

Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government

*200 E. Main St
Lexington, KY 40507*



Tuesday, January 29, 2013

3:00 PM

Packet

Council Chamber

Urban County Council Work Session

**URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL
SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS
January 28 – February 4, 2013**

Monday, January 28

No Meetings

Tuesday, January 29

Confirmation Hearing – General Services Commissioner.....9:00 am
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Confirmation Hearing – CAO.....10:00 am
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Environmental Quality Committee.....11:00 am
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Budget & Finance Committee.....1:00 pm
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Council Work Session.....3:00 pm
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Wednesday, January 30

No Meetings

Thursday, January 31

Waste Management Task Force.....3:00 pm
Conference Room – 5th Floor Government Center

Confirmation Hearing – Ethics Commission.....4:30 pm
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Council Meeting.....6:00 pm
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

Friday, February 1

No Meetings

Monday, February 4

Police Disciplinary Hearing.....3:00 pm
Council Chamber – 2nd Floor Government Center

URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION SUMMARY
TABLE OF MOTIONS
January 22nd, 2013

Mayor Jim Gray called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. All Council Members were present.

- I. Public Comment – Issues on Agenda – Yes
- II. Requested Rezoning/Docket Approval - No
- III. Approval of Summary - Yes

Motion by Ellinger to approve the summary. Seconded by Mossotti. Motion passed without dissent.

- IV. Budget Amendments –No
- V. New Business – Yes

Motion by Gorton to approve the new business items. Seconded by Mossotti. Motion passed without dissent.

- VI. Continuing Business / Presentations – Yes

Motion by Gorton to approve the neighborhood development funds. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

- VII. Council Reports – Yes

Motion by Gorton to approve Richard Moloney as Commissioner of Environmental Quality and Public Works. Seconded by Beard. Motion passed without dissent.

- VIII. Mayor's Report – No

- IX. Public Comment – Issues Not on Agenda – No

Motion by Gorton to adjourn. Seconded by Kay. Motion passed without dissent.

**Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
Work Session Agenda
January 29, 2013**

- I. Public Comment - Issues on Agenda**
- II. Requested Rezoning/ Docket Approval – Yes**
- III. Approval of Summary – Yes p. 1**
- IV. Budget Amendments – Yes p. 4 - 7**
- V. New Business – Yes p. 8 - 16**
- VI. Continuing Business/ Presentations**
 - a** Neighborhood Development Funds - January 29, 2013 p. 17
 - b** General Government Committee Summary January 2013 p. 18 - 22
 - c** Planning and Public Works Committee Summary January 2013 p. 23 - 26
 - d** Presentation: Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation;
By: Beth Mills, Commissioner Social Services p. 27 - 39
 - e** Presentation: Mayor's Commission on Homelessness;
By: Steve Kay, Chair & Debra Hensley, Co-Chair p. 40 - 108
- VII. Council Reports**
- VIII. Mayor's Report – Yes**
- IX. Public Comment - Issues Not on Agenda**
- X. Adjournment**

Administrative Synopsis - New Business Items

- a 0062-13** Authorization to amend Section 21-5 of the Code of Ordinances, creating one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker Sr. (Grade 112N) and abolishing one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker (Grade 111N) in the Division of Community Corrections. (L0062-13) (Maxwell/Mason)
This is a request to amend Section 21-5 of the Code of Ordinances, creating one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker Sr. (Grade 112N) and abolishing one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker (Grade 111N) in the Division of Community Corrections. The total annual impact is \$2,946.54. Budget amendment in process. p. 8 - 9
- b 0081-13** Authorization to change street names and/or individual property address numbers within various Council Districts. (L0081-13) (Lucas/Mason)
This is a request to change street names and/or individual property address numbers within various Council Districts in order to eliminate problem addresses within Fayette County and to insure the proper operation of the Enhanced 9-1-1 system. There is no budgetary impact. p. 10 - 13
- c 0082-13** Authorization to execute an expanded jurisdiction agreement with Kentucky Department of Housing, Buildings, and Construction. (L0082-13) (Crowe/Mason)
This is a request to execute a three (3) year renewal of an expanded jurisdiction agreement with Kentucky Department of Housing, Buildings, and Construction. There is no budgetary impact. p. 14
- d 0087-13** Authorization to submit applications to the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, and accept awards if offered, for participation in traffic safety programs - FY 2014. (L0087-13) (Gooding/Mason)
This is a request to submit applications requesting federal funds in the amount of \$215,000 to the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, and accept awards if offered, for participation in traffic safety programs - FY 2014. No matching funds are required. p. 15
- e 0092-13** Authorization to approve agreement with Webasto Roof Systems, Inc. approving a 10-year local 1% wage assessment to participate in the Kentucky Economic Development's Kentucky Business Investment Program. (L92-13) (Atkins)
This is a request to approve agreement with Webasto Roof Systems, Inc. approving a 10-year local 1% wage assessment to participate in the Kentucky Economic Development's Kentucky Business Investment Program. There is no budgetary impact. p. 16

BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUEST LIST

JOURNAL	66255-56	DIVISION	Parks and Recreation	Fund Name	General Services Fund
				Fund Impact	18,620.21
					18,620.21CR
					.00

To recognize reimbursement for overtime and supplies used in the 2012 Bluegrass State Games.

JOURNAL	66257-58	DIVISION	Parks and Recreation	Fund Name	General Services Fund
				Fund Impact	50.00
					50.00CR
					.00

To recognize a donation for purchase of a tree in memorial to Audrey Hounshell.

JOURNAL	CB00000100	DIVISION	Computer Services	Fund Name	Urban Services Fund
				Fund Impact	55,500.00CR
					55,500.00CR

To transfer funding for one Computer Analyst from the Urban Services Fund to Sanitary Sewer Fund per request by the Division of Computer Services.

JOURNAL	CB00000101	DIVISION	Computer Services	Fund Name	Sanitary Sewer Fund
				Fund Impact	55,500.00
					55,500.00

To transfer funding for one Computer Analyst from the Urban Services Fund to Sanitary Sewer Fund per request by the Division of Computer Services.

JOURNAL	66337	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name	US Department of Interior
				Fund Impact	1,657.44
					1,657.44CR
					.00

To amend Historic Preservation 2009 to reflect actual expenditures.

JOURNAL	66338	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name	US Department of Interior
				Fund Impact	1,312.65
					1,312.65CR
					.00

To amend Historic Preservation 2010 to reflect actual expenditures.

JOURNAL	66189-90	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name	US Department of Justice
				Fund Impact	2,103.78
					2,103.78CR
					.00

To amend Street Sales 2009 to reflect actual revenue and expenses.

JOURNAL	66198-99	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Department of Justice 9,066.00 9,066.00CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	---

To amend SANE 2013 to reflect actual federal award.

JOURNAL	66200-01	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Department of Justice 11,636.32 11,636.32CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	---

To amend SANE 2010 to reflect actual revenue and expenses.

JOURNAL	66202-03	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Department of Justice 14,768.50 14,768.50CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	---

To amend SANE 2011 to reflect actual expenses and revenue.

JOURNAL	66196-97	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Dept of Transportation 11,049.30 11,049.30CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	--

To amend Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) 2011 to reflect actual expenditures and revenue.

JOURNAL	66204-05	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Dept of Transportation 10,000.00 10,000.00CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	--

To establish grant budget for Traffic Safety Supplemental 2013 (Click It or Ticket).

JOURNAL	66334-35	DIVISION	Grants and Special Projects	Fund Name Fund Impact	US Dept of HHS 16,217.82 16,217.82CR .00
----------------	----------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--	---

To amend Runaway Youth 2011 to correct accounting for third party in-kind match.

BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUEST SUMMARY

Fund	1101	General Services District Fund	0.00
Fund	1115	Full Urban Services District Fund	55,000.00CR
Fund	3130	US Department of Interior	0.00
Fund	3140	US Department of Justice	0.00
Fund	3160	US Department of Transportation	0.00

Fund	3190	US Department of Health and Human Services	0.00
Fund	4002	Sanitary Sewer Revenue and Operating Fund	55,000.00

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS REQUIRING BUDGET AMENDMENTS


7

If the New Business item listed below is on the Agenda, approval includes approval of the attached Budget Amendment. These Budget Amendments are not voted upon as part of section IV on the Agenda and are for information only.

NEW BUSINESS ITEM	BUDGET JOURNAL	DIVISION	DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST
062-13	CB00099	Community Corrections	To provide funds for one position of Skilled Trades Worker Sr (Grade 112N) by abolishing one position of Trades Worker (Grade 111N) and reducing the division's Professional Services funds. 1101 910.00 1101 910.00CR .00

EFFECT ON FUND BALANCES

FUND 1101	0.00	NO IMPACT TO:	GENERAL SERVICE DISTRICT FUND
-----------	------	---------------	-------------------------------




Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Jim Gray
Mayor

Janet Graham
Commissioner

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Jim Gray, Mayor
Richard Moloney, Chief Administrative Officer
Council Members

FROM: 
John Maxwell, Director
Division of Human Resources

DATE: January 11, 2013

SUBJECT: Create/Abolish positions – Division of Community Corrections

The attached action amends Section 21-5 of the Code of Ordinances, creating one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker Sr. (Grade 112N) and abolish one (1) position of Skilled Trades Worker (Grade 111N) in the Division of Community Corrections, effective upon passage by Council.

This position is requested due to the need of advanced technical skills and abilities capable of completing diagnostics and repair of the various safety and security systems at the facility. These advance systems include but are not limited to the newly upgraded security system that operates the communication systems, security doors, camera systems, as well as the integrated fire safety systems. The position will be required to perform more difficult and complex tasks which require more technical expertise than those required at the skilled trades worker level.

The fiscal impact for FY2013 (pay periods) will be \$906.63. All costs include benefits and will be funded from the Divisions Professional Services account (1101-505401-5411-71299). This amount does not include lapse which has been included in the attached Budget Amendment.

Name	Position Title	Annual Salary Before	Annual Salary After	Annual Increase/Decrease
Vacant	Skilled Trades Worker Sr.	\$0	\$35,183.72	\$35,183.72
Vacant	Skilled Trades Worker	\$32,870.24	\$0	\$(32,870.24)
Total Annual Impact/ Salary and Benefits \$2,946.54				

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Daniel H. Fischer at 258-3030.

Attachment

cc: Rodney Ballard – Director, Division of Community Corrections
Log #13-0042




Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Jim Gray
Mayor

Clay Mason
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Jim Gray and Urban County Council

FROM: David Lucas, Enhanced 9-1-1 Director 

DATE: January 18, 2013

RE: 4th Quarter 2012 Address Changes for Enhanced 9-1-1 Compliance

This request will change street names and individual numbers of addresses within various Council Districts. The attached listing indicates the individual addresses to be changed which are located within the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th and 11th Council Districts.

The street name and/or number changes are needed to ensure the proper operation of the Enhanced 9-1-1 system. The corrections eliminate several confusing, duplicate and/or improperly named and numbered addresses in Fayette County.

The official date of change should be thirty (30) days from date of passage, to allow for new sign placement, utility and Post Office notification and final citizen notification.

The following documents are attached:

1. Spreadsheet listing of each address change and associated Council District number
2. Individual address list/Draft of Resolution

DSL/jc

RESOLUTION NO. _____ - 2013

A RESOLUTION CHANGING THE STREET NAMES AND PROPERTY ADDRESS NUMBERS OF 1637 COURTNEY AVENUE TO 601 APPLETREE LANE, OF 2280 THUNDERSTICK DRIVE TO 2255 BUENA VISTA ROAD, OF 2051 CAPSTONE DRIVE TO 2031 GEORGETOWN ROAD, OF 333 DESHA ROAD TO 1226 GHENT ROAD, OF 1504 COLESBURY CIRCLE TO 547 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD, AND OF 1676 MCGRATHIANA PARKWAY TO 1000 TEMPUR WAY; AND CHANGING THE PROPERTY ADDRESS NUMBER OF 604 EAST HIGH STREET TO 602 EAST HIGH STREET, OF 324-334 SOUTH MARTIN LUTHER KING BOULEVARD TO 326 SOUTH MARTIN LUTHER KING BOULEVARD, OF 346-380 SOUTH MARTIN LUTHER KING BOULEVARD TO 344 SOUTH MARTIN LUTHER KING BOULEVARD, AND OF 1104 STILLWELL AVENUE TO 1100 STILLWELL AVENUE, ALL EFFECTIVE THIRTY DAYS FROM PASSAGE.

WHEREAS, the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government has created a Geographic Information System ("GIS"); and

WHEREAS, the GIS street mapping and addressing project is the foundation for the Urban County Government's enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone Communication System (the "911 System"); and

WHEREAS, in order for the GIS and 911 Systems to function properly it is imperative that street names and property addresses conform to the standards established in Section 17-2 through 17-4 of the Code of Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, various street names and property addresses located in several Council Districts do not meet the Code requirements and changes should be made to conform to the Code and to accomplish the goals of the GIS and 911 System projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT:

Section 1 – That the street names and property address numbers of the following properties be and hereby are changed as follows:

- (a) Courtney Avenue: That the name of Courtney Avenue located at 1637 Courtney Avenue is changed to Appletree Lane and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
1637 Courtney Avenue	601 Appletree Lane

- (b) Thunderstick Drive: That the name of Thunderstick Drive located at 2280 Thunderstick Drive is changed to Buena Vista Road and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
2280 Thunderstick Drive	2255 Buena Vista Road

(c) Capstone Drive: That the name of Capstone Drive located at 2051 Capstone Drive is changed to Georgetown Road and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
2051 Capstone Drive	2031 Georgetown Road

(d) Desha Road: That the name of Desha Road located at 333 Desha Road is changed to Ghent Road and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
333 Desha Road	1226 Ghent Road

(e) Colesbury Circle: That the name of Colesbury Circle located at 1504 Colesbury Circle is changed to West New Circle Road and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
1504 Colesbury Circle	547 West New Circle Road

(f) McGrathiana Parkway: That the name of McGrathiana Parkway located at 1676 McGrathiana Parkway is changed to Tempur Way and the following number change is made:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
1676 McGrathiana Parkway	1000 Tempur Way

Section 2 – That the street number of the following property be and hereby is changed as follows:

(a) East High Street:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
604 East High Street	602 East High Street

(b) South Martin Luther King Boulevard:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
324-334 S. Martin Luther King Boulevard	326 S. Martin Luther King Boulevard
346-380 S. Martin Luther King Boulevard	344 S. Martin Luther King Boulevard

(c) Stillwell Avenue:

<u>Current</u>	<u>New</u>
1104 Stillwell Avenue	1100 Stillwell Avenue

Section 3 – That this Resolution shall be effective thirty (30) days from passage.

PASSED URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CLERK OF URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL

MC:X:\Cases\911\13-CC0038\LEG\00374098.DOC



Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

Jim Gray
Mayor

Clay Mason
Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Gray, Mayor
Sally Hamilton, CAO
Urban County Council Members

FROM: Dewey Crowe, Director *DC*
Division of Building Inspection

Date: January 18, 2013

RE: Expanded Jurisdiction Contract

This is to request Council approval of an expanded jurisdiction agreement between the LFUCG and the Kentucky Department of Housing, Buildings and Construction. The agreement grants the LFUCG additional jurisdictional responsibility for plan reviews, inspections and enforcement of the Kentucky Building Code, including mechanical and electrical systems. This is a three year renewal of an existing agreement and is budget neutral.

CC: Clay Mason, Commissioner



Mayor Jim Gray

LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT
Division of Grants and Special Programs

TO: JIM GRAY, MAYOR
URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL

FROM: IRENE GOODING, DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF GRANTS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

DATE: JANUARY 22, 2013

SUBJECT: REQUEST COUNCIL AUTHORIZATION TO SUBMIT APPLICATIONS,
AND ACCEPT AWARDS IF OFFERED, TO THE KENTUCKY
TRANSPORTATION CABINET FOR PARTICIPATION IN TRAFFIC
SAFETY PROGRAMS - FY 2014

The Division of Police has prepared two applications for submission to the Governor's Highway Safety Program in the Department of Transportation Safety/Kentucky Transportation Cabinet requesting federal funding for continuation of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government's Traffic Safety Programs for FY 2014. These federal funds originate from the U.S. Department of Transportation's Highway Safety Standards Branch. These programs are:

- **Traffic Safety Program.** Federal funding in the amount of \$165,000 is requested. No matching funds are required. If approved, funds will be used to continue the utilization of officers on an overtime basis to detect speeders, intoxicated drivers, those not wearing occupant protection, and drivers running red lights. Funds will also be used for participation in the Life Savers Conference (required) and for purchase of PBT (preliminary breath test) units.
- **Speed Enforcement Project.** Federal funding in the amount of \$50,000 is requested. No matching funds are required. If approved, federal funds will be used for officer overtime for enforcement of the speed limit laws. The goal of this program is to reduce the number of speed related collisions.

Council authorization to submit applications, and accept awards if offered, is hereby requested.


Irene Gooding, Director

HORSE CAPITAL OF THE WORLD


200 East Main Street 6th Fl Lexington, KY 40507 PH (859)258-3070 FAX (859)258-3081 www.lexingtonky.gov



Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Jim Gray
Mayor

To: Mayor Jim Gray
Urban County Council

From: 
Kevin Atkins, Chief Development Officer

Date: January 22, 2013

Re: Approve agreement with Webasto Roof Systems, Inc. to participate in the Kentucky Business Investment Program

The Kentucky Economic Development Finance Authority has given Webasto Roof Systems, Inc. preliminary approval to participate in the Kentucky Business Investment (KBI) Program. The KBI Program requests that the state and local government enter into a 10-year agreement with the approved company under which the business can recover up to 100% of its start-up costs and 50% of the annual rent costs through Kentucky corporate income tax credits and a wage assessment fee of up to 4%.

Webasto Roof Systems' decision to expand their sunroof and roof systems manufacturing facility in Lexington will create wealth and provide additional job opportunities for citizens of Lexington and the surrounding area. The company plans to create 65 new jobs with an average wage of approximately \$35,000.00 per year plus benefits. KD Analytical Consulting, Inc. plans to invest nearly \$10,000,000.00 in new equipment, building improvements and start-up costs for a 10-year period.

It is recommended by Gina Greathouse, with Commerce Lexington for LFUCG to approve the 10-year local 1% wage assessment through KBI. There is no budgetary impact on LFUCG.

FOLLOW MAYOR GRAY:

www.facebook.com/MayorJimGray

www.twitter.com/JimGrayLexKY

**Neighborhood Development Funds
January 29, 2013
Work Session**

Amount	Recipient	Purpose
\$ 500.00	YMCA of Central KY 239 East High Street Lexington, KY 40507 Elissa Roycraft	Assistance for "Run This Town" Program
\$ 575.00	Lafayette High School Women's Basketball Team 401 Reed Lane Lexington, KY 40503 Allison Tate Denton	Funds for a trip to San Diego, CA tournament
\$ 2,100.00	The Friends of the Kentucky Theatre 250 West Main Street, Suite 1220 Lexington, KY 40507-1714 Lisa Atkins	Renovation of the theatre
\$ 500.00	Friends of Wolf Run, Inc. 639 Cardinal Lane Lexington, KY 40503 Kenneth B. Cooke	Incentive funds for Cardinal Run cleanup project



General Government Committee

January 15th, 2013

Summary and Motions

Vice Mayor Linda Gorton called the meeting to order at 11:00am. Council Members Steve Kay, Chris Ford, Shevawn Akers, Diane Lawless, Julian Beard, Jennifer Scutchfield, Harry Clarke, and Ed Lane were present.

