to tracking outcomes. Service providers would be able to track an individual from intake to, hopefully, positive exit, or otherwise track trends in the use of services.

Finally, the online system would allow the CES also to serve as an online resource database for homeless services. The database would be accessible to both service providers and individual citizens and would be comprehensive and updatable. Such a database would allow service providers and homeless individuals with internet access to have complete access to current information about available services. An online resource database would help link individuals with services more effectively because homeless individuals would have direct access to information and case managers would also have access to more and current information. Additionally, smaller, informal service providers, such as churches, could easily be integrated and make use of this system.

A key obstacle to the success of the expanded version of the CES would be the design, hosting, and updating of the website itself. A poorly managed website will quickly become outdated and the dynamic quality of the resource manual will be compromised. There are three main possibilities for designing, hosting, and curating the site: (1) the ICH or a prominent coalition could take responsibility for the site, (2) the D.C. government could release a Request For Proposals (RFP) for a third party to manage the website, or (3) the site could be hosted (by ICH, a coalition, or a third party), but the updating could be done in a Wiki format, with D.C.’s service providers themselves updating the site to reflect the services they offer.

Having the ICH or a prominent coalition design, host, and update the site has advantages stemming from the host organization’s connections to the homeless service provider community. Those connections may make it easier to gather information and to inspire the level of trust necessary to implement the CES. Each
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group, however, has limited manpower and is not primarily engaged in the business of website hosting and curating. Putting out an RFP would ensure professional competence in the design and hosting of the website, but would be more expensive. A third party also would lack connections to the community. Through a wiki method, the service providers themselves would be able to keep the website up to date with the services they provide and could cut down on the substantial potential cost of updating the website. It could, however, lead to inconsistent or inaccurate updating, given the other burdens for service providers.

A hybrid plan could reduce many of the challenges identified above. The government could issue an RFP and administer a competitive bidding process for a third party to design and host the site and then service providers could update the website themselves, reducing management costs. Simultaneously, the ICH or COHHO could create incentives for self-updating while retaining ultimate supervisory authority of the website’s informational content. This approach would reduce some of the costs while simultaneously ensuring accountability and information accuracy.

Increase the Ratio of Case Managers to Shelter Residents in Low-Barrier Shelters
A key challenge for case managers is the overwhelming demand for their limited services. Case managers with too many clients cannot be effective for their clients. Case managers perform a vital function in actively reaching out to guests and connecting them with resources. Given the essential role that case managers play in the homeless services community and how overworked many of them are, the DHS should consider increasing the ratio of case managers to shelter residents at low-barrier shelters. In addition, the capacity problem for case managers will be minimized as intake procedures and the CES become more sophisticated. Until that system has been fully implemented and evaluated, however, more manpower is necessary.

In the interim, while case manager capacity is increased, encouraging informal peer-to-peer mentoring could provide some of the benefits of case management. Formerly homeless individuals or those on a path to a positive exit from the shelter system could serve as mentors who either recommend resources themselves, based on first-hand experience, or encourage others to seek the counseling of a case manager. In the long term, greater numbers of case managers will allow unaccompanied homeless adults more rapid transitions out of homelessness.
ASSOCIATED FEDERAL FUNDING

Federal funds can be used to help D.C. address the gaps identified in this section. Some of these funds have already been accessed by D.C., those that have a black border, but there are also potential new resources, which have an orange border. Detailed information about federal programs is in Appendix 2.
DHHS offers many grant opportunities for educational institutions, local governments, and individual organizations. The sheer number of potential grants is daunting, and with no clear selection criteria or explanations of why specific grantees were successful, it is difficult to determine which grants an entity could successfully win.

Within DHHS there are a number of agencies with a specific focus. For example, the National Institute of Health primarily funds research dedicated to furthering medical knowledge, whereas the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) funds projects and research specific to this part of the population. Culling through each of the administrations under DHHS to find grants that could be applicable to unaccompanied homeless adults is a daunting task, which can lead to missed opportunities for additional funding.

