



Safe & Stable Housing for
Brown County Consumers
Needs and Policy Options

A Study Commissioned by
Brown County, WI

August 2017



CENTER FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Principal Investigators & Report Authors

Lora Warner, Ph.D., U.W. Green Bay Center for Public Affairs

David Helpap, Ph.D, U.W. Green Bay Center for Public Affairs

Ryan Sievert, Graduate Research Associate, U.W. Green Bay Center for Public Affairs


Data Provided By

Brown County Health & Human Services Division, Brown County Jail

Funding Providing By

Brown County

TABLE OF CONTENTS



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS	i
INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
DATA AND METHODS.....	1
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	2
NEEDS OF CONSUMERS WITH UNSTABLE HOUSING	4
POLICY ALTERNATIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
Additional Housing Units	9
Expand Permanent Supportive Housing Options.....	10
Expand Transitional Housing Options	14
Public and Private Funding Strategies	
Pay for Success Model.....	19
Expanded use of WHEDA programs	21
Leverage Funding Through Partnerships	22
Additional Grants and Funding Opportunities	23
Supplementary Alternatives	24
Government and Community Support	24
Public Information and County Website Improvements.....	26
Comprehensive Homelessness Plan.....	26
Increase Coordination with Community Stakeholders	28
CONCLUSION.....	29
APPENDICES	30
Appendix A: List of Organizations whose representatives participated in interviews	31
Appendix B: Glossary	32
Appendix C: Survey of Brown County case managers.....	33

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to assess the needs of Brown County consumers who have unsafe or unstable housing and provide recommendations on strategies the County might use to improve housing options for these individuals. In this way, the County seeks to increase the likelihood of successful recovery for these consumers and to reduce the risk that they return to homelessness and cycle back into intensive, restrictive, and costly services or jail. This study does not focus on homelessness in Brown County *as a whole*, although it gives attention to existing conditions, stakeholders, challenges, and opportunities relating to the entire community. Rather, it focuses on the needs of Brown County consumers currently served by the Community Treatment Center Outpatient Therapy services, the four County treatment courts, and individuals exiting the Brown County Jail. The study included interviews with over 30 local and statewide experts, a survey of case managers, a rigorous literature search for best practice models used successfully in other communities, and secondary data. Analysis yielded findings and recommendations to address the needs of Brown County consumers.

Brown County has one of the highest rates of homelessness in the state, with 1,512 individuals identified as homeless at one time during the course of 2016 (and not including hundreds of other households that experience unsafe or unstable housing). Many homeless individuals participate in Brown County programs. Our survey of Brown County case managers at the Community Treatment Center, jail, and treatment courts estimated that of 391 consumers on county caseloads, slightly less than half (45%) are believed to have unstable housing or are homeless. Most experience a mental illness, over half deal with substance abuse, and three in four have very low incomes. Limits to available data precluded a direct calculation of the number of county consumers with unsafe or unstable housing. However, a conservative estimate is that at least 200 Brown County consumers currently experience housing that is insufficient to meet their needs.

The needs shown by these consumers overlap a great deal. Collectively, a large proportion of County consumers experience mild to severe mental illness with a variety of individual concerns. According to case management staff, maintaining the proper medications is particularly important because often, individuals with a mental illness who use alcohol and drugs do so to cope with symptoms. Almost all surveyed CTC case managers (92%) indicated that having longer-term treatment for mental illness or addiction was extremely important for their consumers. Some individuals with mental illnesses may need greater assistance on a permanent basis, while others may need more temporary support, such as to apply for Supplemental Security Income. For consumers with substance abuse barriers, the opportunity to foster a structured lifestyle is paramount. Many experts told us that individuals re-entering the community after a stay in jail (including individuals entering treatment courts) often have few or no housing options. These consumers are often rejected by ordinary housing providers due to their criminal records; they need a place to stay as they re-enter society and develop the skills and plans needed to achieve self-sufficiency.