1. Election of Committee Chair

Motion by Lane to nominate Kay for Chair of the General Government Committee. Seconded by Lawless. Motion passed without dissent.

Kay accepted the nomination.

Motion by Clarke to elect Kay as Chair of the General Government Committee. Seconded by Beard. Motion passed without dissent.

Kay told Committee members that he would not be selecting a Vice Chair at this time.

2. Approval of Summary

Motion by Lane to approve the November 13th, 2013 meeting summary. Seconded by Beard. Motion passed without dissent.

3. Parks Master Plan

Commissioner Sally Hamilton came to the podium to present the Parks Master Plan. She began by telling Council Members that the LFUCG operates over 100 parks and 100 facilities. They have an annual budget of \$15MM, 154 employees, and 800 seasonal employees.

Hamilton said that Division is organized into three sections: Recreation; Enterprise; and Maintenance, Planning and Design. Short-term recreation projects will include building out the Shillito multi-use fields; creating extreme sports facilities with archery, ropes/challenges, climbing walls, and bike pump trails; repurposing underused tennis courts into skate spots and futsal areas.

To meet the growing needs of our community, Hamilton mentioned completing park trails at Masterson Station and Jacobson Park and creating outdoor gyms and fit stops in other local

parks. Hamilton went on to say that they want to repurpose the Carver Center into an Art, Culture, and Education Center with emphasis on arts programs for all ages; locate additional facilities for top performing summer camp programs; complete the Wellington Park Sensory Garden and pedestrian bridge; extend “I Do” initiatives each summer using seasonal dollars and volunteer efforts.

Hamilton said they are hoping to build outdoor gyms in larger parks as well as create contemporary community centers and innovative skate parks.

The Division of Parks Enterprise section includes aquatics, golf, concessions, and extended school programs, as well as rentals, shelters, meeting rooms and event space.

The Division of Parks also operates four aquatic centers, three neighborhood pools, a marina, 16 paddle boats and four decorative fountains in the downtown area. Since 2011, the cost per patron has decreased by \$0.97, from \$3.38 to \$2.47. However, Lexington pools have 100,000 fewer patrons today than in 2000. Hamilton said that Lexington’s pools have a dated feel and lack spray features, big slides and climbing walls.

In the short-term they want to attract more families with added play features, shade structures and an increased paddle boat fleet. They also want to add an East End splash pad, updated concessions at Castlewood, a larger baby pool at Shillito and an expanded Better Bites Program.

To attract teenagers, they want to add climbing walls at Castlewood, Douglass, Shillito, and Woodland. Finally, to attract seniors, they want to reduce pool depth and remodel restrooms at Picadome.

The Division also operates five golf courses in Fayette County. Since 2011, the net cost to operate the golf program has decreased \$457,201. There has also been a 9.30% increase in rounds since 2011.

Short-term golf projects include: replacing the Lakeside Golf Course Irrigation System; restoration of the bunkers at the Kearney Hill Golf Links; upgraded kitchens at Lakeside, Kearney Hill, and Bates Creek golf courses; development of golf tour packages by working with Commerce Lexington, Kentucky’s Department of Tourism and others. Finally, they will continue to monitor usage and participation rates as well as the continuation of the evaluation of the demand for golf in Fayette County.

Hamilton also mentioned the maintenance section. She said that they mowed 2,300 acres, maintained 66 ball fields, supported 157 special events, inspected and performed repairs on 63 playgrounds and reduced expenditures through outsourcing, charging for maintenance at special events, and other efficiencies. In the short-term, they want to improve Phoenix Park, establish a Downtown Maintenance District, prioritize the replacement of park access/roadways, implement sustainable models of maintenance and building standards, create greenway/trail maintenance crews and establish an equipment replacement schedule.

Hamilton told Committee Members that the 2009 Park Master Plan recommendations included:

- Invest in a dedicated funding source or periodic major park improvement bonds.

- 125 specific recommendations...many already adopted.
- Approximately \$80MM of redevelopment/new facility needs remain from initial Master Plan effort in 1998.
- Create a focused philanthropy effort through a Conservancy in partnership with community leaders.
- Develop guidelines/standards to promote and increase sponsorships and address naming rights.
- Review accreditation process with the Commission on Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA).

Lawless mentioned the Kaboom Fun Initiative and said that only one city in Kentucky has that accreditation. Lawless also asked Hamilton about the need for a grant writer. Hamilton said that they would like to hire a grant writer. She said that she is not sure the position would be housed in the Division of Parks but said that it would be a tremendous investment.

Gorton asked Hamilton if they have looked at forming a small group of citizens to assist with maintenance issues. Hamilton agreed it was a great idea but said they had not considered it.

Beard asked Hamilton where the LFUCG stands on bonding limits. Hamilton said that she is getting ready to have discussions about bonding capacity.

Akers asked Hamilton if there has been an audit performed for income potential. She gave the example of field rentals. Hamilton said that they have not done a formal assessment. Hamilton said that she had received a list of questions from Akers and she will answer them and send them out to all Council Members.

Jerry Hancock came to the podium and said that he follows a Council approved fees schedule. Hancock said that they should have a discussion about who will review the fees going forward.

4. Metro Employees Credit Union Lease and PSA

Hamilton said that they are working on the PSA and it will be ready for the February 2013 General Government Committee meeting.

5. Amendment of Section 4.104 of the Council Rules

Glenda George said that this item is to give the Mayor authority to approve certain items. George began a discussion on (h) 'legislative review.'

Lawless told George that one of the reasons behind this was expediency and the other was not to have to advertise certain items in the paper. George said originally they looked at this to save costs, but the General Assembly passed legislation so that the LFUCG no longer needs to publish all resolutions in the paper.

Lawless asked if the Council could still debate and vote on any of these items during the Work Session. George said they could debate them and they could make a motion to place the issue on the agenda for Thursday night. Lawless also asked about price contracts.

Gorton asked how these items will become part of the permanent official record. George said that they would not become part of the official record; they would only be in the minutes of the Work Session. Gorton asked to substitute 'after' for 'when' in (h) (a). Gorton also asked about the \$20,000 figure in (h) (b). Todd Slatin said that the figure should be \$19,999.

Gorton went on to ask about changing 'may' to 'shall' in the paragraph beginning with 'The Urban County Council.' Finally, Gorton suggested removing 'g' which deals with change orders. Gorton said that she thinks that change orders should be part of the public record.

Lane agreed with Gorton on change orders. Lane also asked about price contracts. Lane asked if the information listed could be placed on the docket as information or communications from the Mayor. George said that they could do that.

Lane also suggested using the following language for the final paragraph:

'If no action is taken, then the Mayor under his authority may execute said agreements.'

Lawless asked about the subsection that reads \$19,999. She asked for clarification regarding multiple contracts with one person or entity. Slatin said that one entity cannot have contracts totaling \$19,999 or more without issuing an RFP.

Kay asked that if an item is removed from the list, will the Mayor still be able to execute it. George said no. Kay asked if they could remove 'remove' and replace it with 'add to docket.' George agreed to make that change.

Lawless told Kay that her concern is having price contracts on the list. She said that she is concerned about this because when she first came on the Council, they terminated a contract with a local company to enter into a contract with Dell. She wants to be friendly to locally owned businesses.

Slatin said with a price contract, there is no limit involved. What they can spend is what is allocated to that division in the budget.

Lane asked Susan Lamb about the bluesheet process. He asked if this process will make the Clerk's job more difficult. Lamb said that she doesn't see any transparency issues because the documents will be in legistar.

Akers agreed with Gorton about items that have budget implications. Slatin said that with the price contracts, the divisions will only be able to spend what they have been budgeted for that fiscal year.

Gorton asked about item (j), 'acceptance of donations of goods or services that do not require a budget amendment.' George said that monetary donations will still require readings, but goods and services will not.

Lawless said that she doesn't necessarily want to remove price contracts from the list, but wants to see them and have the opportunity to place them into committee if necessary.

Lane asked Stacey Maynard if she is comfortable with the process. She said yes. She said that her staff will have to do summaries of the Work Sessions instead of doing a table of motions.

Kay said that the item will stay on the referral list and will be on the next General Government Committee agenda.

Gorton asked about items on the Mayor's communication list and George said that if the Council takes no action, the Mayor would have authority to execute those agreements immediately following that meeting.

6. Items Referred to Committee

Motion by Ford to remove the General Services Link recommendations from the items referred list. Seconded by Lawless. Motion passed without dissent.

Lawless said that Scott Shapiro was supposed to make a presentation on this item. Benningfield said that the item is ready, and she needs to know if the Council Members want Shapiro to report back to the committee. They said yes.

Motion by Lawless to remove the contracting of abatement of tall grass and weeds from the items referred list. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Ford to remove the number of days a property is allowed to abate a nuisance from the items referred list. Seconded by Clarke. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Lane to remove Ordinance 4-75 from the items referred list. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Lawless to remove the discussion to limit smoking in public parks from the items referred list. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Gorton to remove the procedure for underwriting or sponsoring one of our facilities or parks, how it would be done, how it would be contracted, work up a list of pricing including naming rights from the items referred list. Seconded by Lane. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Lane to adjourn. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Submitted by Jenifer Benningfield, Council Administrative Specialist



Planning and Public Works Committee
January 15th, 2013
Summary and Motions

Vice Mayor Linda Gorton called the meeting to order at 1:01pm. Council Members Chuck Ellinger, Steve Kay, Chris Ford, Diane Lawless, Julian Beard, Bill Farmer, Jr., Jennifer Mossotti, Harry Clarke, and Peggy Henson were in attendance.

1. Election of Committee Chair

Motion by Ellinger to nominate Farmer to serve as Committee Chair. Seconded by Beard. Motion passed without dissent.

Farmer accepted the nomination.

Motion by Ellinger to elect Farmer as Committee Chair. Seconded by Beard. Motion passed without dissent.

Farmer asked Mossotti to serve as Vice Chair and she accepted.

2. November 20th, 2012 Summary

Motion by Ellinger to approve the November 20th, 2012 summary. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

3. December 11th, 2012 Summary

Motion by Gorton to approve the December 11th, 2012 summary. Seconded by Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

4. Exploring the Use of Alternative Fuel Resources for Fayette County – CNG Update

Farmer reported to Committee members that the ZOTA for CNG fueling stations had been approved by the Planning Commission.

Jamshid Baradaran came to the podium to present. Baradaran told Committee members that General Services has been considering converting to CNG vehicles for three years. They have determined that it is a viable option that will save fuel costs and decrease repair and maintenance expenses. He said that they have determined that the solid waste heavy fleet is where they want to start. 79% of the entire fleet budget is fuel cost. In FY 2012, LFUCG spent over \$5.8MM for fuel alone. Baradaran said that CNG averages \$1-2 per gallon less than diesel/gasoline. It also produces 20-30% less greenhouse emissions. He went on to say that 98% of all natural gas is produced in North America. This reduces the reliance on what is happening outside of North America.

Baradaran referenced his Return on Investment graph and said the numbers are based on having 10 CNG compactors in use. The typical lifecycle of a compactor is 10 years. The savings illustrated was approximately \$800,000 to \$850,000. He went on to reference the O&M cost savings. He said those savings would be approximately \$100,000.

Baradaran said that they have looked at the conversion option but decided that it is not the best option. They want to purchase new CNG vehicles. He said another challenge will be fueling stations. They have looked at potential partnerships, entering into a contract for commercial fueling stations, or using a portable skid.

He said that there will be facility modifications needed and also said that he has had discussions with LexTran about a potential partnership.

Henson asked Baradaran about the mileage of CNG vehicles. He said that the current compactors cost about \$3.40 a gallon to fill and CNG would cost \$1.90 a gallon. CNG technology is 10% less fuel efficient but it still makes sense financially. Henson asked about converting existing vehicles. Baradaran said that by converting the vehicles they would lose 35-50% efficiency. Those vehicles could only be used approximately four more years.

Lawless asked if General Services was looking strictly at Waste Management. Baradaran said that next they will look at the fleet in the Division of Streets and Roads. Lawless also asked about vegetable oil. Baradaran said that he has looked into it and it is not a viable option for them. There are also issues with warranties for the vehicles that are currently under warranty.

Lawless mentioned fracking and the impact it has on the environment.

Kay asked about the normal life cycle for these vehicles and was told that there is typically a 10-year, 100,000 mile lifespan. Baradaran said that he has almost completed his in-house model that will include an analysis of age, mileage, and physical condition.

Kay asked if there is a market for old vehicles. Baradaran said that there is market for vehicles that are three to five years old and they will give LFUCG a credit for them. Baradaran said that they do use auctions to sell compactors. He did say, however, that this is hit or miss. The market is not stable but they will consider this option as well.

Mossotti asked about using electric vehicles. Baradaran said that CNG will be used for heavy fleet and went on to say that electric vehicles are usually used for lighter fleet. He said that they purchased one electric vehicle but wants a year to look at pros and cons before purchasing any others.

Clarke asked why they are not going to convert. He asked if there is funding available to purchase new CNG vehicles. Baradaran said they have funding to purchase five to six units.

Commissioner Sally Hamilton provided a brief update on the conversation with LexTran. She said that timing is important. She said a collaborative effort with LexTran is crucial. LexTran is interested in converting their entire fleet to CNG. They would issue an RFP for a fueling station. Hamilton said that LFUCG could get on their contract. LexTran is three to four years out. Hamilton said they issue is if LFUCG gets out ahead of LexTran, LFUCG will need to fuel the vehicles. LFUCG could enter into a short-term agreement with a temporary fueling station. They can issue an RFP for that type of contract.

Farmer said that he was encouraged to hear that there would be decreased maintenance costs. He asked Baradaran about a timeline. Baradaran said the lead time to order the vehicles is 10-12 months.

Henson asked if there is an interest in the private industry. Baradaran said that there is absolutely an interest in the private industry which could increase the demand for fueling stations.

Henson also asked if the mechanics are certified. Baradaran said that the mechanics will get training for no charge to the city when the vehicles are purchased. Henson also asked about safety. Baradaran said they are very safe. He said that they are less likely to explode.

5. Items Referred to Committee

Gorton asked about the FCPS and salt item. Wente will work with FCPS and provide an update in February.

Ford suggested that the Oliver Lewis Project be referred to the Social Services and Community Development Committee because of the new housing and social service needs for that area. He specifically mentioned Davis Bottom.

Gorton suggested leaving the big public works project in Planning and Public Works and referring the social service issues of that project into the Social Services and Community Development Committee.

Motion by Ford to refer the social services aspects of the Newtown Pike Extension issue, particularly the Land Trust and the neighborhood redevelopment to the Social Services and Community Development Committee. Seconded by Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by Clarke to adjourn. Seconded by Mossotti. Motion passed without dissent.

Submitted by Jenifer Benningfield, Council Administrative Specialist

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation




Wagner Design Studio

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

Architectural Programming

↓

Basic Requirements

↓

5 Critical Issues

↓

Preliminary Evaluation

Wagner Design Studio

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

Architectural Program

75 rooms & spaces/46,000 square feet

- Programmed activities
- Services
- Drop-in uses/socialization
- Amenities
- Administration & operations

Wish list for exterior amenities

Parking needs projected at 175-250 spaces

Wagner Design Studio

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

Basic Requirements

- 50,000 square foot area for building patios & covered drop-off
- 99,500 square feet of paved area
- 2,000 square feet for storm water management

3.59 acres of appropriately configured space (1 level)
3.13 acres (2 levels)

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

5 Critical Issues

- 1.Ease & safety of vehicular access/egress
- 2.Space to accommodate architectural program
- 3.Space to accommodate parking requirements
- 4.Accessibility
- 5.Adaptability of existing structures

Lexington Senior Center Preliminary Site Evaluation Study

Springs Inn site

2020 Harrodsburg Rd.
5.11 acres

Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study





Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study





Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study
















Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study




Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study




Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study

Lexington Senior Center

1530 Nicholasville Rd.
2.83 acres
14,960 SF



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study




Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study



Lexington
Senior Center
Preliminary
Site
Evaluation
Study







Mayor's Commission on Homelessness

Council Work Session
January 29, 2013
Steve Kay, Chair
Debra Hensley, Co-chair

Background

- Mayor's charge
 - More direct focus on and attention to issues
 - Recommendations to meet unmet need and areas identified for improvement
- Commission composed of a diverse cross-section of the community
- Met from August 15th to January 16th

2

National Context

- Deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill
- Decrease in funding for low-income housing
- First major federal legislation addressing homelessness in 1987
- Focus on "Housing First" and Rapid Re-housing in recent years
- Homelessness started to decrease and flat through downturn

3

The Need – Local Shelter System

- Current system is overwhelmed
- Emergency Shelter
 - Sleeping on floors and couches
- Recovery
 - Waiting list
- Transitional Housing
 - Waiting list
- System has capacity
 - If targeted services are provided to certain populations

4

The Need – Local Affordable Housing

- Lexington Housing Authority
 - 2,692 households on the waiting list
- Transitional Housing
 - Need 600 beds
- Permanent Supportive Housing - "Housing First"
 - Need 150 beds

5

Interventions –

- People at risk
 - Affordable housing
 - Employment support
- Families
 - Affordable housing
 - Rental assistance
 - Rapid re-housing

6

Interventions (cont'd) –

- People with mental illness

- Housing First
- Mental health courts
- Street outreach

- Chronically Homeless

- Housing First
- Street outreach

7

Interventions (cont'd) –

- Young Adults

- Emergency shelter
- Transitional housing

- People with substance abuse

- Recovery beds
- Transitional housing

- Survivors of intimate partner violence

- Rental assistance
- Transitional housing

8

Cost of Not Intervening –

- People at risk

- Tips individuals and families into homeless system
- More expensive than maintaining current housing
- Disrupts individuals and families

- Families

- Families more expensive in shelter system
- Impact on school system

9

Cost of Not Intervening (cont'd) –

- People with mental illness
 - Cycle through system
 - Cost over \$50,000 per person per year
 - Cost of intervening is @ \$20,000 per person
- Chronically homeless
 - \$42,000 per person per year
 - Most visible; cycle through system
 - Cost @ \$15,000 per person to intervene

10

Cost for Not Intervening (cont'd) -

- Young Adults
 - 20% of homeless population
 - If not stable now, hard to ever get stable
 - Cost \$3,500 per person to intervene
- Substance abuse
 - Effect on children
 - Recovery bed costs approximately \$15,000 a year
- Survivors of intimate partner violence
 - Disruption of individuals or families
 - Effect on school system

11

Recommendations

- Create a dependable revenue stream
- Create an office for implementation and coordination
- Create affordable housing units
- Additional recommendations

12

Create a dependable revenue stream

- Consistent and reliable funding
- Major support for recommendations
- Funds office
- Funds affordable housing units and supportive services
- Leverages:
 - Additional money for affordable housing
 - Grants
 - Public/private partnerships
 - Volunteers

13

Create an Office for Coordination

- Causes are complex - Solutions aren't simple
- Requires:
 - Vision
 - Consistent and deliberate planning
 - Coordination and collaboration
- Opportunities for:
 - Leveraged funding through grants
 - Public/private partnerships
 - Volunteers

14

Create Affordable Housing Units

- Allows intervention in key ways
- Allows current system to operate efficiently

15

Additional Recommendations

- “Housing First” for mentally ill and chronically homeless
- Mental health court
- Street outreach
- Employment support
- Case management

16

The Role of Affordable Housing in Addressing Homelessness



17

Questions

18

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	3
II.	Prologue	5
III.	Introduction	6
IV.	Overview of Homelessness	8
V.	Systemic Socio-Economic Factors	12
	A. The Gap Between the Cost of Housing and Earning Capacity	12
	B. Employment	17
VI.	Systemic Service Provision Factors	20
	A. Coordination/collaboration	20
	B. Funding	23
	C. Case management and supportive services	25
	D. Unified System of Entry	26
	E. Data management	27
	F. Education and outreach	28
	G. Day Centers with expanded hours	29
	H. 24 hour shelter for hard-to-serve	30
VII.	Subpopulations	30
	A. Families	30
	B. Persons with Mental Illness	31
	C. Persons who are Chronically Homeless	38
	D. Youth and Young Adults	40
	E. Persons with Substance Abuse Issues	43
	F. Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence	44
	G. Persons discharged from hospitals	46
	H. Persons discharged from jails	47
	I. Elderly persons	48
	J. Veterans	49
VIII.	Recommendations	49
	A. Summary of Recommendations by Section	49
	B. Readily Available Cost Estimates	52
	C. Comprehensive Recommendations	52
	D. Recommendations by Priority	54

IX.	Implementation Plan	55
X.	Key Indicators	56
XI.	Conclusion	56
XII.	Appendices	56
	A. Mayor's Charge	
	B. Make-up of Commission	
	C. Discussion of Commission work plan	
	Will include methodology and information about survey, Open space, Public meeting, and transparency of process	
	D. Definitions	
	E. Homeless Count Spreadsheet	
	F. Homeless Count Spreadsheet explanation	
	G. Homeless in Lexington narrative	
	H. Provider spreadsheet	
	I. Links to additional resources	
	J. Grid/matrix for recommendations	
	K. Responses from hospitals	

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Adequate shelter is a fundamental human right.¹ Unfortunately, some people in our community do not experience that right. The causes of homelessness are easy to identify: lack of affordable housing, lack of resources to pay market-rate rents, lack of ability to live independently, lack of support services for those who need them on a temporary or permanent basis. The trends affecting these causes have been going in the wrong direction: decreases in affordable housing, a growing gap between cost of housing and lower-income earning capacity, and reductions in funding for services.