D.C. should create a master list of grants that could apply to problems facing single homeless adults. This may involve reconceptualizing what types of funding could be beneficial for the D.C. government or local service providers in addressing homelessness issues. For example, NIH offers many grants to further research on substance abuse in vulnerable populations. It would be beneficial for D.C. to apply for these types of grants to learn how to better serve the homeless community and improve public health. Similarly, individual organizations could apply to such grants to learn how to better tailor their services to their chosen population.

**Shelter Conditions & Oversight**

In the group and individual interviews, unaccompanied homeless adults identified poor shelter conditions as a primary concern. The most commonly cited problems were a lack of hygiene and safety at the twelve-hour low-barrier shelters. The individuals linked these poor shelter conditions to a lack of adequate staff oversight and ineffective grievance procedures.

**GAP: UNDESIRABLE SHELTER CONDITIONS**

Low-barrier shelter residents described the facilities as unhygienic in a variety of ways. Several individuals shared their experiences of sleeping on mattresses with bed bugs, seeing rodents crawling through the shelter, or viewing food preparation in visibly dirty kitchens. One older man ate spoiled food and experienced a severe hernia due to an untreated infection. Approximately one year later, at the time of the interview, this man still sought legal assistance to pursue a claim against the shelter. Another man said the lack of hygiene began even before entering the shelter. He explained that residents wait in line for several hours to get a bed for the night. While waiting, individuals are not given access to a restroom, and some individuals relieve themselves in the alley on a regular basis, leaving the permanent stench of urine.

Serious gaps in safety also exist at the low-barrier shelters. A common sentiment was that the shelters were often worse, in some ways, than the streets. One individual said his safety concerns in the shelter kept him awake overnight and he preferred the safety of sleeping in a public area, such as a park, during the day. A few other interviewed individuals described incidents of theft—one man did not even trust the lockers in the shelters because his personal belongings, including toiletries, had been stolen on two separate occasions.
Several groups identified Adam’s Place as a preferred shelter because they strictly enforce the rules, have responsive staff members, and maintain a safe and clean environment.\textsuperscript{147} Adam’s Place is one of the smaller shelters for men in D.C. and has a limited capacity of 150 beds.\textsuperscript{148} In addition to shelter, they provide a hot meal, showers, a case manager, a work program, and a limited substance abuse support group.\textsuperscript{149} By comparison, New York Avenue and 801 East have capacities of 360 and 380 respectively—more than twice the beds of Adam’s Place.\textsuperscript{150} One man noted he only went to New York Avenue because its central location allowed him to get in the shelter line on time.\textsuperscript{151}

Residents also identified issues with the grievance procedures. Several individuals did not feel comfortable approaching a staff member to report an issue in the shelter.\textsuperscript{152} For many, their reasoning was due to a fear of reprisal or poor staff treatment.\textsuperscript{153} One man, after speaking out against the staff, was refused entrance to the same shelter for the next three nights.\textsuperscript{154} Other interviewed individuals reported that they did not feel that staff members adequately addressed their concerns.\textsuperscript{155} As one man retorted—“they must either trash or ignore them, because nothing changes.”\textsuperscript{156} Another man observed that DHS regularly sends an individual to oversee shelter operations, but he did not see any improvements after these visits.\textsuperscript{157}

Undesirable shelter conditions may discourage some unaccompanied homeless adults from seeking accommodation at a shelter. When individuals avoid the shelters, they become less likely to connect with a case manager or access vital services such as mental health care.\textsuperscript{158} In hypothermia and hyperthermia months, individuals who avoid shelters increase their risk of experiencing negative health consequences, including death.\textsuperscript{159}

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

While the shelters will never be equivalent to a person’s home, they should be a place where individuals in need can sleep safely, get nourishment, and connect with resources. Funds for homeless services are scarce, but providing a base level of dignity for shelter residents should remain a priority. Shelters can accomplish this by: enforcing existing standards at the shelters, increasing avenues for resident oversight, and improving the current grievance procedures.

**Enforce Existing Shelter Standards Using a Variety of Oversight Methods**

The first way to effectively enforce existing shelter standards, such as food safety and hygiene standards, would be to increase DHS visits and shelter staff involvement. Currently, DHS regularly visits publicly funded shelters. These visits should be more frequent, in a randomized pattern, and the agency could publicly report key indicators of shelter conditions. A potential standard form would include questions about hygiene, resident-staff interactions, and would also include a record of any resident-filed grievances. This increased oversight and transparency would ensure more uniform compliance with current standards and thus enable the shelters to provide a more dignified environment for residents, including unaccompanied homeless adults.

A second way to more effectively enforce existing standards would be to outsource oversight functions to an independent party. An independent party might be better able to objectively evaluate the compliance of shelter conditions with existing standards. A third party, however, may not have the same ties to DHS, the shelter staff, or D.C.’s homeless services community. One challenge would be to identify
an appropriate third party. It would be costly to hire and pay for a completely neutral, outside party that is detached from the community. A more feasible option would be for coalitions and service providers to create a rotation schedule; each participating group would have the responsibility to complete the shelter condition reporting form and share the information publicly.

Finally, shelter residents can play a greater role in oversight. In addition to the existing DHS visits, shelter residents can also use the same reporting form or certify to the accuracy of the reporting forms completed by DHS or a third-party. Residents, who experience the conditions in the shelters firsthand, are best qualified to identify and document poor conditions. The ability to participate in the oversight process and hold the shelters accountable may also be empowering for shelter residents. A key challenge will be to ensure that the chosen residents can report about the conditions honestly without a fear of repercussion.

**Ensure Anonymity in the Grievance System and Provide Off-Site Access**

Whether or not residents are formally assigned to a greater role in shelter oversight, the procedures for filing and investigating grievances should be improved. The grievance system should maintain anonymity to prevent perceived or actual staff retaliation against the residents.

As part of an anonymous grievance system, shelter residents could complete a form, paper or online, away from the shelters and the staff. For example, major service providers, D.C. agencies, and other central hubs could have a grievance collection box. Alternatively, an online system would allow shelter residents to file a complaint from almost anywhere, including the public library. A system that is accessible outside of the shelter would reduce shelter residents’ fear of poor future treatment by the staff. Ultimately, residents, who may be best positioned to identify and document shelter conditions, could report their concerns more freely.

**Create an Avenue to Publicize Documented Undesirable Shelter Conditions**

Providing an avenue to document and publicize undesirable shelter conditions may shame a shelter into compliance. One possibility is to adopt a web page as part of the Coordinated Entry System (discussed above) that allows residents and/or volunteers to upload photographs, videos, or written accounts of undesirable shelter conditions. Alternatively, the grievance system could allow a complainant to attach specific pictures or documentation. This publicity will raise broader awareness of the unhygienic and unsafe shelter conditions and create incentives for shelters to improve.

**Community**

Every person needs some type of support system. Shared experience and understanding is invaluable in maintaining stability in one’s life. Unaccompanied homeless adults living on the streets and in shelters, who may have limited contact with their families, establish these support networks with others who are connected to their day-to-day lives on the streets. Individuals transitioning out of homelessness can maintain their stability by staying in close contact with their support network.