The major single or combined routes by which a particular person or family comes to lack one or more of these essential aspects for remaining adequately housed is also relatively easy to identify: children who flee their homes; youth who “age out” of foster care; people who have difficulty finding or holding a job; people who work at jobs that do not pay well; people who have difficulty caring for themselves because they are mentally ill and/or have substance abuse issues; people with or without children who are forced to flee their homes or who lose critical financial support because they are victims of intimate partner violence. This report addresses both the general causes and specific roots of homelessness.

In Lexington, the current system is overwhelmed with people sleeping on the floor of emergency shelters, on waiting lists for transitional housing, and spending extended periods of time in transitional housing because there is no permanent housing, supportive or affordable, to which to exit. While we will always need emergency shelter, including transitional housing, to meet emergency needs, it appears that the current system has sufficient capacity, but only if certain subpopulations such as families, young adults, persons with mental illness, and the chronically homeless are provided housing. Creating more affordable housing units and expanding rapid rehousing programs will reduce the backlog in emergency shelters and transitional housing.

A nationwide body of research now documents the ways that homelessness costs the community. Emergency and other services for a homeless individual or family on the street or in the shelter system can cost the community up to five times as much as for those who are permanently housed. There is both a moral and an economic benefit gained by providing housing for these individuals and families.

We start with the firm belief that the overall goal of any effort to address homelessness should revolve around the prevention of becoming homeless in the first place and the reduction of the time a person or family is homeless. The recommendations included in this report are intended to reflect that goal.

Mayor Jim Gray created the Commission on Homelessness in July, 2012 in response to the complex set of issues that impact people finding themselves without adequate shelter and support services, and that impact the community as a whole. The Commission represents a diverse cross-section of the community, including homeless service providers, advocates, people who have experienced homelessness, community activists, education and business leaders, and government officials. Mayor Gray

charged the Commission with reviewing the full range of materials and experiences related to homelessness and creating a report of findings and a set of recommendations to “meet unmet needs and areas identified for improvement.”

This report contains 48 inter-related recommendations regarding 1) systemic factors affecting homelessness in Lexington: the housing and wage gap, collaboration and coordination, funding, data management, case management and supportive services, a unified system of entry, education and outreach, day centers, and 24-hour shelter service; and 2) subpopulations of homeless: families, persons with mental illness, the chronically homeless, youth and young adults, substance abuse, intimate partner violence, hospital and jail discharges, the elderly, and veterans. Comprehensively, the recommendations include funding, structure, facilities, services, legislative and policy changes, and items for further study.

Three recommendations that received the Commission’s highest priority ranking are comprehensive and foundational. They are:

- 1) Increase from 5% to 6% the present fee assessed on insurance premiums, to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund that will provide a consistent, reliable, dedicated funding stream to address the recommendations contained in this report (this recommendation is an increase of .5% above the recommendation of the Affordable Housing Task Force proposal presently being considered by Urban County Council and reflects the expanded scope of programs and services included in this report’s recommendations which would be funded in part by the fee increase);
- 2) Create an Office within LFUCG, funded in part by the fee increase and tasked with overall coordination of the recommendations contained in this report;
- 3) Create more affordable housing units to meet the needs of the homeless and those at risk of homelessness.

In addition, these specific recommendations, all of which address more effective ways to prevent and deal with chronic and episodic homelessness, received the next highest level priority ranking:

- 1) Institute a “Housing First” model for the mentally ill and chronically homeless;
- 2) Support creation of a mental health court;
- 3) Develop a program of street outreach;
- 4) Encourage and support collaboration among providers to provide more case management.

The report also contains a concise set of Key Indicators designed to provide a snapshot of progress on improving the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of services for people who are homeless in our community. The Key Indicators will be the primary vehicle for reporting progress to the community. The Key Indicators are:

- 1) Increase in the number of affordable housing units;
- 2) Reduction in the number of homeless included in the annual Point-In-Time Count;

- 3) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring incarceration;
- 4) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring emergency medical care;
- 5) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring referral and evaluation by Eastern State Hospital;
- 6) Reduction in the number of youth who age out of foster care who become homeless;
- 7) Reduction in the number and the amount of time spent in emergency shelter and in transitional housing.

II. PROLOGUE – “The Faces of Homelessness”

In the process of preparing this report Commission members learned--or had reinforced for them--that homelessness isn't a simple problem. Understanding homelessness is not just a matter of walking in someone else's shoes. It's that the feet of the homeless range from the shoes of infants and toddlers to the 14W work boots of veterans. The homeless wear sneakers to school, loafers to work, flats and slippers and sandals and sometimes have no shoes at all. The homeless wear the shoes that were on their feet when they finally fled domestic violence and those are the only shoes they will have until they find relief, respite, and recovery.

There are startling moments when we see right before our eyes homeless folks who have, in fact, been there all along. In an instant, with stinging clarity we see people that may frighten, trouble, or disturb us. The nagging truth that something is broken, something awry in our nation and our community when so many others live, every day, in a ragged, worn out state of mind and state of affairs wears us down and wears us out.

There is no single face to homelessness. It is the face of “Bill”, who served in Iraq and returned unable to hold a job or function on his own.

It is Jeff, Mary, and their two kids. Jeff had just been hired into management of a store in town. When the company downsized and Jeff lost his job, they were thrown into the shelter system.

Mary Francis had a bad boyfriend, a small child, and a dog. Getting rid of the boyfriend meant a ride to the emergency room, putting her child in emergency foster care, and no place to return to when she was discharged. It was easier to find a home for the dog than for Mary Francis and her child.

It is the face of “Mary Francis”, a single mother escaping from domestic violence.

It is the face of “Harry” who lost his job as a carpenter's helper, was out of work for two months, could not pay his rent and utility bills, and was evicted from his apartment.

The homeless face is the face of “Joe”, a 16 year old student who has finally run out of another new couch on which to sleep.

That homeless face is the face of “Roger”, who sometimes fails to take the medication prescribed to keep the effects of his bipolar disorder in check. He is one of the many homeless people with mental health disabilities that range from modest and manageable to extraordinary and inconceivable.

In short, the homeless are not a problem to be solved. They are not a riddle for which an answer will provide a path forward. The homeless are people.

Joe came to live with us after 18 months of sleeping in parks, stairways and the floor of friends. He came with a tent, a stove, a sleeping bag and a 3.2 G.P.A. Is this the best we can do? I asked him how he made it. He said, “mom or dad is always in trouble, she’s in jail and he’s on probation. They can’t look after me and I’m tired of foster care. But I know this much. My mother loves me and I have a good mind. I just have to get through this the best I can.”

Because the primary encounter with homelessness for most citizens is with the chronically homeless who are often on our streets and in other public places, it is easy to confuse the reality of homelessness with the most common faces of the homeless. It turns out, contrary to the cliché, that actually believing is seeing. Many believe that hard working folks can find housing if they want. Many believe that high school students can’t really be on their own sleeping one week on this couch and the next week on another couch. Many believe that law enforcement can deal with the victims of domestic violence and that once the violence is brought to light people can just get on with their lives. Many believe that hospitals would never release anyone out of an emergency room without someplace to recuperate from their injury or illness. Many believe that a nation that honors its veterans must surely attend to their needs after service. Many believe that mental illness and disability can surely be dealt with by a crisis line or a pharmacist. Many believe that mothers with children can’t really be without shelter or a roof over their heads. It is a long list of misunderstanding and myth. And because we believe these things it is hard to see the truth. Of the approximately 1,500 homeless folks in Fayette County at any given time, only around 125 at most fit the profile of the person on the street we have in mind when we hear the word homeless.

Read the executive summary, read the details, read the recommendations, and consider the costs. The costs of inaction. The costs of trivial consideration. It is costing all of us too much to continue with business as usual. There is a cost to productivity, our revenue, and our conscience. Extraordinary action and unusual thinking can, however, create a legacy that will be a real gift to the next generation.

III. INTRODUCTION

Lexington is a caring community with a long history of working to reduce homelessness. Over the past several decades numerous organizations and individuals have worked diligently to meet the needs of individuals and families who experience homelessness. Lexington is also a community driven by continuous improvement even when things are going well.

The Commission has worked to be as comprehensive as possible, and as consistent as possible with the 2010 *Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness*. We have taken into consideration the many different paths into and out of homelessness, the many ways that the community now provides services and support, and best practices examples from other communities.

We have constructed our report and tailored our recommendations to reflect the specific needs of the differing individuals who at any one time experience homelessness. We have also included recommendations that are more systemic in scope and would affect all aspects of homelessness.

The homeless service providers have been very helpful throughout this process and have provided invaluable information. The Commission sought feedback from service providers and people who are experiencing homelessness through questionnaires and structured interviews. The feedback received in these surveys and conversations have been carefully considered in the development of the recommendations presented in this report.

In submitting this report we recognize that any reduction in the numbers of homeless, any improvement in the services available for people who are homeless, and any lessening of the negative impacts of homelessness on both the individual and the community depend on our working together as a community to understand the diverse needs and the best use of limited resources to address those needs. We encourage your attention to this report and your support for the recommendations advanced in it.

The main body of this report is organized into three major sections, each of which looks at homelessness from a different perspective and contains a description of the present status and one or more related recommendations. These sections are: **Systemic Socio-Economic Factors; Systemic Service Provision Factors; and Specific Subpopulations within the Homeless Population.**

The **Systemic Socio-economic Factors** section considers those major elements of the social and economic environment that are significant contributing factors to the creation and continuation of homelessness, regardless of the differences among those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. These factors are: 1) the growing gap between wages earned and the cost of housing, and the resultant lack of sufficient affordable housing; 2) lack of job opportunities and/or skills that pay adequate wages.

The **Systemic Service Provision Factors** section presents information about present services and the ways that services could be provided more effectively in the effort to reduce both the numbers of homeless and the duration of episodes of homelessness. Specific opportunities for new or improved approaches identified in this section include: 1) coordination and collaboration among service providers and community partners; 2) increased financial and volunteer resources; 3) case management and supportive services; 4) a unified system of entry for those in need of services; 5) more comprehensive and consistent data management; 6) education and outreach to provide

better information for the public about the nature and extent of the issue in order to increase understanding and support; 7) education and outreach to provide more information about options for those in need of services; 8) the ways that day centers can meet some of the needs of the homeless population; and 9) the ways that night-time or twenty-four-hour shelters can meet some of the needs of the homeless population.

The **Specific Subpopulations** section identifies the ways that differing segments of the homeless population present differing challenges and thus require differing strategies for effective intervention, whether prevention, transitional services, and/or ongoing support. The specific subpopulations are separated for description and analysis only, since many people do not fit easily within any one subpopulation, or may fit within multiple subpopulations. The specific subpopulations addressed are: 1) Families; 2) Persons with Mental Illness; 3) Persons Who Are Chronically Homeless; 4) Youth and Young Adults; 5) Persons with Substance Abuse Issues; 6) Survivors of Intimate Partner Domestic Violence; 7) Persons Who Have Been Discharged From Hospitals; 8) Persons Who Have Been Discharged From Jail; 9) Elderly Persons; and 10) Veterans.

Major substantive **Recommendations** from these three sections are presented in summary in three ways: 1) a list of recommendations structured to reflect the order of organization within the report; 2) the same list organized by logical categories, with overlap and redundancy reduced; 3) a second list organized by weighted priority.

In addition, the report includes a set of procedural recommendations meant to ensure that an administrative structure is in place to provide coordination and assistance to primary service providers and to monitor and report back to the community on a regular basis about progress in the Key Indicators that provide a snapshot of the status of homelessness in our community.

The **Appendix** includes information about the charge to the Commission, its membership and structure, explanatory and supportive materials, and references to studies, reports, and successful programs in other communities.

IV. OVERVIEW OF HOMELESSNESS

Formal and Informal Definitions

It is important to understand just what is meant by the word “homeless.” While the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has established legal definitions for who qualifies as homeless, for purposes of simplicity, when this report refers to homelessness, it means that a person or family is without a place to live of one’s own that is meant for human habitation. Being homeless does not mean that a person has to be literally living on the street, under a bridge, or sleeping on a park bench.² People who are staying in an emergency shelter are homeless, as are many who are in substance abuse recovery programs, or transitional housing provided by one of Lexington’s non-profit organizations that are intended to help people get back on their feet.

Brief Recent National History

The Community Mental Health Act of 1963 was a major factor in setting the stage for homelessness in America because long-term psychiatric patients were released from state hospitals and sent to community based treatment for follow up, but the modified system never worked properly. Homelessness grew in the 1980's as a result of significant cuts to low-income housing and a deterioration of the economy. As a result of the growth of homelessness, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act was passed in 1987. Despite the focus on homelessness, the numbers remained high and it became apparent that treating the symptoms of homelessness was not helping the root causes. In recent years, the focus has turned to "Housing First" models and rapid re-housing and homelessness, among some populations, has begun to decline. Great strides were made in improving the situation but a setback occurred in the economic downturn of 2008. It is a testament to the success of current programs that the percentages of homelessness for individuals in the nation remained flat during the economic downturn. Only homelessness among families increased slightly.

The Shelter System

While most people who become homeless or are at risk of homelessness will likely need a range of support services in order to exit homelessness or stay out of it entirely, providing some level of shelter is the fundamental way Lexington, as well as the rest of the nation, has developed to address the issue. In the traditional "Continuum of Care" model, there are three primary methods of housing the homeless: Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, and Permanent Supportive Housing. Most of the federal funding for homeless services is tied to these three types of housing programs, so each program must meet certain requirements in order to be eligible for this funding. In theory, the thought has been that people move through the system on a continuum, starting with emergency shelter, then transitional housing and so on. That is certainly the case for some, but many people enter the system at different points. If intervention is made early, people may avoid the shelter system entirely by being provided with the best support for their respective needs.

Emergency Shelter is intended to be temporary and is meant to meet the basic needs of an individual or family often after a crisis event. In Lexington, as well as many other communities, an emergency shelter serves as the entryway to more targeted assistance beyond just a place to stay overnight.³

Transitional Housing is intended to facilitate the movement of homeless individuals and families to permanent housing. Individuals and families can stay in transitional housing for up to 24 months and supportive services are often provided to help people become better prepared to live independently.⁴ Recovery beds for substance abuse treatment are included in this category for the purposes of the Point-in-Time Count (PITC).

Permanent Supportive Housing is typically for an indefinite timeframe and is paired with services to help homeless people with disabilities achieve housing stability. While federal funding is available for permanent housing as a component of homeless initiatives, the federal government no longer considers people in permanent housing to

be homeless. Therefore, these numbers are not included in the official count of the homeless submitted to HUD each year for Lexington's Point-in-Time Count.⁵

Chronic and Episodic Homelessness

There is also a difference between Chronic and Episodic Homelessness. Most people who are homeless experience "episodes" of homelessness. This means they are either homeless for a finite amount of time that is less than a year or they go in and out of homelessness throughout their life. As defined by current federal policy, a person experiencing chronic homelessness is an "[u]naccompanied (single adult) *and* disabled *and* homeless continuously one year or more *or* four or more episodes in the past three years. With implementation of the HEARTH (Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009) Act, in the future this definition will also include families with children."

It is difficult to know just how many people are homeless at any given time in Lexington. It is even more difficult to know how many people experience homelessness throughout the span of a year. While people who are chronically homeless are the ones most people are familiar with, more people are actually homeless for shorter periods of time or go in and out of homelessness depending on circumstances. Furthermore, there are many people who are "marginally housed" or "precariously housed" that are not included in any dataset or report. These are people who may be sleeping on a friend or family member's couch or are just a paycheck away from not being able to pay rent.

Each year across the nation, communities attempt to count the number of people who are homeless in their towns. Lexington participates in this count known as the Point-in-Time (PIT) Count. The following chart indicates the number of people who were identified as homeless over the past six (6) years in Fayette County. These numbers do not include the "hidden homeless" who are on floors, couches, in cars, doubled-up, or in marginal housing.

2007-2012 PIT COUNT

Type	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	1/1/2012	11/1/2012
Emergency	514	472	485	481	471	401	559
Transitional	609	770	766	961	958	911	1420
Street Count ⁶	96	96	68	116	116	116	116
Total w/o PSH	1219	1338	1319	1558	1545	1428	2095
Permanent Supportive Housing	300	300	471	560	481	486	392
Total with PSH	1519	1638	1790	2118	2026	1914	2487

In 2011 the PIT Count included 947 single men, 406 single women, and 242 families with 357 children.

While the elimination of homelessness is a goal to which our community should aspire, it is important to recognize that Lexington will continue to have individuals and families

who experience homelessness for the foreseeable future and we must continue to support efforts to serve these people in need.

In addition, we know that people come to Lexington because of the quality of life opportunities it offers. Besides economic opportunities, we are a regional hub for health care, including mental health services. It is likely that people will continue to come to Lexington for these services and other quality of life opportunities, including access to homeless resources.