**GAP: INEFFECTIVE MAINTENANCE OF SUPPORT NETWORKS**

Based on anecdotes shared with us during group and individual interviews, feelings of isolation and otherness can create a barrier to individuals attempting to exit homelessness. Homeless persons often
face disparaging treatment from those with whom they share a neighborhood. As one man described, he has gotten used to being treated differently. The disparaging treatment ranges from being ignored and denied service at different businesses, to more serious discrimination, such as police profiling and employment discrimination. In the employment context, another man described the humiliation and rejection he felt as employers visibly reacted negatively to seeing his bags and the shelter address he listed on the application form. A resident of CCNV said he knew people who were clean when they were first homeless, but the adjustment to homelessness triggered depression and substance abuse. Because of these emotional challenges, and because many unaccompanied homeless adults do have strong familial support networks, informal support networks play a critical role in moving individuals from homelessness to self-sufficiency.

It is also important for the formerly homeless to maintain connections with their friends, others who have shared experiences, and their informal resource networks. Some service organizations and low-barrier shelters do not design their programs and groups to include those who have successfully exited homelessness. As one man explained, one of his friends, after seven years in the shelters, turned down a permanent housing placement because it was on the other side of town, away from the community he had created. None of the interviewees spoke of existing programs to encourage community in the shelter system or after people move to permanent housing. The lack of programs focused on creating connections or encouraging support systems may be an unintentional disincentive for people to transition out of the shelter system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to exit homelessness successfully, individuals reported that they need to be better integrated into mainstream society and they need to make and maintain strong connections within the homeless community. Programs that harness an underutilized resource – homeless alumni, those who have successfully transitioned out of homelessness – could serve as low-cost options to address this human need. Ultimately, these options may encourage people to move out of the shelter system.

Establish Alumni Programs, Including Peer-to-Peer Mentoring, in the Shelter System

Alumni programs would connect those who have left the shelter system to those who are still in the shelter system. There are two benefits: (1) the alumni can maintain regular contact with members of their support network who may still be in the shelter and (2) returning alumni would serve as a positive example and could provide advice on life after homelessness to those presently experiencing homelessness and working to exit the shelter system.

One program would allow alumni to continue to participate in groups or activities that were important to them during their time in the shelter. Former shelter residents could return to continue their participation in art, writing, or poetry groups; they could participate in shelter advocacy groups; and shelters could host monthly alumni dinners where they would invite back old residents for a meal. These events give those exiting the shelter a way to maintain their community and support networks.

Another program would focus on peer-to-peer mentoring. Formerly homeless would serve as peer mentors, would work one-on-one with a currently homeless person, and would be available for advice, support, and to discuss issues or concerns that they might not share with a caseworker. The focus of this
program would be on developing more concrete interpersonal relationship, which would also ensure a sense of connectedness and community.

A third program, alumni-led training programs, would also be beneficial for all of the parties involved. An alumnus could lead a life skills training or other similar session. The alumnus could see his support network on a regular basis and give back to the shelter or service provider that assisted him in exiting homelessness. Those attending the trainings would know that employment and life outside the shelter is achievable for someone who had been in their position, and might be more inclined to work with someone who knows what they are going through.

**Establish a Shelter Advisory Board in Each Low-Barrier Shelter**
Creating a Shelter Advisory Board for each shelter, which includes staff, residents, and former residents, could also be a proactive and positive way to maintain community and engagement for both alumni and current residents. This board could simultaneously address the shelter oversight issues discussed above and shelter alumni might have fewer inhibitions about identifying and discussing problems in the shelters. It could also serve as a mini think-tank for issues specific to D.C. shelters.

**Encourage General Integration with Housed D.C. Residents**
Community-wide events would encourage interaction among shelter residents and others that live in the same neighborhood. An example of such an event could be a shelter-sponsored or hosted community picnic in a local park. This type of event would help neighborhood and shelter residents establish a stronger sense of community with each other, ideally helping the single homeless adults feel less isolated.

**CONCLUSION**
We hope that our recommendations spur new thinking and serve as a catalyst for conversation in the community. There is no single solution to solve the problems facing unaccompanied homeless adults in D.C. Employment, housing, and federal funding are large structural issues that require significant momentum and persistent advocacy efforts to guarantee lasting solutions.

Open lines of communication between government officials, service providers, and those who have experienced homelessness can produce invaluable insights on how to meet the needs of this population. With the continued dedicated efforts of the community, we can continue to improve homeless services and provide every unaccompanied person with something they need—a place to call home.
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APPENDIX I

GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Approximate Time: 1 Hour

Roadmap

Introduction
- Introduce yourself
- [If using a sign-in sheet] Ask people to sign-in (during conversation or before they leave); indicate that this is truly optional.
- Goals of conversation (Targets)
  - Discuss service gaps
    - What is missing?
  - Helpful short-term safety nets
    - Before you became homeless, what would have helped you?
- We will not use this information in any way that makes you identifiable.
- Explain that you will pose a question and each person will have an opportunity to briefly respond. [essentially serving as a Facilitator]
- Ask people to say their first name before getting into their answer.

Questions Homeless/Formerly Homeless individuals:

Discuss Service Gaps:
- In your opinion, what is the biggest gap in services for homeless singles?/ What’s missing? (Limit to one thing)
- What else would you like to see?
- Do you think the government cares about homelessness, especially for single adults?

Homelessness Prevention:
- What would have helped you earlier to avoid homelessness?
- What was the biggest challenge you face/faced before you became homeless?
- What organizations or programs did you find the most useful?

Barriers to Shelter Exit:
- What was the biggest challenge you face/faced?
- What would help you get into permanent housing?
  - OR What would have helped you get into permanent housing earlier?
- What organizations or programs did you find the most useful?

Targeted Topics [may not use if all relevant topics are discussed]

As part of our project, we have spent time going to different organizations and having similar conversations to the one we’re having today. In those conversations, we discussed some topics that did not come up today. We want to see if you agree or disagree with some of the issues raised in the other conversations.
Unaccompanied Homeless Adults: Increasing Resources in D.C.

Shelter Conditions & Oversight
• Others have mentioned shelter conditions and staff as potential areas of concern.
  o Do you feel that shelter conditions are adequate?
  o Do you feel that shelter staff are supportive/helpful?
• Do you feel that improved shelter conditions would help you get into permanent housing?

Case Management
• Others mentioned that low-barrier shelters do not have enough case managers. Do you agree/disagree?
• Similarly, others mentioned that the case managers do not reach out or care about the people they’re working with. Do you agree/disagree?
• Are there any other comments or concerns about case managers or social workers? (even if it is not at a low-barrier shelter)

Substance Abuse
• Some homelessness literature suggests that drug and alcohol abuse play a role in causing and prolonging homelessness. Would you agree with that?
  o Do you think a lot of people on the streets have a similar struggle?
• Are there enough treatment centers and options for homeless singles who may suffer from substance abuse?

Mental Health
• Some homelessness literature suggests that mental health may play a role in causing and prolonging homelessness. Would you agree with that?
  o Do you think a lot of people on the streets have a similar struggle?
• Are there enough treatment centers and options for homeless singles who may suffer from this issue?

Brief recap at the end and an open forum for any other comments people would like to include. [5-10 minutes]
APPENDIX 2
FEDERAL FUNDING MATRICES AND SOURCES
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MATRIX DEFINITIONS

Assisted Living Facility (ALF): Housing designed to accommodate frail elderly and people with disabilities who can live independently but need assistance with activities of daily living.

Competitive Grants: Eligible applicants submit proposals for utilizing the grants, and the applicable federal agency awards the funds to the strongest proposals.

Formula Grants: The grants are distributed to states and territories on the basis of a pre-determined formula utilizing characteristics of those states and territories.

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS): A system to collect data about persons who experience homelessness during a twelve-month period.

N/A: We have included this symbol to indicate that we were unable to access the funding information in question through publically available resources.

Public Housing Agency (PHA): Public Housing Agencies are local government organizations that implement HUD programs.