Costs of Homelessness

Homelessness is not only a humanitarian but an economic concern. As we have discussed, there is a broad spectrum of persons suffering from homelessness and they can cost the community between \$35,000 and \$150,000 depending on the type of services needed. The cost to provide housing and services, however, is between \$13,000 and \$25,000 an individual.⁷ Therefore, a homeless person on the street or in the shelter system can cost up to five times as much as those who are permanently housed.⁸

A landmark study in Los Angeles recognized the “nationwide body of research into the cost of homelessness and the savings that are achieved by housing homeless residents, particularly individuals who are chronically homeless and mentally ill.”⁹ The study found “that practical, tangible public benefits result from providing supportive housing for vulnerable homeless individuals. The stabilizing effect of housing plus supportive care is demonstrated by a 79 percent reduction in public costs for these residents.”¹⁰ The findings are mirrored in a study conducted in Louisville, KY.¹¹

Both studies also found that costs for homeless individuals vary widely depending on their demographics. Young men with no jail history, substance abuse or mental health problems, cost the system very little. Older adults, particularly ones with mental health problems, substance abuse, or co-occurring disorders are very costly. Not surprisingly, these costs increase as individuals get older.¹²

Families, however, even without substance abuse or mental health issues, are very costly on the shelter system because they require a private room and transportation for the children.¹³ The economic cost, however, does not take into effect the emotional and physical toll homelessness takes on an individual, a family, a community, and a school system.

There are important junctures when intervention will minimize the effects on these individuals and families and the cost to the community. In order to take advantage of these opportunities it is important to match the range of solutions to the needs of the different groups in the homeless population and target the housing strategy to the high-cost users. Therefore, data management, coordination, and vision are important.

Nationally, the proven solutions¹⁴ are the prevention of homelessness in three ways; through the provision of affordable housing; through “rapid re-housing” which gets

people back into housing as quickly as possible through rental assistance, case management, and vouchers; and through “Housing First” or permanent supportive housing for hard-to-serve populations including the mentally ill and chronically homeless. This report addresses all three and provides recommendations regarding their implementation in this community.

While this report focuses much of its attention on programs and services geared at either preventing homelessness or reducing its duration, it is important to note that the Commission understands the need for emergency shelter and encourages the continued support of our shelters. The emergency shelter system is overcapacity and taking resources away from them at this time for other solutions is not advised. Ideally, with time and the right interventions, we will not need to further expand our emergency shelters, but that will take long-term commitment, including financial support, from the community.

Finally, it is important to note that while improvements are needed, Lexington is very fortunate to have such a strong group of services providers and programs to address homelessness. The Commission expresses its thanks to all organizations and individuals who work each day to help the homeless. If not for their efforts, many more people would be homeless and the overall community would be negatively impacted.

V. SYSTEMIC SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

V. A. The Gap Between the Cost of Housing and Earning Capacity

V. A. 1. Description

One of the main causes of homelessness is the large and ever increasing gap between wages earned and the cost of housing. Nationally, wages have fallen 19% since 1970 and for those with only a high school diploma, wages have fallen 41%.¹⁵ In Lexington, from 2003 - 2005, the cost of housing rose 10% while wages only rose 5.5%.¹⁶ From 2005 - 2010, the cost of housing rose 7% while wages only rose 1%.¹⁷ Minimum wage workers are especially vulnerable to rising housing costs because their wages tend to stay stagnant.¹⁸ Individuals and families with extremely low incomes are at the most risk for homelessness. This population is literally a paycheck away from homelessness and can become homeless because of job loss, sickness of themselves or their child, or any other emergency.

It is difficult for persons working at or near minimum wage to afford decent housing. In Lexington, minimum wage is \$7.25. A person working full-time at minimum wage makes \$15,080 annually, which is below the federal poverty threshold of \$15,130 for a two (2) person household.¹⁹ It is no surprise then that 20% of the population of Fayette County lives in poverty, which is higher than the state average of 19% and the national average of 15%.²⁰

The minimum wage needed to afford a two (2) bedroom apartment in Lexington is \$12.73.²¹ Since minimum wage is only \$7.25, a minimum wage worker would have to work 65 hours a week or a household would have to 1.8 wage-earners to afford it.²² This has several damaging results: it causes families to be housed in marginal housing or to be homeless, it takes money from other sectors of the economy (food, clothing, services, etc.) because so much money is spent on housing, and it forces minimum wage laborers to move out of the county to afford housing, or tips them into homelessness when tragedy strikes. All are very costly to the community.

Public Housing and Rental Assistance

Whether or not a household is classified as “low income” is determined by the federal government according to the area median income (AMI), which is the midpoint in household income for a certain geographic area.²³ In order to qualify for public housing or rental assistance, a household can make no more than 80% of AMI. 80% AMI is considered “low income,” 50% AMI is considered “very low income,” and 30% AMI is considered “extremely low income.” In Lexington, the AMI is \$67,100.²⁴ 30% AMI for an individual is \$13,450 and for a two (2) person household is \$15,350 regardless of the number of wage earners. Once qualified for public housing, the household pays the landlord 30% of their actual monthly adjusted income.

In Lexington, public housing is provided by the Lexington Housing Authority (LHA) which manages 4,133 units.²⁵ They provide both conventional public housing units and Housing Choice (Sec. 8) vouchers that assist the household in obtaining housing in the private rental market. In April of 2011, there were 1,171 households²⁶ on the waiting list for a public housing unit²⁷ and 349 households²⁸ on the waiting list for a Sec. 8 voucher. The trend has only gotten worse. In November of 2012, there were 2,376 households on the waiting list for a public housing unit and 316 households on the waiting list for Sec. 8 voucher.²⁹ Both waiting lists are closed. The wait list has grown 1,172 in the last 19 months which is an average of 62 households a month. The number of households does not reflect the total number of persons living in the household including children. The average income of the persons on the waiting list is \$11,000³⁰ which is under the poverty threshold for an individual of \$11,170.³¹

Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is “housing that requires families and individuals to pay no more than 30% of their income for housing and housing-related costs including taxes, insurance, and utilities.”³² “Households are considered

“cost burdened” if they pay more than 30% of their income for housing and extremely cost-burdened if they pay more than 50% of their income.³³

In Lexington, the problem has only gotten worse as shown by the chart below:³⁴

Households Paying More than 30% Gross Income

Description	2005	2008	2010
Renter Households	48,357	48,020	49,910
# that pay between 30% and 50% gross income	17,213	19,825	21,710
% that pay between 30% and 50% gross income	36%	41%	43%
# that pay more than 50% gross income	8,753	10,970	12,090
% that pay more than 50% gross income	18%	23%	24%
Total # that pay more than 30%	25,966	30,795	33,800
Total % that pay more than 30%	54%	64%	67%

This means that only 33% of the renter households in Lexington meet the criteria for having affordable housing.

Housing becomes affordable in two (2) ways: construction of affordable housing units or rental subsidies paid to market rate landlords. Affordable housing stock in America has decreased significantly in the last decade. From 2001 to 2007, affordable rental housing stock decreased by 6.3% while high-rent rental housing stock increased by 94.3%. This translates into a loss of more than 1.2 million affordable housing units. While 15.8 million households are eligible for tenant based housing subsidies (Sec. 8) only one in 9 receives them. Programs dedicated to the provision of affordable housing are primarily funded under the HUD budget but it has been reduced by \$50 billion in the last 50 years.³⁵ While there are 6 million units of affordable housing accessible to households earning 30% of AMI, there are 7.7 million such households.³⁶ There is no expectation that there will be more federal funding in this area. There is a significant affordable housing crisis in the country and in the community because we do not have a sufficient supply of adequate housing to meet the needs of those who are on the edge of homelessness, those who are temporarily housed, and those who are chronically homeless in our community.

Addressing Systemic Factors

There is a simple answer to the question of how to end homelessness: ensure adequate housing for all those in need. There is also a simple answer to the question of how to reduce homelessness: ensure adequate housing for those most in danger of becoming or remaining homeless. These simple answers, however, are not also easy answers, because the need is so great and resources are limited. It is critical to have a dedicated funding stream, vision, resources, criteria for evaluation, and coordination.

There are critical moments when having a modest level of support combined with decent housing alternatives will keep those on the edge of homelessness from becoming homeless. These moments offer opportunities to minimize the effects on these individuals and families, and to minimize the ultimate costs for our community.

There are similar critical moments when, having a decent place to live will lead most quickly to full housing independence for those who find themselves temporarily homeless. This is true for people who presently emerge from one of the transitional and support programs in our community and find themselves with no good options for next steps. These people include those who age out of foster care, those people who time-out of transitional housing programs, and those with no resources who have been discharged from hospitals.

In a different way, housing, along with relevant support services, can lead to better lives, less dependence on emergency room services and mental health services, and less impact on the criminal justice system for the chronically homeless, which often have mental health and substance abuse issues.

V. A. 2. Recommendations

V. A. 2. a. We recommend creation of an Affordable Housing Trust Fund to begin to meet the need to increase the supply of affordable housing units in a systematic and reliable way, and to provide services necessary to ensure stability for those in housing. Providing housing, with support services where necessary, will prevent the greatest number of people from falling into homelessness and assist the greatest number in getting out of homelessness. This recommendation builds on and modifies the recommendations previously submitted to the Urban County Council by the Affordable Housing Task Force in the following ways.

V. A. 2. b. We recommend that the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government (LFUCG) increase from 5% to 6% the fee presently levied by LFUCG on insurance premiums to create a source of funding of roughly \$3.9 million per year. This recommendation is an increase of .5% above the recommendation of the Task Force, and reflects the expanded scope of programs and services included in this report's recommendations which would be funded by the fee increase, as enumerated below.

V. a. 2. c. We recommend that the allocation of funds be as follows: 1) 50% for the programs, approaches, priorities and targeted populations cited in the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations; and 2) 50% for programs, approaches, priorities and targeted populations cited in the recommendations in this report.

V. A. 2. d. We recommend that the funds generated by the increased fee be used in the following ways:

V. A. 2. d. i. Provide support for the creation of more affordable housing units, to target those in danger of becoming homeless. This is consistent with the Task Force recommendations, and is the main focus of the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations.

V. A. 2. d. ii. Fund administrative support. This is consistent with the Task Force recommendations.

V. A. 2. d. iii. Initiate a “Housing First” program, a nationally recognized best practice that provides ongoing housing and support services for those who have been mentally ill and/or chronically homeless. This is an expansion in scope of programs and services.

V. A. 2. d. iv. Support a rapid rehousing program. This is an expansion in scope of programs and services.

V. A. 2. d. v. Target those transitioning out of support programs, and include support services as needed to help ensure that there will be a lasting transition to independent housing. This is an expansion in scope of programs and services.

V. a. 2. e. The Affordable Housing Task Force report includes an Appendix with a description of a recommended independent board and management structure for the Trust Fund. We support that recommendation with one modification: instead of an Administrative Agent hired by the board, we recommend that an Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention (described in detail in later sections) be created within Urban County Government. That office should be funded by the proceeds from the fee increase and be charged with day-to-day administration of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, whose expanded scope would include coordination and/or implementation of the recommendations in this report.

V. B. Employment

V. B. 1. Description

Lexington/Fayette County is currently experiencing an unemployment rate well below the national average. Therefore, we can conclude that the majority of the employment problem for the homeless is created by barriers that create unemployment, underemployment, and the lack of job readiness. The sources of these barriers include:

V. B. 1. a. Lack of Transportation

Often this population does not own or have access to reliable private transportation or does not have the funds or access to public transportation routes. Both homeless provider input and the survey information from individuals that are homeless indicate a clear need for transportation assistance to medical appointments, jobs (both in county and out-of-county), community resources such as Social Security, Food Stamp Office, and housing opportunities, and to surrounding counties when people have been transported to Lexington via ambulance and cannot get transportation back to their counties. Currently, most transportation assistance that is provided to individuals who are homeless is from the homeless services provider and is inadequate to meet the need.

V. B. 2. b. Lack of Job Ready Training

Many members of the homeless population have not had necessary training in personal life skills to interview for a job or have formed the habits necessary to maintain a job. Other members of the population do have the personal life skills to maintain a job but do not have the training to match their abilities. They are, therefore, under-employed, and earning less income than they could.

There are numerous organizations in Lexington that provide job training and/or placement services and people who are homeless are eligible for these services. The problem is generally not a lack of resources/services, but often a lack of awareness by the individual and the homeless service provider about how to access them. Some people are already employable, but the individual and the homeless service providers who are assisting them find jobs do not have relationships established with employers willing to hire these individuals or are not aware of the existing job placement services available. There are also individuals who need job training or skills building prior to seeking employment. It is important that

these individuals be matched with training that is within their capabilities and that a linkage to a job is already established.

V. B. 2. c. Lack of Opportunity

In many cases employers are reluctant to hire members of this group because of a poor work history, criminal record, or reasons observed above. Solutions include the consideration of incentives by LFUCG to its vendors and contractors, as well as private sector employers, to remove the barriers to full employment; insurance or bonding that insure against a minimal risk to employers who employ people with certain criminal records; and LFUCG taking a leadership position in hiring and training members of this population and incentives for vendors and contractors of LFUCG to include members of this population in their workforce.

One of the solutions to the problem of lack of opportunity is assistance with placing individuals with a criminal record. It is a common practice for employers to purchase insurance to indemnify them against employee dishonesty but insurance companies typically will not provide insurance for “at risk” employees or if they do so, it is cost prohibitive. At-risk or “non-bondable” job seekers include ex-offenders, recovering substance abusers, welfare recipients, and other people having poor financial credit, economically disadvantaged youth and adults who lack a work history, and individuals dishonorably discharged from the military.

The Federal Bonding Program is a tool to help “at-risk” job seekers gain employment. Through this program, Fidelity Bonding Insurance is provided as an incentive to employers to hire at-risk job seekers. This program is the only Fidelity Insurance program for at-risk job-seekers. However, these employees can become commercially bondable by demonstrating job honesty during the 6 month duration of the bond coverage. While these bonds have historically been exclusively provided by state employment agencies, now any organization can deliver these services, including non-profit organization, private industry associations, and the local government.

V. B. 1. d. Lack of Daycare

Working parents often do not have access to reliable or affordable daycare for their children or other dependents. This is especially true for single parent households, families with children who are ill or disabled, and families working 2nd and 3rd shift.

V. B. 2. Recommendations

V. B. 2. a. Transportation

V. B. 2. a. i. We recommend that the Office of Homeless Intervention and Prevention investigate a procedure that provides transportation assistance to providers working with individuals and families who are homeless. This assistance could be given as an incentive for entering data into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) or providing sufficient data to LFUCG so it can be entered. Such assistance could include discounted and free bus passes, and funding for a limited amount of cab vouchers.

V. B. 2. a. ii. We recommend that the Office explore the creation of partnerships with homeless providers to have access to ITN Bluegrass and Wheels for scheduled medical appointments; with Lexington hospitals to establish funding and procedures for transporting individuals back to home counties, if individuals wanted to return; and partnerships with local non-profits including the faith-based community to assist with transportation needs including a discount or used bicycles program.

V. B. 2. b. Job Training

V. B. 2. b. i. In order to increase awareness and utilization of existing resources, we recommend that the Office maintain a list of job training programs and placement agencies and cultivate a list of employers who are willing to hire employees who may have been or are currently homeless.

V. B. 2. b. ii. The Office would also serve as a reference for organizations looking to assist people who are homeless find employment. In order to ensure that there are jobs available for individuals coming out of these training programs, relationships must be built with employers to understand their specific needs so that the training can be appropriately tailored. Some people may not need training and can be referred to these employers quickly. We recommend that the Office help providers foster relationships with these employers and develop new partnerships as well.

V. B. 2. c. Opportunity

V. B. 2. c. i. We recommend that LFUCG fund a Federal Bonding Program operated by the Office.

V. B. 2. c. ii. We recommend that the Office study the barriers to opportunity and look for solutions.

V. B. 2. d. Day Care

It appears to be cost prohibitive to create a 24 hour day care just to serve homeless individuals and families. It would probably be more effective to partner with a current provider to place children in that day care that need those services. We recommend that the Office investigate this possibility.

VI. SYSTEMIC SERVICE PROVISION FACTORS

VI. A. Coordination/collaboration

VI. A. 1. Description

We have established in this report that the causes of homelessness are often simple to identify but because individuals and families are homeless for a variety of reasons and long-term solutions are not simple to implement. Identifying the right solutions and implementing these measures is much more complex and requires vision, consistent and deliberate planning, coordination and collaboration.

There are numerous organizations in Lexington that provide service or programming for people experiencing homelessness. These organizations rely on a mix of support from the public and private sectors. Various divisions within LFUCG also deal with certain aspects of homelessness on a limited basis, though no one person or office is responsible on a day to day basis for thinking about the issues surrounding homelessness and how our community can best address them in collaboration with appropriate partners. Without such a person or office, the ability for LFUCG and its leadership to proactively address homelessness is significantly reduced. The issues are complex and solutions require deliberate planning across governmental divisions and with community partners.

Central Kentucky Housing and Homeless Initiative (CKHHI) serves as Lexington's Continuum of Care organization and has taken the lead in collaboration efforts regarding homelessness. CKHHI is responsible for Lexington's Continuum of Care application to the Department of Housing

and Urban Development (HUD), which brings in approximately \$1.6 million in federal dollars annually. CKHHI also advocates for the homeless, homeless service agencies and provides a forum for collaboration among providers. There is limited partnership and communication with LFUCG, however, because LFUCG does not have an Office that is responsible for the overall coordination and vision for a communitywide housing and homeless plan.

The HUD Continuum of Care grant requires coordination and collaboration among service providers. Many other granting agencies also emphasize its importance, and it is considered one of the key aspects of successful community-wide programs. At a minimum, some structure for regular communication and sharing of information is essential.

While a strong CoC organization is important, CKHHI does not have full-time professional staff or an operating budget. While it does an excellent job convening providers and advocates on a regular basis, its limited resources prevent it from providing the consistent level of coordination that a funded and staffed organization can provide. A decision was made when the Continuum of Care was originally formed that CKHHI would not take any money away from the allocations awarded to the individual agencies actually providing services. With the passage of the HEARTH Act (Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009), the continuum of care process has been codified as well as the use of the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). As a result, the responsibilities of CoCs have increased.

Collaboration and coordination will be essential if Lexington is to comply with these requirements. Furthermore, without proper resources and structure, Lexington will be at risk of losing vitally important federal support, which will only increase the burden on local government. It is important to note, however, that collaboration is not something Lexington should be doing simply to comply with HUD standards, but rather it is a fundamental component of any serious effort to address homelessness for our community. Resources are limited and rarely ever enough, which further demonstrates the need for strategic collaboration. It is nearly impossible to find a community who is successfully dealing with homelessness without broad, community collaboration and innovative partnerships. Communities who are often cited as being on the leading edge of addressing homelessness share two common traits: strong local government leadership and commitment and meaningful collaboration among service providers and other community partners. To be successful, Lexington is no different.

VI. A. 2. Recommendations

VI. A. 2. a. In order for LFUCG to take a more active role in addressing homelessness and the impact it has on our community, we recommend that the Office of Homelessness Intervention and Prevention's principle function be to focus on housing and homeless issues. It will provide planning, coordination, advocacy, and awareness about the changing needs and gaps of services within Lexington. This office would not provide direct support services, nor would it control or direct providers, but rather serve as an objective source of information and assist in problem solving for difficult situations that require multiple resources and organizations to work together. The Office would work in conjunction with the Department of Social Services, CKHHI, and other providers to leverage private sector involvement including businesses, non-profits, the faith-based community, and private individuals both monetarily and as volunteers.