Service Enriched Housing (SEH): It is housing that accommodates the provision of services to elderly residents who need assistance with activities of daily living in order to live independently.

Stand Downs: One to three day events that provide a variety of services, including job training, to homeless veterans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TARGET POPULATION</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</th>
<th>FUNDING MECHANISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Veterans Reintegration Program</td>
<td>Homeless veterans</td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program</td>
<td>Incarcerated veterans</td>
<td>Case management, job counseling</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Corps</td>
<td>At-risk youth 16-24</td>
<td>Job training, education</td>
<td>Private contractors</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Build</td>
<td>Youth ages 16-24</td>
<td>Job training, education</td>
<td>Nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand Downs</td>
<td>Homeless veterans (funded under HVRP)</td>
<td>Job training, opportunities through 1-day or multiple day &quot;stand down&quot; events</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organization.</td>
<td>Non-competitive grants, first come-first-served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Workforce Investment Program</td>
<td>Veterans in need of new job skills</td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs for Veterans State Grants</td>
<td>Veterans, transitioning service members, veterans' spouses</td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organization.</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,501,802</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$28,568,953</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$28,722,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,882,443</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,837,443</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>*Program merged with HVRP for FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,570,932,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,709,360,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,702,946,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,800,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$75,700,000</td>
<td>$1,099,932</td>
<td>$72,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$742,405</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DC Hosted a Stand Down</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,530,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$165,063,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$165,081,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$170,049,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>TARGET POPULATION</td>
<td>SERVICES PROVIDED</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE GRANTEES</td>
<td>FUNDING MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care Program (CoC)</td>
<td>Homeless individuals (including youth) and families</td>
<td>Permanent housing, transitional housing, supportive services, HMIS, homelessness prevention, administrative costs</td>
<td>Local government, state government, nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Solution Grants (ESG)</td>
<td>Homeless individuals and families</td>
<td>Emergency shelter, rapid rehousing, homelessness prevention, street outreach, HMIS, administrative costs</td>
<td>Local government, state government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)</td>
<td>Low-income individuals (80% AMI) living with HIV/AIDS and their families</td>
<td>Housing, supportive services, program planning, development costs</td>
<td>Local government, state government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)</td>
<td>Low-income individuals (80% AMI) living with HIV/AIDS and their families</td>
<td>Housing, social services, program planning, development costs</td>
<td>Local government, state governments, and nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>Development costs, building rehabilitation, job creation, public services, energy conservation, and renewable energy</td>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly</td>
<td>Low-income households with at least one person who is 62 years old</td>
<td>Housing and supportive services</td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 811 Supportive Housing for People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Low-income households with at least one person with a disability</td>
<td>Capital advances and operating subsidies or rental assistance</td>
<td>State government, Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living Conversion Program (ALCP)</td>
<td>Elderly and disabled with a functional limitation (who are unable to perform at least one activity of daily living)</td>
<td>Cost to convert multi-family dwelling into SEH and ALF</td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Investment Partnerships (HOME)</td>
<td>Low-income households</td>
<td>Affordable housing programs, tenant-based rental assistance</td>
<td>State government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Service Coordinators Program</td>
<td>Public Housing residents (especially elderly and those with disabilities)</td>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>PHAs, nonprofits, resident organization or associations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant</td>
<td>Public Housing residents</td>
<td>Neighborhood planning</td>
<td>Local government, nonprofit organizations, for-profit developers</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant</td>
<td>Public Housing residents</td>
<td>Development costs, supportive services</td>
<td>Local government, nonprofit organizations, for-profit developers</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,674,351,578</td>
<td>$20,539,506</td>
<td>$1,671,972,953</td>
<td>$20,404,829</td>
<td>$1,700,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000,000</td>
<td>$1,243,053</td>
<td>$286,000,000</td>
<td>$1,414,021</td>
<td>$215,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$299,000,000</td>
<td>$13,795,546</td>
<td>$299,000,000</td>
<td>$13,623,582</td>
<td>$297,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,500,983,000</td>
<td>$26,418,104</td>
<td>$3,008,090,000</td>
<td>$13,904,983</td>
<td>$2,941,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$399,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$375,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$475,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$165,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$23,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,976,206</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,606,780,000</td>
<td>$8,273,607</td>
<td>$1,000,000,000</td>
<td>$4,343,097</td>
<td>$947,694,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$4,374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$108,980,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$109,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>TARGET POPULATION</td>
<td>SERVICES PROVIDED</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE GRANTEES</td>
<td>FUNDING MECHANISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care for the Homeless</td>
<td>Homeless individuals</td>
<td>Primary health care, emergency services</td>
<td>Primary care providers, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Center Program</td>
<td>Under-served populations, low-income individuals</td>
<td>Primary health care, emergency services, in-patient care services</td>
<td>Primary care providers, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act of 2006</td>
<td>Individuals with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>HIV-related health care</td>
<td>Primary care providers, local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH)</td>
<td>Homeless individuals with serious mental illness or substance abuse issues</td>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>Mental health care providers, substance abuse treatment providers, housing providers</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services in Supportive Housing</td>
<td>Homeless individuals with serious mental illness or substance abuse issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for the Benefit of Homeless Individuals</td>
<td>Homeless individuals with serious mental illness or substance abuse issues</td>
<td>Development costs, supportive services, permanent housing</td>
<td>Local government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Recovery</td>
<td>Homeless individuals with substance abuse issues</td>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>State government</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health Services Block Grant</td>
<td>Individuals with serious mental illnesses and children with emotional disturbances</td>
<td>Primary health care</td>
<td>State government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant</td>
<td>Individuals with substance abuse issues</td>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>State government</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,167,306,962</td>
<td>$3,410,928</td>
<td>$2,331,290,193</td>
<td>$3,405,369</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,167,306,962</td>
<td>$6,911,357</td>
<td>$2,331,290,193</td>
<td>$6,929,772</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,167,306,962</td>
<td>$617,546</td>
<td>$2,331,290,193</td>
<td>$1,615,290</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$61,694,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$61,877,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$418,835</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,584,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,584,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$109,000,000</td>
<td>$3,256,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3,227,840</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$752,010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$813,506</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,684,946</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,670,567</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assorted Federal Programs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>Eligible Grantees</th>
<th>Funding Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court Discretionary Program</td>
<td>Individuals with substance abuse issues, nonviolent offenders</td>
<td>Prevents criminal record</td>
<td>State government, local courts</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice and Mental Health Collaboration</td>
<td>Individuals suffering from mental health issues, nonviolent offenders</td>
<td>Prevents criminal record</td>
<td>State government, local government</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance Act</td>
<td>Former prisoners</td>
<td>Job training, supportive services</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Assistance Grants for Victims of Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>Transitional housing, supportive services</td>
<td>State government, local government, nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherization Assistance Program</td>
<td>Low-income individuals</td>
<td>Weatherproofing</td>
<td>State government, nonprofit organization</td>
<td>Formula grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem</td>
<td>Homeless veterans</td>
<td>Transitional housing, supportive services</td>
<td>Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Veterans Dental Program</td>
<td>Homeless veterans</td>
<td>Dental care</td>
<td>Dental care providers (with experience serving homeless individuals)</td>
<td>Often provided along with Stand Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Services for Veterans Families (SSVF) Program</td>
<td>Veterans, veterans’ families</td>
<td>Supportive services in permanent housing, supportive services to transition to housing</td>
<td>Nonprofit organization, community cooperative</td>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,645,120</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,035,121</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$18,325,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,397,582</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,507,513</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,346,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,738,279</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$24,854,193</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,707,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,031,384</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$21,199,322</td>
<td>$299,993</td>
<td>$20,084,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$174,300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$68,000,000</td>
<td>$412,423</td>
<td>$139,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$59,070,117</td>
<td>$999,999</td>
<td>$98,807,284</td>
<td>$1,994,702</td>
<td>$299,056,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOURCE LIST: FEDERAL FUNDING DATA