This Office, working with CKHHI, would also play a lead role in prioritizing funding needs and monitoring progress, applying for grants, recruiting volunteers, providing education and outreach, and keeping LFUCG more involved in services related to serving the homeless. The head of this Office would be the direct liaison with CKHHI and significantly improve LFUCG's coordination with Lexington's homeless service providers. This Office would also be charged with the implementation of this plan, manage the HMIS program, and a member of this Office will serve as Administrative Agent of the Housing Trust Fund.

The Office would also organize educational outreach and community campaigns such as the 100,000 Homes Campaigns³⁷ which creates a community-wide focus on getting people housed and motivates coordination and leverages private resources.

We recognize that no one individual or individuals within this office will be able to singlehandedly implement every recommendation within this report. However, the Office will provide consistent leadership in ensuring that the goals within this report and others that are developed in the coming years will have the attention and support they need to be realized. Nearly every recommendation within this report will require partnerships among organizations and this Office will work daily to ensure that innovative solutions through collaboration are developed.

VI. A. 2. b. Because of the expanded responsibilities and expectations of CoCs by HUD, we recommend that financial

support be provided to Lexington's CoC via a contract to provide specific services for the community. Nationally, communities with both strong CoCs and local government collaboration and support are the most likely to have success in addressing homelessness.

VI. B. Funding

VI. B. 1. Description

There are currently several avenues of funding for homelessness and prevention in Lexington-Fayette County, consisting of federal, state, and local governmental funding, private non-profit funding, grants, donations, and volunteer hours. Federal dollars flow to LFUCG directly through the Community Development Block (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG). Federal dollars flow directly to the providers through the Continuum of Care.

CDBG is a flexible program allowing local government to address a wide range of community development needs.³⁸ In 2012, LFUCG received \$1.9 million in CDBG and the bulk of the money was used to fund infrastructure needs (\$865,000), housing rehabilitation (\$767,000) and provided to partner agencies for services (\$330,000).³⁹ The remainder of the money was used for administration.

HOME is the largest federal block grant to local governments to be used exclusively for creating affordable housing for low-income families. In 2012, LFUCG received approximately \$1 million, a 28% decrease from the previous year. The HOME Funds were provided to R.E.A.C.H., Inc., Lexington Habitat for Humanity, Fayette County Local Development Corporation, Parkside Development Group, Salem Village Apartments, Bluegrass.org, Community Action Council, and AIDS Volunteers Inc.⁴⁰

ESG is to be used exclusively for homelessness. In 2012, LFUCG received \$164,919 which was used by the Salvation Army, the Hope Center, Bluegrass Domestic Violence, and LFUCG Adult and Tenant Service. Adult and Tenant Services received \$80,000 for homeless prevention services and uses the money for rent and utility deposits and payments to assist households to remain in permanent housing.⁴¹ In order to qualify a household has to be at 30% AMI, have income, and be homeless. Recipients are required to meet monthly with their case worker. In December of 2012 they had 39 on-going clients and 84 short-term case management clients.

Adult and Tenant Services also receives \$200,000 in a general fund allocation to operate the emergency financial assistance program. The amount allocated is down from \$300,000 in 1996 even though the need

has not decreased. This is a crisis response program that provides all types of emergency financial assistance including rent and utility deposits and payments, and burial expenses. A household can only receive assistance once every two (2) years. They have to currently be without income but have pending income. There is no case management attached to the receipt of this money.

In addition, Adult and Tenant Services operates a payee program with 13 clients. There is an unmet need for 50 additional payee clients but it would require an additional social worker.⁴² Bluegrass.org also has a significant need for additional resources to expand their payee program

Adult and Tenant Services was previously awarded \$849,668 in federal Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program funds as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 but this money is now expended and will not be renewed.

LFUCG also allocates in the budget approximately \$1 million each year to partner agencies that provide services to the homeless including the Hope Center, the Salvation Army, Community Action, Arbor Youth Services, and the Chrysalis House.⁴³

Lexington-Fayette County receives approximately \$1.6 million in federal dollars through the Continuum of Care. In 2011, this money was used by Chrysalis House, Hope Center, Volunteers of America, the Kentucky Housing Corporation, New Beginnings, Bluegrass.org, Community Action Council, and the LHA.

The majority of the funds provided by the federal government to Lexington are based on a standard formula used throughout the country by HUD. The formula is based on a number of demographic factors. It should be acknowledged that the \$1.6 million from the CoC grant is not enough to meet the real needs of our community, especially since Lexington is a regional hub for mental health care needs. Therefore, to adequately address the issues as opposed to scraping by each year, it is critical that supplemental revenue streams be identified and actively pursued. Reliance on the federal government alone is not a good policy decision for Lexington.

There are, of course, funds outside of government expended to address this need but more funding is needed to more fully and comprehensively address the spectrum of need outlined in this report. For instance, Atlanta has just recently received approximately \$1.5 million grant from Bloomberg Philanthropies to do research and develop a program for street outreach. Boise, ID has a program called "Project Catch" which partners with businesses and non-profits to sponsor a homeless family or individual

for a year. Minneapolis raised \$350,000 in private funding primarily from downtown businesses and interfaith congregations to hire 10 case managers to evaluate the needs of homeless individuals and connect them with appropriate services. In the first six months of the program, 150 chronically homeless individuals were housed. There are clearly options and ideas of which Lexington needs to take advantage. It will, however, take someone focused on this issue on a full-time basis.

VI. B. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, look for ways to increase the funds available through all sources including applying for grants and leveraging private, non-profit, and faith-based participation.

VI. C. Case management and Support Services

VI. C. 1. Description

Case management is a system of comprehensive one-on-one support for the full range of needs for those who are homeless or in danger of becoming homeless. The type and duration of case management needed is dependent upon the needs of the individual. Case management is an essential component of the services needed to help most people exit homelessness or prevent them from becoming homeless in the first place. While case management can be a simple one-time intervention, it is an absolute requirement for programs like rapid re-housing and Housing First. Case management is provided by a number of organizations and LFUCG for the clients they serve. While there is some funding available for case management and support services at the federal level, it is very limited. According to Adult and Tenant Services and the providers that responded to the Commission's questionnaire, more case management and supportive services were the most frequently cited needs.

As noted in the previous section, other communities have found creative ways to fund case managers, including partnering with the private sector. Some communities have been successful in providing case workers at the public libraries where people who are experiencing homelessness often frequent.

VI. C. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office collaborate with appropriate partners to find innovative ways to increase case management and supportive services available to people in need including reducing or eliminating unnecessary paperwork and processes that take time away from helping

those in need. The Office would also seek funding for additional case management throughout the system including within LFUCG.

VI. D. Unified system of entry

VI. D. 1. Description

A unified system for entry is intended to better assess clients early in the process so that assistance can be targeted in a way that is most effective for the client in need and gets them into stable housing as soon as possible. A unified intake program can be a physical location or a process that is utilized by multiple organizations-- ideally all organizations-- involved in services to those who are homeless or on the verge of becoming homeless. A critical component of a successful intake system is to have a common assessment tool that is used by all organizations. Louisville is in the process of developing such a tool.

Except for data that is required to be entered into the HMIS (Homeless Information Management System) database managed by the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC), Lexington does not have a centralized intake program or database in which data is shared and accessible across providers. The HMIS data is primarily used to provide information to HUD. Individual agencies use their own intake forms and procedures, and some utilize databases separately from HMIS.

People become homeless for many reasons and the help they need to exit homelessness or to stay out of it entirely is unique to each individual. Therefore, thoughtful assessment of each individual's needs is an essential part of the process. Early and appropriate intervention is also critical to reducing the cost of homelessness to both the individual and community. While the Commission has found no evidence to suggest that people are not getting the help they need from the right providers, we believe that a unified system of entry would allow clients to access these services quicker and more efficiently, while saving time and resources for both the client and the many providers.

In addition, information about the makeup of Lexington's homeless population that is more consistent would enhance the coordination of prevention and homeless services and reduce fragmentation. This is especially important as the demographic makeup of those in need changes and resources continue to be limited. Furthermore, if Lexington's goal is to rapidly rehouse individuals and families, linking them to appropriate services as quickly as possible is critical.

Such a system is a requirement of HUD but communities maintain some flexibility in what type of system it implements. There are numerous

models for unified systems of entry throughout the country and if deemed appropriate, Lexington should design a program that meets its specific needs. It is also possible that the existing HMIS system can be enhanced to meet this need. Lexington should carefully examine lessons learned from communities around the nation and implement best practices so mistakes can be avoided. It is imperative that providers be included in the process and expected outcomes including the design of the assessment tool with a standard set of questions.

VI. D. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office, in partnership with CKHHI and other appropriate partners, fully explore whether a unified system of entry would be effective in Lexington and if so, how to design and implement such a system.

VI. E. Data management

VI. E. 1. Description

Accurate data is important to Lexington's effort to address homelessness for a variety of reasons, including a unified system of entry. Decision makers utilize this information to make funding and policy decisions. It can also be used at a micro-level to better assist those in need (see unified system of entry). It is imperative that the data collected is the appropriate information needed to quickly assist an individual or family. The data collected should also provide useful information for providers and policy makers. Ideally, data can be used to evaluate the progress made of certain programs or the overall effort to reduce homelessness in Lexington. The two primary sources of data relating to homelessness in Lexington are the annual Point In Time (PIT) Count and any information generated and collected through HMIS.

Participation in HMIS is a requirement of some HUD funded programs, and there are sanctions for the failure to enter the data, including loss of funding. Furthermore, when making funding decisions, HUD considers the extent to which a community is able to get service providers to participate in HMIS.

Not all providers participate in HMIS and information is not always entered accurately and in a timely manner. The information is used primarily to submit reports to the Kentucky Housing Corporation (KHC) and HUD and is not shared among providers or routinely used to inform decisions locally. It also takes a great deal of agency staff time to enter the data into the system which could be better used serving clients with support services and case management. While individual agencies maintain and

utilize their own data, which is entirely appropriate, access to timely, reliable information for the whole system is difficult.

Each year, CKHHI coordinates a PIT Count of people experiencing homelessness and a Housing Inventory County (HIC). The primary purpose of this count is to determine how many people are homeless at that particular time and how many beds are available. To avoid duplication, the count is conducted on a single night. Providers are called and asked to provide the number of individuals staying in their program on that night as well as other demographic information. In addition, every other year a count of unsheltered individuals is conducted at the same time the shelter count takes place.

VI. E. 2. Recommendations

VI. E. 2. a. We recommend that the Office, together with appropriate providers, implement a more coordinated data management system and utilize the information to identify gaps in service and find ways to continually improve the continuum of care.

VI. E. 2. b. We recommend that the Office, in conjunction with the providers, improve usage of the existing HMIS and find ways to enhance the data collected in order to better meet the needs of Lexington's continuum of care for the homeless.

VI. E. 2. c. We recommend that the Office hire or fund via contract one or more HMIS data entry specialists to assist agencies with correctly entering HMIS data on a regular basis. The agencies could submit data to this specialist and the specialist could then enter the data into the HMIS system. This would allow agencies to direct staff time and financial resources towards other needs such as much needed case management. This position should be funded with new money and CKHHI could be contracted to provide this service.

VI. E. 2. d. We recommend that the Office work with service providers to develop incentives to encourage participation in HMIS, including by organizations that are not required to because they do not receive and federal dollars.

VI. F. Education and outreach

VI. F. 1. Description

Two kinds of education and outreach are essential components of a comprehensive approach to homelessness. The first kind is directed at

the homeless and those in danger of becoming homeless, to alert them to the full range of service and support offered in our community. This is often integrated with efforts at coordination of services.

The second kind is education and outreach for the community, beginning with those who might provide resources and extending to the general community. The more people understand the many faces of homelessness the better able we will be as a community to focus present resources, expand the range of resources needed to address the issues raised by homelessness, and recruit volunteers and other public/private partnerships.

VI. E. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, develop and coordinate training for the community including landlords, judges, law enforcement, local business, non-profits, churches, and schools. Additionally, on-going training for volunteers and other staff in service provider agencies and programs should be provided.

VI. G. Day center with expanded hours

VI. G. 1. Description

Day centers provide a place for those who are homeless, whether in shelter at night or not, to get in out of the elements and receive some services during the day. There are currently two (2) day centers operated by faith based groups which serve adults⁴⁴ and one (1) day center which serves youth 11-17 years of age.⁴⁵ While one of the adult day centers is open from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm seven days a week, the other is only open 9:00 am – 3:00 pm Monday through Friday. It does not appear that there is a need for additional day centers, but expanded hours for at least one of the centers for adults would be helpful. The number of the people using the current day centers continues to rise and should be monitored closely.

VI. G. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office assist this center in expanding its hours with the recruitment and coordination of volunteers and ensure that they be located in appropriate locations.

VI. H. 24 hour shelter for the hard-to-serve population

VI. H. 1. Description

The chronically homeless, often people with substance abuse and/or mental health issues, are both the most visible portion of the homeless population and the hardest to serve. Some resist any assistance, some resist enrollment in programs designed to help them cope or change behaviors, some behave in ways that present challenges to themselves and those around them. The Catholic Action Center is currently operating a night shelter at the Community Inn and a day center at the Catholic Action Center and wishes to combine these operations.

VI. H. 2. Recommendation

We recommend that the Office work with the Catholic Action Center to find an appropriate location where these services will not negatively impact residential neighborhoods and where the services could be more conveniently and efficiently coordinated.

VII. SUBPOPULATIONS

The Commission clearly understands that homelessness involves people and therefore both the causes and solutions are multi-faceted. However, there are some subpopulations that are discussed separately. The order of the sections is not meant to indicate priority of importance.

VII. A. Families

VII. A. 1. Description

Families now make up 38% of the homeless population and are the only segment of the homeless population that increased during the most recent economic downturn.⁴⁶ The primary cause for most homelessness among families is the inability to find housing they can afford.⁴⁷ Most families experiencing homelessness are headed by a single mother who has an average of two (2) children, an extremely low income, less access to housing subsidies, and a weaker support system.⁴⁸ Many families are broken apart in the homeless system, causing an increase in the rate of placement in foster care.⁴⁹

The cost to the taxpayer of family homelessness is greater than that for single adults.⁵⁰ Not only does it include the cost of shelter or transitional housing but it also includes the cost of transporting children to schools and the impact of transiency on the education system. A study in Louisville, KY found that the availability of safe, decent, and affordable housing has a

direct effect on student and school success. Those students who moved schools and homes more than once during the year scored an average of 10 academic index points lower on the Kentucky Core Content Reading Test than students who had only one school move. Multiple movers were 8% more likely to be rated as novice (below grade level) than single movers and 10% less likely to be rated as proficient.⁵¹

There are also costs borne by the child welfare and the health care systems. As will be discussed below, it is important to do all that we can to prevent children from entering the child welfare system since a significant number of the homeless population are people who have aged out of that system. Providing families with affordable housing and rental assistance will prevent them from falling into homelessness and assist them in rapidly exiting homelessness. The best alternative to prevent homelessness, or ensure that it does not reoccur, is to ensure that an adequate stock of affordable housing and rental subsidies are available.

Rapid re-housing is the primary tool that communities currently use to reduce the number of families experiencing homelessness.⁵² Communities are quickly re-housing families at a minimal cost by providing assistance in locating new affordable housing, short-term rental assistance, and follow-up case management focused on employment. This approach has resulted in a decline in the need for emergency shelter and transitional housing,⁵³ it dramatically reduces the time families remain homeless, it costs 50% less than emergency shelter and 75% less than transitional housing, it improves access to emergency shelter and long-term supportive housing for those who really need it, and it allows homeless service systems to serve all kinds of families. Shelter and transitional housing are ill-equipped to meet the needs of families including two-parent households, single fathers with young children, and multi-generational households.⁵⁴

VII. A. 2. Recommendations

We recommend a rapid-rehousing approach be funded and rental assistance be expanded. In addition to its intrinsic value, it offers a great opportunity for partnerships with private landlords and the faith community.

VII. B. Persons with Mental Illness

VII. B. 1. Description

Approximately 20% of the homeless population has some mental illness: 15% have severe mental illness or co-occurring condition (dual diagnosis); and 5% have less serious mental illness.⁵⁵ This group includes men,

women, and young adults. Their condition can range from independent living skills with the correct medication to the need for supportive permanent housing with case management. This population started to increase with the deinstitutionalizing of persons with mental illness by the federal government in the 1960's and has continued to increase as both federal and state governments withdraw funding in this area. Approximately 44% of this subpopulation is also chronically homeless.⁵⁶ They are often the most visible, sometimes scary, and always heart-breaking subpopulation of our homeless. This population is also aging and it is sometimes difficult to place mentally ill individuals in nursing homes.

In Lexington and the surrounding counties, most individuals with mental illness who need evaluation for hospitalization are taken to Eastern State Hospital. Only 25%, however, meet the criteria for admission. While Eastern State does everything in its power to find a safe alternative for these individuals, often they wind up back on the street, in shelter, in the emergency room, or in jail. In some cases, the individual qualifies for assistance, but has never applied or does not have a payee to manage their money.⁵⁷ Without resources and stable housing, it is almost impossible for these individuals to maintain their required medication and other outpatient treatment, so they cycle through the system.

While this subpopulation is only 20% of the homeless population, they account for 62% of the cost expended by a community for homelessness.⁵⁸ In Louisville, the average cost for persons with severe mental illness was just over \$17,000 and the average cost for persons with less serious mental illness was just under \$6,000 per person.⁵⁹ However, this subpopulation contains 71% of the clients which cost the system over \$50,000 per person a year.⁶⁰ A study in Louisville found that in 2004-2005, there were 1,452 persons who were severely mentally ill or had a dual diagnosis that used homeless services: 626 were in emergency shelter, 792 were in transitional housing, and 34 were in permanent housing. Of the 626 in emergency shelter, 107 were considered "high-cost" with an average multi-system service cost of \$53,596. Of the 792 in transitional housing, 167 were considered "high-cost" with an average multi-system service cost of \$54,945. The average cost of providing permanent housing was \$27,450. Therefore, the community could save \$7.4 million a year by providing permanent housing to the high-cost clients.⁶¹

In Lexington the service array currently includes emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing, but there is a need for more permanent housing.⁶² Because of the permanent nature of the housing, the providers do not keep waiting lists. However, they believe that there is a need for at least 100 more beds of permanent

supportive housing for the mentally ill and this number will increase if the state moves forward in closing personal care homes.

The Louisville study recommended two (2) models which have demonstrated their cost effectiveness with these clients: Assertive Community Team or Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) and “Housing First.”⁶³ The study found that “[c]ontrolled research studies showed that homeless clients participating in ACT had reduced psychiatric hospitalization and psychiatric symptoms, better housing stabilization, greater client satisfaction, and greater likelihood of obtaining independent housing....Assertive Community Team models are expensive and must be targeted to homeless clients with histories of heavy–multi-service use.”⁶⁴ It costs approximately \$27,450 per client per year.⁶⁵ ACT will be discussed below. “Housing First” is discussed in the section on the chronically homeless.

VII. B. 1. a. Assertive Community Treatment

“Assertive Community Treatment” or “Assertive Community Team” (ACT) is voluntary and provides support and treatment to individuals with serious and persistent mental illness utilizing a team of providers who offer services in the community, including the individuals’ homes. The team typically provides case management, clinical treatment, psychiatric services, employment, housing assistance, family support, and education. The goal is to wrap services around the individual who has not successfully obtained mental health treatment within the traditional service delivery system and whose symptoms create cycles of dysfunction that include frequent hospitalizations, incarceration, homelessness, unemployment, and poor daily living skills.