Department of Labor

Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program
Other Grantees FY 2012: http://www.dol.gov/opa/media/press/vets/VETS20121351.htm
Grantees FY 2013: http://www.dol.gov/opa/media/press/vets/VETS20131265.htm

Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Continuum of Care Program

Emergency Solution Grants
Unaccompanied Homeless Adults: Increasing Resources in D.C.

**Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**


**Community Development Block Grant Program**


**Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly: Capital Advance and 3-Year Rental Subsidies (awarded in FY 2011)**


**Section 811 Supportive Housing for People with Disability**

[http://partner.hud.gov/content/811-project-rental-assistance-1](http://partner.hud.gov/content/811-project-rental-assistance-1);

**Assisted Living Conversion Program**

[http://archives.hud.gov/funding/2012/alcpnofa.pdf](http://archives.hud.gov/funding/2012/alcpnofa.pdf);

**HOME Investment Partnerships**


Unaccompanied Homeless Adults: Increasing Resources in D.C.

FY 2012:
http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/about/budget/budget12. (Click on “DC” on the map.)

FY 2013:
http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/about/budget/budget13. (Click on “DC” on the map.)

Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency Service Coordinators (ROSS-SC) Program


HUD Notice of Funding Availability FY 2013:
http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail/nofa13/ross_sc. (Click on the program section.)

CHOICE Neighborhood: Implementation and Planning Grants


FY 2013 Planning Grant:

FY 2013 Implementation Grant:

Department of Health and Human Services

Health Care for the Homeless


Unaccompanied Homeless Adults: Increasing Resources in D.C.

Community Health Center
http://bphc.hrsa.gov/healthcenterdatastatistics/index.html
http://bphc.hrsa.gov/about/requirements/index.html

Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Modernization Act of 2006
http://bphc.hrsa.gov/healthcenterdatastatistics/index.html
http://hab.hrsa.gov/about/program.html
http://bphc.hrsa.gov/about/requirements/index.html

Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH)
http://www.hhs.gov/homeless/grants/index.html
http://pathprogram.samhsa.gov/Path/Reports09/ViewReports.aspx?sld=st1010&rYear=2011&rpts=StateProfile
http://pathprogram.samhsa.gov/Path/ProgramInformation.aspx
http://pathprogram.samhsa.gov/Path/Reports09/ViewReports.aspx?sld=national&rYear=2012&rpts=NationalProfile

Services in Supportive Housing
http://www.samhsa.gov/Statesummaries/detail/2012/DC.aspx

Grants for the Benefits of Homeless Individuals
http://www.samhsa.gov/Statesummaries/detail/2012/DC.aspx

Department of Justice

Drug Court Discretionary Program
http://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov:85/selector/solicitations
(Search under “Bureau of Justice Assistance” by year)
Unaccompanied Homeless Adults: Increasing Resources in D.C.

Transitional Housing Assistance
http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/grantactivities.htm (grant awards by program)

Second Chance Act
http://grants.ojp.usdoj.gov:85/selector/solicitations
(Search under “Bureau of Justice Assistance” by year)

Assorted Departments and Programs

Transitional Housing Assistance Grants for Victims of Domestic Violence
http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/grantactivities.htm

Weatherization Assistance Program
http://www1.eere.energy.gov/wip/serc.html

Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem
No financial information available

Homeless Veterans Dental Program
No financial information available

Supportive Services for Veterans Families (SSVF) Program
http://www.va.gov/HOMELESS/docs/SSVF_Program_FY_2011_Grant_Award_List.pdf
http://www.va.gov/HOMELESS/docs/SSVF/FY2012_SSVF_Awards_7172012_2.pdf