The small client to staff ratio means services are more intensive and highly individualized. The 24-hour a day access to services means a crisis is averted as soon as it surfaces. Research has shown that this model is highly effective in stabilizing symptoms, increasing functionality, dramatically reducing rates of hospitalization, and consequently eliminating homelessness. ACT, even with its high cost of 24/7 treatment, has been demonstrated to be a highly effective and cost efficient model of service that produces excellent results.

In 2006, bluegrass.org implemented a modified ACT program called the Mobile Outreach Team (MOT) to serve individuals in Fayette County. The team consists of two fulltime case managers along with a part-time clinician, prescriber, and peer support specialist. To date, the team has served 54 individuals with 25-30

people receiving services at any given time. 63% of individuals served by the MOT were homeless at entry but with these supportive services, 85% were transitioned to permanent housing. The MOT provides similar services as an ACT team for about half the cost, with the same excellent results.

VII. B. 1. b. Mental Health Courts

People with mental illness have had a dramatic over-representation in the jails and prisons of our country for several decades. Untreated mental illness is often the causal factor to criminal charges. While there are a broad range of outpatient mental health resources in Fayette County, offered by Bluegrass, there are limited resources for people who are homeless. In fact, mental health services provided by Corrections have expanded exponentially while community mental health service funding has been flat-lined for a decade or more. Due to this limitation of mental health services, many persons with mental illness become unstable and are arrested, resulting in increased criminalization of mental illness.

Mental Health Courts have been developed as a way for the Justice system to use the leverage of their authority to help people with mental illness follow through with treatment, thus diverting them from Corrections. This type of “problem solving court” is most effective when it works in collaboration with Community Mental Health services, with staff that actively engage people in treatment and other needed social services. A key component is the voluntary participation in treatment as a diversion from jail and the dismissal of judicial sanctions with follow through. The successful mental health courts show that active engagement in treatment programs and support services not only improves the quality of participants’ lives, it also reduces public safety concerns, overcrowded jails and corrections costs. In Kentucky, there are several Mental Health Courts, most notably in Louisville and in Northern Kentucky. Both have impressive data that show the number of people who have been diverted from jail and frequent court involvement through increased engagement in mental health treatment. In Lexington, the establishment of a Mental Health Court is being explored.

VII. B. 1. c. Federal Benefit Assistance

The Social Security Representative Payment Program (Payee program) provides financial management of benefits for people who are incapable of managing their payments on their own. For most of us, this would most likely be a family member or friend but this is

often not an option for the homeless. In that case, another qualified organization or individual can serve.⁶⁶ While sometimes it is LFUCG, Bluegrass.org, other churches and non-profits, or individuals in town, it can also be a slumlord or corner liquor store. There is a great need for additional payees.

There is also a program to assist individuals in obtaining their disability benefits called “SOAR”⁶⁷ which stands for “SSI/SSDI Outreach, Assistance, and Recovery.” It is designed to increase access to the disability income benefit programs administered by the Social Security Administration for eligible adults who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and have a mental illness and/or a co-occurring disorder. This is very important for a number of reasons. The Louisville study found that 43% of this population was not receiving the disability benefits to which they were entitled which also made them eligible for Medicaid. Once they obtained their disability benefits, they had access to both benefits and health care which brought \$4 million into the system to pay for their care.⁶⁸

VII. B. 1. d. Street Outreach and Intervention

Street Outreach and intervention is also important for this population, as well as others, because it has been proven to significantly reduce the homeless population and the costs of multi-system service in other communities. People who are mostly unsheltered or not already in programming often have a number of challenges such as mental illnesses and/or substance abuse problems that make it difficult to seek appropriate help. These individuals are often chronically homeless and cycle in and out of jails, emergency rooms and hospitals, and mental health facilities. The cost to the community is significant and the problems only continue. Street outreach and intervention can identify these hard-to-serve individuals and through coordinated case management, individuals can receive the support they need. The Hope Mobile does provide a form of street outreach, but individuals must choose to go the Hope Mobile and case management is not necessarily provided. Historically, street outreach has been about providers trying to bring people on the street in to their programs. This should be continued, but a more aggressive approach is needed to target the hard-to-serve who likely need a number of interventions.

VII. B. 1. e. Triage/Crisis Care Center

As discussed above, currently patients are evaluated at Eastern State but very few meet the criteria for admission. If the person is homeless, the choices for shelter then become the jail (if they have

committed an offense), the hospital (if they are ill), or a homeless shelter. Often persons will have some medical and mental issues but they are not sufficient to require admission to the hospital. They are then placed in the shelter system which does not have adequate facilities to care for them.

In response to this problem, some cities have developed a 24-hour Triage/Crisis Care Center which allows for around the clock assessment and triage. After evaluation, individuals can be admitted for in-patient treatment, but if they do not meet the criteria for admission, they can stay at the facility, be monitored, and receive case management until the proper placement is made. The facility also serves as a step-down facility from inpatient care if clients are not ready to return home which will be discussed later in the report in the “Hospital Discharge” section.⁶⁹

Some Crisis Care Centers also have a jail diversion service which provides alternatives to incarcerating individuals impacted by their mental health issues. The Crisis Care Center provides the community with less costly options than inpatient psychiatric care, emergency room visit, incarceration, and involuntary admission to detoxification services and places the individual on a road to recovery not homelessness.⁷⁰

VII. B. 1. f. Court-ordered Outpatient Treatment

Some persons with severe mental illness do not accept that they are ill and will not take their medication or participate in treatment. Because the law protects individual civil liberties, it requires a court order to force people to do so. In Kentucky, court-ordered outpatient treatment is allowed under KRS 202A.081 in limited circumstances when symptoms are severe and long-term hospitalization appears to be the only options. Consequently, it is not used as often as it is needed. There is a ground swell of support for changing the civil commitment legislation to broaden the ability to order an individual into outpatient treatment. Changes in the legislation would allow treatment to be ordered any time there is evidence that an individual has a significant history of problems that are directly related to not following treatment recommendations. A change in legislation will have a positive impact on reducing an individual’s cycle from being on the street, to jail, to homelessness due to untreated mental illness.

VII. B. 2. Recommendations

VII. B. 2. a. Permanent Supportive Housing

We recommend that housing and case management for 100 beds of permanent supportive housing be provided under the assertive community treatment model. The average cost per individual would be approximately \$15,000⁷¹ for a total annual outlay of \$1.5 million.

VII. B. 2. b. Legislative Lobbying

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, lobby for the creation of a mental health court and advocate for changes to the outpatient treatment laws and any other laws regarding mental health that will assist this population.

VII. B. 2. c. Federal Benefit Assistance

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, work to expand the Payee and SOAR programs.

VII. B. 2. d. Street Outreach

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, actively develop an aggressive program of street outreach and intervention.

VII. B. 2. e. Triage/Crisis Care Center

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, further study the cost and efficiency of a Triage/Crisis Care Center to provide services to the individuals that are not admitted to Eastern State, other area hospitals, or the jail, to prevent them from ending up on the street and cycling through the jail and hospital system. The study should include using this Center for respite and palliative care, discussed subsequently in this report, as a detox center, and as a jail diversion center to cut down on the system cost of the criminalization of homelessness.

VII. B. 2. f. Policy Changes

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, lobby for changes to the state's Medicaid system regarding funding for assertive community treatment and court-ordered outpatient treatment to ensure that these programs are covered by Medicaid.

VII. C. Persons who are chronically homeless

VII. C. 1. Description

The federal definition of chronically homeless is an “unaccompanied (single adult) *and* disabled *and* homeless continuously one year or more or four or more episodes in the past three years.” With implementation of the HEARTH Act, this definition will include families with children. Nationally, the chronically homeless account for 17% of the homeless population and 6 out of 10 are “unsheltered.”⁷² In Lexington, they account for approximately 11% of the homeless population and 3 out of 10 are unsheltered.⁷³ Therefore, they are most often the people you see “on the street” and are the most difficult to reach and serve. They are also the most costly using almost 50% of the services.⁷⁴ The average cost of a chronically homeless person on the street is \$42,000 a year for police, hospital, emergency rooms, and incarceration.⁷⁵ Like the mentally ill, members of this group will most often cycle through the system of hospitalizations and incarceration without receiving the help they need to break the cycle. Most are not enrolled in Medicaid or other health insurance programs which could cover part of their care.⁷⁶

They also have high rates of mental illness and/or substance abuse⁷⁷ which prevent them from seeking the services available which often require them to be stable and sober before providing treatment. Often, the chronically homeless must be served “on the street” before they can either become stable or develop enough trust in the system to seek shelter and services.

As discussed in the Louisville study, one successful model for addressing the chronically homeless is “Housing First.” As discussed in the introduction, the traditional approach to providing homeless services was a “continuum of care” including emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive services. In order to obtain housing, an individual would have to be “housing ready” which included being clean and sober. However, it is now clear that the best practice for ending chronic homelessness is permanent supportive housing using a “Housing First” model.⁷⁸ In this model, the homeless are moved from the streets directly into their own apartments without the condition of accepting mental health or substance abuse treatment.⁷⁹

The model was pioneered by Dr. Sam Tsemberis, a faculty member of the Department of Psychiatry of the New York University School of Medicine, and the organization Pathways to Housing in New York City in the early 1990s.⁸⁰ It is currently recognized as a “best practice” by the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) and the

Department of Housing and Urban Development.⁸¹ It has been implemented in at least 22 cities across the United States; 6 cities in Canada; Australia; Netherlands; and Japan. It has also been included in more than 300 cities' 10-year plans to end homelessness.⁸²

Case studies have shown that it is incredibly cost-effective. It saves the taxpayers nearly 50% of the money they would have spent if the individual remained on the street for emergency services, police, and corrections. It significantly reduces the number of chronically homeless.⁸³ Nationally, there was a 7% drop in those experiencing chronic homelessness because of this model.⁸⁴ The average cost of the "Housing First" program is varies between \$14,000 and \$26,000 a participant.⁸⁵

Prevention policies, street outreach and appropriate discharge planning from hospitals, jails, foster care, and other institutions, is important to ending chronic homelessness. The City of Louisville has recently started a program targeting the top 50 revolving-door offenders who struggle with mental illness, substance abuse, homelessness and criminal recidivism finding that they incur millions of dollars in taxpayer costs at jails, courts, police, hospitals, and treatment centers. They are using an "assertive community treatment" model discussed above and they anticipate that it will cost between \$16,000 and \$20,000 a year per person in addition to the housing. The Louisville study found that the cost for such persons living in emergency shelters was \$107,912 which was more than twice as much as for those in permanent supportive housing. It is also more effective in improving lives. It is anticipated that Medicaid will pay approximately \$1.8 million of the \$6 million tab.⁸⁶

Most people initially find the program counterintuitive and resist spending money on individuals that are not working and may have a substance abuse problem, mental health issues or both. The reality is that the taxpayers are already spending money on these individuals and this program is much cheaper with a better success rate.

In Lexington, most programs have beds set aside for the "chronically homeless." However, there is no intentional outreach or coordination regarding this group. This group needs intentional outreach (as discussed in the section "Street outreach"), coordination, housing, and case management.

VII. C. 2. Recommendations

VII. C. 2. a. We recommend the creation of a "Housing First" program for at least 50 people. At last count, there were approximately 116 persons living on the street or chronically homeless.⁸⁷ Not all, however, will agree to participate in the

program. Based on information from local providers, the cost should average \$15,000 a person⁸⁸ for a total annual outlay of \$750,000.

VII. C. 2. b. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, develop a street outreach and intervention program as discussed above.

VII. D. Youth and Young Adults (18-24 years old)

VII. D. 1. Description

It is troubling to learn that there are unaccompanied children under 18 years of age that are homeless. There is also a concern in the homeless community that the number of homeless youth is underreported. Homeless youth can be runaways, committed to the Cabinet for Families and Children (Cabinet)⁸⁹ but not yet placed, have parents in other homeless shelters, or have homes where it is unsafe or undesirable for them to stay at that time because of severe family conflict, parental abuse or neglect that is not yet substantiated, parental mental health issues or substance abuse, or be in the juvenile justice system as status offenders – truants, runaways, or out of control.

Children must leave emergency shelter upon turning 18 years of age. If they have not been committed to the Cabinet prior to that time, they have no further support system. If they have been committed to the Cabinet and have not been adopted, they have 12 months from their 18th birthday to decide whether to remain in the state's care.⁹⁰ If the youth "opts-in," he or she can stay in the state's care through age 21 and continue to receive housing and case management.⁹¹ The Cabinet does not have to accept every youth that wishes to opt-in. Also, the youth can be asked to leave the system for disobeying the rules. If the youth "opts-out", he or she receives no further assistance from the state. The youth are considered to have "aged-out" of foster care. Approximately 20% of the homeless population in Lexington are young adults (18-24 years old)⁹², many of whom have aged out of foster care. The percentage of homeless who are older but were in the foster care system at some point is significantly higher.

VII. D. 1. a. Emergency Shelter for Youth under 18 years of Age

Arbor Youth Services (AYS) currently operates a 10-bed shelter for 11-17 year olds, but the demand is greater than shelter capacity. In 2011, AYS experienced a long period in which its shelter was at or above capacity and, consequently, stopped proactively seeking out

new referrals for services. While they had previously conducted semi-annual presentations to police officers and regular presentations to schools and other agencies in order to educate professionals about its services, they were no longer able to meet the high demand this produced and stopped aggressively seeking out these opportunities. In FY 2013, their funding from LFUCG decreased by over \$20,000 which further reduced their capacity to provide services because they lost one full-time staff position. There are currently 6-8 youth in shelter, and, while they have additional bed space available, they do not have the staff capacity to provide adequate supervision and case management for the full 10 beds on an ongoing basis.

VII. D. 1. b. Emergency Shelter for Youth 18-24 years old

Little attention is paid to the youth that are aging out of the foster care and juvenile justice systems, many of whom are reluctant to listen or receive assistance. Like most 18 year-olds, youth in foster care are eager to “be free” and often opt-out of continued care. It is not until after the year has passed that they realize they need assistance. There is no designated emergency shelter for these youth. They are mixed with the general population at the Hope Center, the Salvation Army, and the Community Inn. In 2011, the Hope Center provided shelter for 185 18-24 year old men.

This population, however, has special needs because of their experiences in foster care and the juvenile justice system, and their developmental stage. Their situation is compounded by debt and lack of access to medical care. Youth who age out of foster care are eligible to receive Pell Grant tuition waivers for post-secondary education. If students with Pell Grants do poorly, which occurs often, and are unable to return to school by choice or because of grades, they have to pay back the tuition. Furthermore, they cannot return to school until the loan is repaid. This happens routinely and creates another obstacle for the youth to overcome, makes self-sufficiency less attainable, and many become homeless or marginally housed.

Youth with serious mental illness receive Title IV-E funding, which is federal dollars, in place of disability. These are the youth most likely to become homeless, but there is often no effort made to flag them for additional help. Also, after 19, foster care youth lose Medicaid coverage unless they are able to qualify on their own. Therefore, they lose access to medications and mental health treatment as well as other medical care. It is unclear if the Affordable Care Health Care Act will address this issue.

An emergency shelter designed specifically for this population would allow for a transitional setting with more accountability and less supervision than shelter for youth under 18 years of age but with more assistance and case management than offered by adult shelters in the community. AYS believes that approximately 15-20 beds would remain full if this service were offered in Lexington.

VII. D. 1. c. Transitional Housing for Youth 18-24 years of age

Currently, AYS is serving the population of youth who have not been committed to the Cabinet and the Methodist Home and Bellewood serve youth who have been committed to the Cabinet and have opted-in. AYS currently operates a Transitional Housing Program for youth that is funded by LFUCG. The program offers case management, rent subsidies, and other assistance to homeless youth ages 18-21 years old. 10 youth are served per year in this program, although the demand is actually much higher and the waiting list can be up to one year long. There is a great need for these services to be provided to youth up to 24 years of age but they have been unable to expand the program due to insufficient funding. AYS needs funding to provide service to an additional 60 young adults each year..

VII. D. 2. Recommendations

Addressing the complex issues regarding youth homelessness is critical since these youth are a major component of the homeless population. If they do not obtain stability as young adults, they will battle the revolving door of homelessness for the rest of their lives. This is a crucial point of possible intervention, where an investment of resources would reduce the numbers of youth who end up homeless for a period of time or chronically homeless.

VII. D. 2. a. Housing

VII. D. 2. a. i. We recommend that at least 10 additional beds of emergency shelter be provided for youth under 18 years of age.⁹³ According to AYS, additional annual funding of \$400,000 is needed in this area in addition to the capital cost to buy or rent housing.

VII. D. 2. a. ii. We recommend that 20 beds of emergency shelter be provided to young adults between the ages of 18-24 years old. The cost to open a 20 bed shelter would be

approximately \$373,000 per year in addition to the cost of the construction or purchase cost of the facility.

VII. D. 2. a. iii. We recommend that an additional 60 young adults be provided transitional housing each year. It costs approximately \$3,500 a bed to provide transitional housing for young adults. Therefore, approximately \$210,000 is needed annually.⁹⁴

VII. D. 2. b. Legislative and Policy Changes

We recommend that the Office lobby for legislative changes to the foster care laws to allow more time for youth aging out to opt-in to the system and state policy changes to the Medicaid system to allow coverage for these youth and the Chafee program funding for housing and case management until the age of 25.

VII. E. Persons with Substance Abuse issues

VII. E. 1. Description

Persons suffering from substance abuse account for approximately 13% of the homeless population but 20% of the system costs.⁹⁵ This group includes men, women, and young adults. In some ways it is one of the most noticeable groups of the homeless, and significant resources have been provided in the past to address this issue, particularly for men. Lexington has significant recovery resources but more is needed, particularly for women.⁹⁶

There is an unmet need for 143 recovery beds, particularly for women many of whom have children. Providing substance abuse treatment for these women will not only assist in preventing homelessness for these women but also their children later in life. Whether there is also a need for recovery beds for women with older children should be investigated.

Currently recovery programs are graduating individuals and sending them back into the systems from which they came. The possibility of recidivism is greatly increased if individuals do not have stable housing and case management during this period of transition. There is an unmet need for 350 beds in transitional housing. It is possible that more transitional beds will be required if more recovery beds are added, particularly for women.

VII. E. 2. Recommendations

VII. E. 2. a. We recommend that an additional recovery beds be provided. The cost of a recovery bed, not including the capital cost of acquiring the building, is approximately \$15,000 per year.⁹⁷

VII. E. 2. b. We recommend that 350 beds in transitional housing be provided. The cost of a transitional bed for this population is primarily the capital cost of the building.

VII. F. Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence

VII. F. 1. Description

A study by the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty ranks domestic violence as the leading cause of homelessness for women in the nation. Some studies have shown that between 90-100% of homeless women report that they have been victims of intimate partner violence.⁹⁸ It is essential that any homeless assistance program include adequate training of assessment and case management staff on the basic dynamics of domestic violence, risk assessment, and adherence to federal laws in place to protect survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

Bluegrass Domestic Violence Program, Inc. (BDVP) serves male and female survivors of intimate partner violence and their children from a seventeen (17) county region. The main office and emergency shelter is located in Lexington-Fayette County. In 2011, they served 10,000 clients, including 300 in shelter. 98% of the clients served are female, 2% are male; 50% are adult, 50% children; and 50% come from Fayette County.

The emergency shelter has 32 beds, but sleeps an average of 20 additional people each night on couches, floors, or in motel rooms. They also serve 208 in transitional housing through the Lexington Housing Authority, but could serve an additional 150 if there were funding for housing and case management.

Most of the clients are currently served without the need for emergency shelter. They are assisted in obtaining a protective order, which orders their abuser to vacate their shared residence, or in changing the domicile locks, or in changing domicile, or through other forms of case management. While many survivors of violence choose to remain in their homes after successfully obtaining an order of protection, they often find that they cannot maintain the property due to a lack of financial resources to pay the rent, pay the deposits to change names on the utility accounts, or pay for the necessary security measures to make their home safer,

such as lock changes, window locks, trimming bushes, improving lighting, or obtaining a home security system. Survivors of intimate partner violence often need to be released from a lease or utility contract.

90% of the clients who end up in emergency shelter could be served without coming into emergency shelter if more resources were available for rental assistance and case management. Some clients have criminal histories, or poor credit, rental, and employment histories; inability to pay security deposits, first and last month's rent, and utility deposits; or they have past due utility bills that must be paid in order to get the service transferred.

Immigrant survivors of intimate partner violence have even fewer housing choices as they are often unable to work, are ineligible for public housing, face discrimination in private housing, and have language access barriers. While immigrant victims of intimate partner violence are eligible to seek emergency shelter regardless of their immigration status, they often do not seek protection through the courts due to fear of deportation and language access barriers.

VII. F. 2. Recommendations

VII. F. 2. a. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, seek additional funding for rental assistance and case management to allow services to be provided without the need for emergency shelter. If rental assistance and funding for case management are made more available, then most clients could be served without the need for emergency shelter, which would be more beneficial for the family and the community, and would be more cost effective.

VII. F. 2. b. We recommend that an additional 150 beds in transitional housing be provided.

VII. F. 2. c. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, lobby for clarification or changes in the laws and policies which would allow victims of intimate partner violence to: terminate a lease; remove an abuser from their lease or utility contract; require the abuser to pay for enhanced safety measures for victims such as changing locks and improve lighting and any damage caused by the abuser; and increase ease of access to U Visas and T Visas for undocumented victims of intimate partner violence and human trafficking.

VII. G. Persons discharged from hospitals

VII. G. 1. Description

Most hospitals do not specifically track the number of homeless individuals they treat in a way that could be useful to the Commission. The agencies who provide shelter to the homeless indicate that on an annual basis, there are approximately 70 individuals they serve who are unable to live independently and/or are in need of referral to boarding homes, personal care homes, or nursing homes due to medical issues, or are in need of Hospice care.⁹⁹ Although local shelters make every provision to help discharged patients, there is a lack of personnel and appropriate facilities to provide follow-up treatments, medical equipment needs and management of medications for the homeless discharged patient.

Hospitals in Lexington are staffed with professionals who are trained to address the unique challenges of discharging chronic homeless individuals into a safe environment. Each hospital has discharge personnel whose job it is to contact the various shelters and organizations serving the homeless populations for possible placement. One hospital in particular, Eastern State Hospital, has recently added a Transition and Outreach Coordinator who serves as the liaison between the hospital and the Hope Center. This collaboration has proven to be an effective technique to ensure continuity of care.

Discharging chronic homeless patients from the hospital is a complex process that is fraught with challenges. Often the individuals who are discharged into homelessness do not have insurance or an income. Local hospitals often keep consenting patients well past discharge dates, while attempting to identify services and resources for a safe discharge all to find an inadequate supply of housing and support services to meet the demand.

Patients with co-occurring disorders, Serious Mental Illness (SMI) or Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI) pose an extremely difficult challenge for a safe discharge as do the homeless terminally ill, who have a heavy burden of disease, including physical illness, psychiatric conditions and addictions.

Effective discharge planning can contribute significantly to preventing homelessness. As part of a larger continuum of care, this process can help people reach goals of stable housing, recovery, and increased quality of life in the community. Discharge planning identifies and organizes services a person with mental illness, substance abuse, and other vulnerabilities needs when leaving an institutional or custodial setting and returning to the community.

Preventing avoidable re-hospitalizations has the potential to profoundly improve both the quality-of-life for patients and the financial well-being of healthcare systems. There is national recognition of the importance of this issue. The Affordable Health Care Act is penalizing hospitals if there readmission rates are too high.

Many communities are now providing “medical respite” shelters which is short-term residential care that allows homeless individuals the opportunity to rest in a safe environment while accessing medical care and other supportive services. It might be possible to combine “medical respite” with a Crisis Care Center that was previously discussed.

There is a growing body of evidence that a collaborative approach with local hospitals can reduce costs and increase positive outcomes. Partnerships with hospitals will be critical in solving this problem.

VII. G. 2. Recommendations

VII. G. 2. a. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, work with the local hospitals and homeless providers to develop a Respite Care facility to provide acute and post-acute medical care for homeless persons who are too ill or frail to recover from a physical illness or injury on the streets, but who are not ill enough to be in a hospital.

VII. G. 2. b. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, work with the local hospitals, homeless providers, and other non-profits to provide shelter-based palliative care for the terminally ill.

VII. G. 2. c. We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, examine the availability of necessary medications for individuals with no income or insurance.

VII. H. Persons discharged from jails

VII. H. 1. Description

Approximately 1 in 5 persons leaves prison and becomes homeless soon after. Former inmates tend to have limited or low incomes and have trouble obtaining jobs or housing because of their criminal history. Former inmates who are homeless are also more likely to return to prison.¹⁰⁰ It is therefore critical to address this situation, including federal bonding for employment and working with private landlords to overcome some housing barriers. Some communities have had success with “re-entry

housing” which is subsidized housing with associated intensive support services. In New York, it saved \$20,000 to \$24,000 relative to the cost of release to shelter and re-incarceration.¹⁰¹ Boston starts discharge planning while the inmates are still incarcerated and forms a Transition Accountability Plan with a re-entry support team which includes jail staff and mentors from the community. The inmate continues to work with the team 12-18 months after release. It has had a significant effect on recidivism rates.¹⁰²

VII. H. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office work with the Kentucky Department of Corrections and the local Division of Corrections to determine what, if any, re-entry programs are operating in Fayette County and find best practices to deal with the issue.

VII. I. Elderly persons

VII. I. 1. Description

According to the National Coalition for the Homeless, approximately 17% of the persons in shelters in 2008 were over 51 years old.¹⁰³ The age group between 51-65 years old frequently falls between cracks because they are not old enough to qualify for Medicare but their physical health resembles that of a 70 year old. Elderly homelessness is increasing despite the fact that a lot of housing assistance is directed toward the elderly. It is difficult for them to survive in the shelter system because of the physical demands including climbing stairs and waiting in long lines. They often need additional medical care or assistance with daily living. They often have difficulty navigating the system and may not be receiving all the benefits to which they are entitled.¹⁰⁴

One of the main causes for homelessness in this group is the lack of affordable housing. The current maximum monthly SSI benefit is \$710 for an individual and remains well below the poverty line. A person receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cannot afford housing at the fair market rate anywhere in the country and often the wait list for senior housing is very long. Economic growth will not solve the problem because it is unlikely they can return to work.¹⁰⁵

Because of the problems finding appropriate housing and the shelter system, they tend to stay in dangerous situations and there is a concern about elder abuse.

VII. I. 2. Recommendations

We recommend that the Office, in collaboration with appropriate partners, determine and address the needs of the elderly homeless in Lexington.

VII. J. Veterans

The Veterans Administration has made significant progress in reducing homelessness for veterans primarily using a “Housing First” model.¹⁰⁶ We applaud their efforts and do not believe that this report can add to what is already being provided. We recommend that the Office work with the Veterans Administration in any way possible to support their success and learn best practices.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

VIII. A. Summary of Recommendations by Section within the Report

1. The Gap Between the Cost of Housing and Earning Capacity (V.A.2., p. 15)

- a. Create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund;
- b. Increase the present fee levied on insurance premiums from 5% to 6%;
- c. Allocate 50% of funds for programs in the original AHTF proposal and 50% for recommendations in this report;
- d. Use funds for affordable housing units, administrative support, “Housing First,” rapid rehousing, and transitional housing;
- e. Designate the Office of Homelessness Intervention and Prevention as the Administrative Agent.

2. Employment (V.B.2., p. 19)

- a. Transportation:
 - i. Provide transportation assistance to providers;
 - ii. Explore partnerships with providers and local transportation networks and non-profits;
- b. Job training:
 - i. Maintain a list of job training programs and employers;
 - ii. Help providers foster relationships with employers;
- c. Opportunity:
 - i. Fund a Federal Bonding program;
 - ii. Study the other barriers to employment and seek solutions.
- d. 24 hour day care.

3. Coordination and collaboration (VI.A.2., p. 21)

- a. Create an Office of Homelessness Intervention and Prevention within LFUCG;
- b. Fund CKHHI to provide CoC services.

4. Overall Funding Needs (VI.B.2., p. 25) - Increase funding grant application and leveraging private, non-profit, and faith-based participation;

5. Case management and supportive services (VI.C.2., p. 25) -

Encourage collaboration among providers to provide more case management and seek funding for additional case management;

6. Unified System of Entry (VI.E.2., p. 26) - Office of Housing Services to explore if system would be effective and how to implement such a system;

7. Data management (VI.E.2., p. 28)

- a. Implement a more coordinated data management system;
- b. Improve usage of existing HMIS;
- c. Hire or fund a HMIS data entry specialist;
- d. Create incentives to encourage participation in HMIS.

8. Education and Outreach (VI.E.2., p. 29)- Develop and coordinate training.

9. Day Center (VI.G.2., p. 29) – Assist with recruitment of volunteers to expand hours and provide services in a proper location.

10. 24 hour shelter (VI.H.2., p. 29) - Work with Catholic Action Center to provide services in a proper location.

11. Families (VI.A.2., p. 31) – Fund rapid rehousing and expand rental assistance.

12. Persons with Mental Illness (VII.B.2., p. 37)

- a. Add 100 beds of permanent supportive housing;
- b. Lobby for creation of mental health court and changes to outpatient treatment laws;
- c. Expand Payee and SOAR programs;
- d. Create program of street outreach.
- e. Study cost and efficiency of Triage/Crisis Care Center;
- f. Lobby for changes to State's Medicaid system regarding assertive community treatment and court-ordered outpatient treatment.

13. Persons who are chronically homeless (VII.C.2., p. 39)

- a. Create “Housing First” program for 50 people;
- b. Create a program of street outreach.

14. Youth and Young Adults (VII.D.2., p. 42)

- a. Housing
 - i. Add 10 emergency shelter beds for youth under 18 years old;
 - ii. Add 20 emergency shelter beds for young adults 18-24 years old;
 - iii. Add 60 beds of transitional housing for young adults 18-24 years old.
- b. Lobby for changes to foster care laws, the Chafee program, and changes to the Medicaid system.

15. Persons with Substance Abuse (VII.E.2., p. 43)

- a. Add 115 recovery beds for women;
- b. Add 350 transitional beds for men and women.

16. Intimate Partner Violence (VII.F.2., p. 45)

- a. Provide additional funding for rental assistance and case management;
- b. Add 150 transitional beds;
- c. Lobby for changes to landlord/tenant laws and increase ease of access to U Visa and T Visas for immigrant survivors.

17. Persons discharged from hospitals (VII.G.2., p. 47)

- a. Work with local hospitals and homeless providers to develop a Respite Care facility;
- b. Work with local hospitals and homeless providers to provide shelter based palliative care to the terminally ill;
- c. Examine the availability of necessary medications for no income individuals.

18. Persons discharged from jail (VII.H.2., p. 47) - Work with Division of Corrections to develop re-entry plans.**19. Elderly (VII.I.2., p. 48) - Investigate needs of elderly population.****20. Veterans (VII.J., p. 48) - Support the VA in its work.**

VIII. B. Readily Available Cost Estimates

Category/ Subpopulation	Recommendation	Per unit cost	Annual Cost
Families	Additional funding for rapid re-housing, rental assistance, and case management		\$250,000
Youth and young adults	60 Transitional beds for young adults (rent and case management)	\$3,500	\$210,000
Chronically homeless	50 "Housing First" beds (rent and case management)	\$15,000	\$750,000
Persons with Mental Illness	100 permanent supportive housing beds for mentally ill	\$15,000	\$1,500,000
Substance Abuse	115 recovery beds for women	\$15,000	\$1,700,000
Young Adults	Emergency shelter - 20 beds for young adults 18-24 years old		\$280,000
Youth and young adults	Emergency shelter - 10 additional beds for youth under 18 years of age		\$380,000
TOTAL			\$5,070,000

VIII. C. Comprehensive Recommendations

VIII. C. 1. Funding

We recommend an increase from 5% to 6% in the present fee assessed by LFUCG on insurance premiums, to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund that will ensure consistent and reliable funding to provide major support for the recommendations that follow. We also recommend that the Office look for ways to increase the funds available through all sources including applying for grants and leveraging private, non-profit, and faith-based participation.

VIII. C. 2. Structure

We recommend that an Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention be created within LFUCG, guided by an Advisory Board appointed by the Mayor and approved by council, funded by the increased fee on insurance premiums, and tasked with overall coordination of the housing and housing-related issues cited in this report.

VIII. C. 3. Facilities

We recommend the following, funded in part by the increased fee on insurance premiums and coordinated by the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention:

- a. Create additional units of affordable housing;
- b. Create additional beds in transitional housing;
 - i. 60 additional beds of transitional housing for young adults 18-24 years old;
 - ii. 150 transitional beds for victims of intimate partner violence;
 - iii. 115 recovery beds for women;
 - iv. 350 transitional beds for men and women.
- c. Create a 24-hour emergency shelter for hard to serve;
- d. Create emergency shelter for youth and young adults;
 - i. 10 additional emergency shelter beds for youth under 18 years of age;
 - ii. 20 beds for young adults 18-24 years old.
- e. Expand present homeless day-center hours;
- f. Adopt a “Housing First” model for the mentally ill and chronically homeless:
 - i. 100 permanent supportive beds for persons with mental illness;
 - ii. 50 permanent supportive beds for the chronically homeless.
- g. Adopt a “rapid re-housing” approach for the temporarily homeless;
- h. Expand the rental assistance program.

VIII. C. 4. Services

We recommend the following additional or enhanced services:

- a. Create and support a system for a unified point of entry;
- b. Create and support a system for data management;
- c. Provide employment support including:
 - i. Transportation;
 - ii. 24 hour day care;
 - iii. Job readiness training;
 - iv. Federal bonding.
- d. Expand Payee and SOAR program;
- e. Develop a program of street outreach;
- f. Support VA in work with veterans;
- g. Encourage collaboration among providers to provide more case management and seek funding for additional case management.

VIII. C. 5. Policy Changes

We recommend advocacy at the state and/or federal level for the following:

- a. Changes to the landlord/tenant laws;

- b. Creation of a mental health court;
- c. Improvements in the foster care laws regarding “aging out”;
- d. Increase ease of access to U Visas and T Visas for immigrants ;
- e. Changes in community-based treatment laws;
- f. Changes in Chafee program;
- g. Changes in Medicaid system for person with mental illness and youth and young adults.

VIII. C. 6. Further Study

We recommend further study, with an eye to implementation, for the following issues:

- a. Investigate a Triage/Central Intake center;
- b. Work with homeless providers to determine how many beds of medical respite/palliative care are needed and work with hospitals to fund;
- c. Examine availability of necessary medications for no-income individuals;
- d. Work with Division of Corrections regarding re-entry plans for former inmates;
- e. Assess needs of elderly homeless.

VIII. D. Recommendations by Priority

All of the recommendations are important and are integral to solving and reducing homeless in Lexington. The Commission, however, understands that priorities must be set to guide the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention in addressing these issues. The Commission also understands that the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention may need to reorder these priorities given their expertise and information that may come to light after this report. With that in mind, the Commission made the following priority rankings among the recommendations:

The recommendations that received the Commission’s highest priority ranking are:

1. Increase from 5% to 6% the present fee assessed on insurance premiums, to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund to provide a consistent, reliable, dedicated funding stream to address the recommendations contained in this report;
2. Create an Office within LFUCG, funded by the fee increase and tasked with overall coordination of the recommendations contained in this report including finding ways to increase the funds available through all sources such as applying for grants and leveraging private, non-profit, and faith-based participation;
3. Create more affordable housing units to meet the needs of the homeless and those at risk of homelessness.

The recommendations that received the next highest level priority ranking are:

1. Institute a "Housing First" model for the mentally ill and chronically homeless;
2. Support creation of a mental health court;
3. Develop a program of street outreach;
4. Provide employment support;
5. Encourage and support collaboration among providers to provide more case management.

The recommendations that received the 3rd level of priority ranking are:

1. Adopt a "rapid re-housing" approach for the temporarily homeless;
2. Create a 24-hour emergency shelter for the hard-to-serve;
3. Lobby for changes to the foster care laws regarding "aging out;"
4. Create and support a system for data management;
5. Create emergency shelter for youth and young adults;
6. Work with homeless providers to determine how many beds of medical respite/palliative care are needed and work with hospitals to find funding;
7. Lobby for clarification of or changes to the landlord/tenant laws with special attention to assisting survivors of intimate partner violence.

The recommendations that received the 4th level of priority ranking are:

1. Support the Veterans Administration in their work with the veterans;
2. Increase ease of access to U Visas and T Visas for immigrants;
3. Expand the rental assistance program;
4. Expand present homeless day center hours;
5. Create and support a system for a unified point of entry;
6. Lobby for changes in the Medicaid system for person with mental illness and youth and young adults.

The recommendations that received the 5th level of priority ranking are:

1. Work with the Division of Corrections regarding re-entry plans for former inmates;
2. Lobby for changes in the community-based treatment laws;
3. Examine availability of medications for people with no income;
4. Investigate a Triage/Crisis Care center;
5. Create additional beds in transitional housing;
6. Expand the SOAR and Payee programs;
7. Lobby for changes in the Chafee program;
8. Assess the needs of the elderly homeless.

IX. Implementation Plan

We recommend that the Office of Homelessness Prevention and Intervention and the related Advisory Board recommended in this report be charged with ongoing implementation, and with monitoring, assessment, and reporting of progress made

towards increasing the supply of affordable housing and related appropriate services, reducing the incidence of homelessness, reducing the duration of homelessness, reducing the impact on those who become homeless, and reducing the impact of homelessness on the community. This progress should be reported annually to Council and the community.

We recommend that the Mayor's Commission on Homelessness not be disbanded until decisions have been made about recommended funding and structures, to ensure that there is a successful transition to an ongoing structure for carrying out the recommendations in the report.

X. Key Indicators

These Key Indicators are designed to provide a snapshot of progress on improving the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of services for people who are homeless in our community. The Key Indicators would be the primary vehicle for reporting progress to the community.

The Key Indicators are:

- 1) Increase in the number of affordable housing units;
- 2) Reduction in the number of homeless included in the annual Point-In-Time Count;
- 3) Reduction in the number of people included in the Street Count in the Point-in-Time Count;
- 4) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring incarceration;
- 5) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring emergency medical care;
- 6) Reduction in the number of homeless requiring referral and evaluation by Eastern State Hospital;
- 7) Reduction in the number of youth who age out of foster care who become homeless;
- 8) Reduction in the number and the amount of time spent in emergency shelter and in transitional housing.

XI. Conclusion

We know what a more humane, rational, effective system for reducing homelessness in Lexington looks like.

We know that we can keep some people out of emergency shelters if we intervene with minimal financial support when they are threatened with the loss of their place to live by short-term financial stress. We know that we can shorten the amount of time that some people spend in emergency shelters if we have more transitional housing available for them. We know that we can shorten the amount of time that some people spend in transitional housing if we have appropriate supportive services and more affordable housing units available for them. We know that we can keep more chronically homeless

people off the streets if we have more affordable housing units with supportive services available for them.

We know, in short, the most effective ways to intervene to prevent some people who are most at risk from becoming homeless or remaining homeless. And we know that these interventions reduce the present costs of homelessness by reducing the frequency of emergency room services and incarceration, and by replacing costly services with less-costly services.

We know that to have a more humane, rational, effective system we need a reliable source of consistent funding, a single, professionally staffed coordinating body, increased volunteer effort, and greater cooperation and coordination among all those presently providing services and support aimed at the homeless population.

We know that we can have a more rational, effective system if we have the will to commit the necessary human and financial resources to bring it about. We look to our community to have that will and make that commitment.

- XII. Appendices**
- A. Mayor's Charge**
- B. Make-up of Commission**
- C. Discussion of Commission work plan**
- D. Definitions**
- E. Homeless Count Spreadsheet**
- F. Homeless Count Spreadsheet explanation**
- G. Homeless in Lexington narrative**
- H. Provider spreadsheet**
- I. Links to additional resources**
- J. Grid/matrix for recommendations**
- K. Responses from hospitals**

¹ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2011). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, Update*, p. 30. Available from http://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/USICH_FSPUpdate_2012_12312.pdf.

² Approximately 116 people are unsheltered, sleeping in parks and doorways, under bushes and awnings, and in other encampments.

³ There are approximately 559 persons in an emergency shelter system designed to serve 419. The additional persons are sleeping on couches, cots, and mats. The Hope Center for Men, the Salvation Army, and the Community Inn are the only emergency shelter providers in town except for Bluegrass Domestic Violence which only serves individuals fleeing intimate partner violence. Arbor Youth Services ("AYS," formerly MASH of the Bluegrass) houses individuals under the age of 18 years of age. The Hope Center serves only men and sleeps approximately 205 in a shelter designed for 106. The Salvation Army serves primarily women and children, but if space is available, they will house a family. Otherwise, families are separated in the emergency shelter system. On an average night, the Salvation Army will sleep 158 in shelter space designed for 132. Both men and women, including couples, can stay at the Community Inn which averages 115 a night. On the average, Bluegrass Domestic Violence serves 52 women and children a night in a shelter with 32 beds. AYS has space for 10 youth in emergency shelter. Room in the Inn provides shelter for approximately 15 men during the winter months.

⁴ Transitional housing is provided by the Catholic Action Center, the Lexington Rescue Mission, the Salvation Army, Community Action Council, One Parent Scholar, Volunteers of America, Rainbow House (HIV/Aids), and St. James II (veterans).

⁵ New Beginnings, Volunteers of America, Bluegrass.org provide permanent supportive housing.

⁶ There was no street count done in 2007, the number was imputed from 2008. 2009 was the winter of the large ice storm and that is considered the explanation for the low numbers. The street count numbers for 2011 and 2012 were imputed from 2010. The next street count will be done in 2013.

⁷ <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2012/mar/12/shaun-donovan/hud-secretary-says-homeless-person-costs-taxpayers/>.

⁸ Economic Roundtable. (2009). *Where We Sleep: Costs when Homeless and Housed in Los Angeles*, p. 1. Available from http://shnny.org/uploads/Where_We_Sleep.pdf.

⁹ Economic Roundtable. (2009). *Where We Sleep: Costs when Homeless and Housed in Los Angeles*, p. 3. Available from http://shnny.org/uploads/Where_We_Sleep.pdf.

¹⁰ Economic Roundtable. (2009). *Where We Sleep: Costs when Homeless and Housed in Los Angeles*, p. 1. Available from http://shnny.org/uploads/Where_We_Sleep.pdf.

¹¹ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 10. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.

¹² Economic Roundtable. (2009). *Where We Sleep: Costs when Homeless and Housed in Los Angeles*, p. 5. Available from http://shnny.org/uploads/Where_We_Sleep.pdf.

¹³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2010). *Costs Associated With First-time Homelessness For Families and Individuals*, p. ES-4. Available from http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/povsoc/cost_homelessness.html.

¹⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2012). *The 2012 Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness*, p. 1. Available from https://onecpd.info/resources/documents/2012AHAR_PITestimates.pdf.

¹⁵ Greenstone, M. & Looney, A. (2012, October 22). The Uncomfortable Truth About American Wages, *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/10/22/the-uncomfortable-truth-about-american-wages/>.

¹⁶ Central Kentucky Housing and Homeless Initiative and Lexington Fayette Urban County Government. *Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in Lexington-Fayette County, KY*, p. 5. Available from [http://www.kyhousing.org/uploadedFiles/Specialized_Housing/KICH/Lexington10yearPlanPRINTFINAL\(1\).pdf](http://www.kyhousing.org/uploadedFiles/Specialized_Housing/KICH/Lexington10yearPlanPRINTFINAL(1).pdf).

¹⁷ National Low Income Housing Coalition (2005-2012), *Out of Reach*, p. 1. Available from <http://nlihc.org/orr>.

¹⁸ National Low Income Housing Coalition (2012), *Out of Reach*, p. 3. Available from <http://nlihc.org/orr>.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (2012), *Poverty Guidelines*, Available from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/12poverty.shtml>.

²⁰ Lex18.com (2011), *Census: Over 20 Percent of Fayette County Residents Live in Poverty*, Available from <http://www.lex18.com/news/census-over-20-percent-of-fayette-county-residents-live-in-poverty>.

²¹ National Low Income Housing Coalition (2012), *Out of Reach*, p. 83. Available from <http://nlihc.org/orr>.

²² National Low Income Housing Coalition (2012), *Out of Reach*, pp. 11, 83. Available from <http://nlihc.org/orr>.

²³ This means one-half of the households in that area have more income and one-half of the households have less income. It is a better indicator of income than average income since it is not as much affected by highs and lows.

²⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Data Sets (2012). Available from <http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il/il2012/2012summary.odn>.

²⁵ Including 1,303 conventional public housing units; 2,630 Housing Choice Voucher (Sec. 8) units; and 200 other affordable housing units; 437 of these vouchers are allocated to Community Partners including those service providers listed subsequently in this document who also provide housing to their clients

²⁶ Of those on the list, 944 were in the extremely low income bracket (<30% AMI), 104 were in the very low income bracket (<50% AMI), and 22 were in the low income bracket (<50% but <80% AMI). 576 are families with children, 67 are elderly families, and 90 are families with disabilities.

²⁷ Lexington Public Housing Plan, pp. 6-7

²⁸ Of those on the list, 266 were in the extremely low income bracket (<30% AMI), 42 were in the very low income bracket (<50% AMI), and 12 were in the low income bracket (<50% but <80% AMI). 210 are families with children, 51 are elderly families, and 10 are families with disabilities.

²⁹ 2,376 for a public housing unit and 316 for a Sec. 8 voucher

³⁰ Provided by Kim Jent, Lexington Housing Authority

³¹ U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (2012), *Poverty Guidelines*, Available from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/12poverty.shtml>.

³² U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Available from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing.

³³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Available from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing.

³⁴ Affordable Housing Trust Fund Commission Report, 2008; 2010 Consolidated Plan; 2010 CHAS Data

³⁵ National Alliance to End Homelessness (2007), *Fact Checker*, Available from http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/ba9d2bf0d27d8a163f_grm6bx92v.pdf.

³⁶ National Alliance to End Homelessness (2007), *Fact Checker*, Available from http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/ba9d2bf0d27d8a163f_grm6bx92v.pdf.

³⁷ <http://100khomes.org/>

³⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Retrieved January 13, 2012 from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs.

³⁹ Including the Salvation Army, Volunteers of America, the Hope Center, Bluegrass.org, the Police Activities League, Arbor Youth Services, Bluegrass Domestic Violence, Repairers of the Breach, and Imani AIDS Educational Program. Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report

⁴⁰ Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report, June 30, 2012, p. 6

⁴¹ Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report, June 30, 2012, p. 6

⁴² In order to meet the community need they would need a budget allocation of \$350,000, an additional eligibility counselor (\$40,00), an additional social worker (\$60,00), and access to a vehicle. In person communication with Beth Mills, Commissioner, Department of Social Services, and Connie Godfrey, Director of Adult and Tenant Services, January 11, 2013.

⁴³ Lexington-Fayette County Urban Government, *FY 2013 Enacted Budget*, Available from <http://www.lexingtonky.gov/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=20806>.

⁴⁴ Catholic Action Center and New Life Day Center

⁴⁵ Arbor Youth Services

⁴⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2012). *The 2012 Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness*, p. 3. Available from https://onecpd.info/resources/documents/2012AHAR_PITestimates.pdf.

- ⁴⁷ National Alliance to End Homelessness (July 27, 2009), *Affordable Housing key Component to Ending Family Homelessness*, Available from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/affordable-housing-key-component-to-ending-family-homelessness>.
- ⁴⁸ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 13. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁴⁹ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 13. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁵⁰ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2010). *Costs Associated With First-time Homelessness For Families and Individuals*, p. ES-4. Available from http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/povsoc/cost_homelessness.html.
- ⁵¹ Metropolitan Housing Coalition (2004), *Moving On: Student Mobility and Affordable Housing*, Available from http://www.metropolitanhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/member_docs/2004_Moving_On_Student_Mobility_and%20Affordable_Housing.pdf.
- ⁵² United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 14. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁵³ A study in Hamilton County, Ohio found that fewer than 8 percent of the families served returned to homelessness within 2 years. National Alliance to End Homelessness (2012), *Rapid Re-housing: Successfully Ending Family Homelessness*, p. 1. Available from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/rapid-re-housing-successfully-ending-family-homelessness>.
- ⁵⁴ National Alliance to End Homelessness (2012), *Rapid Re-housing: Successfully Ending Family Homelessness*, p. 2. Available from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/rapid-re-housing-successfully-ending-family-homelessness>.
- ⁵⁵ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 9. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁵⁶ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 38. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁵⁷ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 13. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>; United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 17. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁵⁸ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 9. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁵⁹ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 9. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶⁰ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 38. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶¹ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 40. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>. $\$53,596 - \$27,450 \times 107 = \$2,797,622$. $\$54,945 - \$27,450 \times 167 = \$4,591,665$. $\$4,591,665 + \$2,797,622 = \$7,389,287$.
- ⁶² Currently, in Lexington, emergency shelter for men is provided by the Hope Center for Men and the Community Inn. The Salvation Army and Community Inn provide emergency shelter for women but they are not counted separately from the general population. Bluegrass.org ("Bluegrass," formerly Bluegrass Mental Health and Mental Retardation) provides 2 beds of emergency shelter, 28 beds of transitional housing, 40 personal care beds that can be used for transitional living for people with mental illness who are homeless, and 29 beds in permanent supportive housing with their mobile outreach teams⁶². New Beginnings provides permanent supportive housing for 38 people. Canaan House provides permanent supportive housing for 17 residents. The Hope Center provides separate transitional housing for 24 persons with severe and persistent mental illness (SPMI) in addition to the emergency shelter beds. The Catholic Action Center provides housing for 16 people while they are awaiting placement at the other facilities.

- ⁶³ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 12. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶⁴ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 45. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶⁵ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 45. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶⁶ U.S. Social Security Administration, Retrieved on January 13, 2013 from <http://www.ssa.gov/payee/>.
- ⁶⁷ Substance and Mental Health Services Administration, Retrieved on January 17, 2013 from <http://www.prainc.com/soar/>.
- ⁶⁸ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 13. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁶⁹ Tucson, AZ, <http://www.crisisnetwork.org/crnsc/crisis-response-center>; Rapid City, SD, <http://www.crisiscarecenter.org/>; Waco, TX, <http://www.hotrmhmr.org/crisis-care.html>; Philadelphia, PA, <http://www.med.upenn.edu/psych/pah.html>
- ⁷⁰ Heart of Texas Region, Crisis Care Center, <http://www.hotrmhmr.org/crisis-care.html>.
- ⁷¹ Based on conversations with Ginny Vicini, Executive Director of New Beginnings (November 2012), the cost of a permanent supportive housing bed at New Beginnings is approximately \$9,000 not including the capital cost of the building and Sec. 8 vouchers received. Therefore, it will cost approximately \$900,000 not including housing. However, the cost per individual for the Mobile Outreach Team at Bluegrass.org is higher given the intensity of the treatment needed and closer to the Louisville cost of \$27,000 including housing.
- ⁷² United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 17. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁷³ Lexington, KY 2010 CoC application.
- ⁷⁴ National Alliance to End Homelessness (2010). *Chronic Homelessness Fact Sheet*, p. 1, Available from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/fact-sheet-chronic-homelessness>.
- ⁷⁵ National Alliance to End Homelessness (2010). *Chronic Homelessness Fact Sheet*, p. 2, Available from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/fact-sheet-chronic-homelessness>.
- ⁷⁶ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 17. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁷⁷ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 17. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁷⁸ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2010). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness*, p. 18. Available from http://www.ich.gov/PDF/OpeningDoors_2010_FSPPreventEndHomeless.pdf.
- ⁷⁹ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 12. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.
- ⁸⁰ U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (2009), Spotlight on Path Practices and Programs, p. 1 Available from <http://homeless.samhsa.gov/ResourceFiles/ou0axeoyo.pdf>.
- ⁸¹ Boulder City Council (December 13, 2011). *Housing First Programs and Related Issues*, p. 1. Available from http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/files/City%20Council/Study%20Sessions/2011/2011SS/12132011SS/Final_-_Housing_First_and_Related_Issues_12-13-11_Study_Session_combined_docs_3.pdf.
- ⁸² Pathways Housing First, Retrieved on January 18, 2013 from http://www.pathwaystohousing.org/content/training_and_consulting; National Alliance to End Homelessness, Retrieved on January 18, 2013 from http://www.endhomelessness.org/pages/local_progress.
- ⁸³ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 10. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.

⁸⁴ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (December 10, 2012). *HUD Reports Slight Decline in Homelessness in 2012*, Available from http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/press_releases_media_advisories/2012/HUDNo.12-191.

⁸⁵ Morgenstern, J. (August 15, 2010). "Housing First" and helping the homeless, *Los Angeles Times*, Available from <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/aug/15/opinion/la-oe-morgenstern-homeless-20100815>.

⁸⁶ Kenning, C. (January 6, 3 Jefferson County targets 'frequent flier' inmates with new intensive-treatment program, *Louisville Courier-Journal*, Available from http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/courier_journal/access/2858194931.html?FMT=FT&FMTS=ABS:FT&type=curren&fmac=d755010bb751e817793fdb6bef428c90&date=Jan+6%2C+2013&author=&pub=&desc=Jefferson+County+targets+%27frequent+flier%27+inmates+with+new+intensive-treatment+program.

⁸⁷ 2011 PIT Count

⁸⁸ Information provided by New Beginnings and Bluegrass.org

⁸⁹ There must be a finding of dependency or neglect for the child to be committed to the Cabinet and placed in foster care.

⁹⁰ State statute

⁹¹ State regulations

⁹² Provided by homeless shelters in town

⁹³ AYS believes they would be able to maintain 20 emergency shelter beds if adequate funding were available. At a minimum, \$20,000 in additional funding would allow AYS to regain the staff position lost this year so that they could provide adequate services to 10 youth on a daily basis. In order to add beds, a larger facility is needed. Their current annual budget includes \$46,350 in fixed expenses and \$335,085 in variable expenses for the shelter program. Adding an additional 10 beds, therefore, would roughly double the expense. The cost is greater for youth under 18 years of age because of the state required supervision ratios. Staff-to-youth ratios would need to be considered in determining the specific cost of incrementally increasing shelter beds between 10 and 20. For example, 11 beds would not be as cost-efficient as 16 beds due to required ratios.

⁹⁴ The program currently has a budget of approximately \$29,000 per year. To expand this program, a full-time staff member would be necessary. Even so, AYS approximates that they could serve 20 youth per year and hire a full-time case manager for the program for a total of \$70,000 (an increase of \$41,000 over the current budget).

⁹⁵ Kent School of Social Work (2008). *Cost of Homelessness in Metropolitan Louisville*, p. 9. Available from <http://www.louhomeless.org/coal%20files/cost-study.pdf>.

⁹⁶ The following providers have recovery services for men: The Hope Center - 269 beds; The Lighthouse - 12 beds; Shepherd's House - 31 beds; and Volunteers of America serves 40 veterans. The Lighthouse has a waiting list of 13 and Shepherd's House has a waiting list of 15. The Hope Center, Shepherd's House, and the Lexington Rescue Mission provide transitional housing for individuals that have completed a program. Hope Center Hillrise Apartments houses 40 with an unmet need of 200; Shepherd's House houses 10 with an unmet need of 40; and Lexington Rescue Mission houses 14 with a waiting list of 8. Recovery beds for women are provided by The Hope Center and Chrysalis House. The Hope Center serves only women and has 70 beds with 40 on the waiting list. Chrysalis House serves single women and women with children less than two (2) years of age, and has 70 beds with 75 on the waiting list. The Hope Center, Chrysalis House, and the Lexington Rescue Mission also provide transitional housing for individuals that have completed a program. Hope Center Rouse House houses 40 with an unmet need of 60; Chrysalis House houses 105 with an unmet need for 50, and the Lexington Rescue Mission houses 12 with an unmet need of 30. The Schwartz Center, which serves both men and women, is operated by bluegrass, and has 20 beds for short term residential substance abuse treatment.

⁹⁷ Provided by Hope Center for Women

⁹⁸ National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, *Some Facts on Homelessness, Housing, and Violence Against Women*, Available from <http://www.nlchp.org/content/pubs/Some%20Facts%20on%20Homeless%20and%20DV.pdf>.

⁹⁹ Information provided by the Hope Center for Men and the Community Inn

¹⁰⁰ National Alliance to End Homelessness, *Re-entry Fact Sheet*, Retrieved on January 13, 2012 from http://www.endhomelessness.org/pages/re_entry.

¹⁰¹ National Alliance to End Homelessness, *Re-entry Fact Sheet*, Retrieved on January 13, 2012 from http://www.endhomelessness.org/pages/re_entry.

¹⁰² National Alliance to End homelessness, *Boston Re-entry Initiative*, Retrieved on January 13, 2012 from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/boston-re-entry-initiative>.

¹⁰³ National Coalition for the Homeless (2009). *Homelessness Among Elderly Persons*, p. 1, Available from <http://www.nationalhomeless.org/factsheets/Elderly.pdf>.

¹⁰⁴ National Coalition for the Homeless (2009). *Homelessness Among Elderly Persons*, p. 1, Available from <http://www.nationalhomeless.org/factsheets/Elderly.pdf>.

¹⁰⁵ National Coalition for the Homeless (2009). *Homelessness Among Elderly Persons*, p. 2, Available from <http://www.nationalhomeless.org/factsheets/Elderly.pdf>.

¹⁰⁶ United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2011). *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, Update*, p. 34. Available from http://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/USICH_FSPUpdate_2012_12312.pdf.