The report concludes with a discussion of policy options selected for their alignment with the needs of Brown County consumers, feasibility of implementation by the county, and likely sustainability. Three sets of alternatives are provided.

Develop additional housing units for county consumers. We identified two housing strategies to expand the number of affordable housing units with supportive services. First, permanent supportive housing is needed for individuals with serious mental illnesses. Conservatively, 50-100 consumers could benefit from permanent supportive housing, where affordable units are provided either at a single or scattered sites with ready access to treatment provided by the county or contracted community agencies. Units could be financed with a combination of available sources and incentive-based approaches. Second, transitional housing is needed for consumers in treatment or recovery and those exiting jail to the community or treatment court programs. Immediate "front end" temporary housing with no barriers is necessary for

individuals leaving jail, since landlords are reluctant to house individuals with criminal records, employers are reluctant to hire them, and other homeless shelters may not be appropriate or available settings. Again, the County might consider developing a variety of options such as group homes, scattered individual units, or converted buildings given that a one-size-fits-all approach would not reflect the array of individual needs among consumers. The County could tailor housing arrangements to particular programs or services, such as the treatment courts. Securing landlords to participate has challenged a new supportive housing program in Brown County, but with county involvement, more could be willing.

Pursue public and private funding strategies. A relatively new model for providing social services, “Pay for Success,” connects governments, private investors, and nonprofit service providers. In short, the County would engage with private funders, who would provide upfront resources to a service provider who then must meet specific service outcomes. The County would then repay the funders if the established goals are met. This model could include supportive treatment. Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) offers another key funding source. Brown County lags nearby metropolitan areas in use of WHEDA’s Low Income Housing Tax Credit program to create permanent affordable housing units. While the tax credits accrue to developers, the source can be one of several financial resources that contribute to creation of affordable housing. Finally, the county could play a role in leveraging more federal funding (mostly from HUD). By partnering with the local Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition (BCHHC) or its nonprofit member agencies, Brown County has the potential to provide the local dollar match required by HUD. By providing staff—for a permanent supportive housing program or treatment court, for example—or investing its funds to lease several scattered site units designated for Brown County consumers, the region may capture a much higher level of federal funds. This approach will indirectly assist County consumers and reduce the need for intensive and costly alternatives such as inpatient care. Several experts we interviewed pointed out that this region has a great deal of potential to increase federal funding to area programs through greater collaboration between the County and nonprofit providers.

Explore supplementary alternatives. Brown County has an opportunity to pursue other alternatives to improve access to affordable housing locally. One of the most consistent themes that emerged from interviews with community stakeholders is the need for stronger, more public support for homelessness initiatives from Brown County government and an appeal for broad, comprehensive community effort—which could have the potential to stimulate greater philanthropic support. Brown County and area nonprofits also have the potential to benefit from a more detailed, comprehensive plan to address homelessness and safe and stable housing. Similarly, the county has an opportunity to impact the problem of homelessness (and benefit its own consumers, as well as other potential consumers) through increased coordination with the BCHHC.

In conclusion, the root causes of homelessness and unstable living conditions, while complex, are not insurmountable. Other communities have taken substantive and even innovative measures to ensure safe and stable housing for residents. Brown County consumers with mental illness often require greater support in long term housing or a more temporary situation where they can stabilize. One point is clear, however, Brown County is in a unique position to act as a catalyst in the community to expand affordable housing options to benefit all area residents. According to several individuals we interviewed outside of the Brown County system, involvement by the County has the potential to bring credibility to a housing initiative, to influence other organizations, and, in general, raise public awareness about homelessness. But Brown County cannot serve all its consumers, much less the community, without collaborating with other public and private funders, agency partners, and advocates.

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to assess the housing needs of Brown County consumers who do not have access to safe and stable housing and to provide recommendations on strategies to increase safe and stable housing options for these consumers. In this way, the County's goal is to improve the likelihood of successful recovery and reduce the number of consumers who become homeless after exiting services. Brown County Human Services has identified the following key populations, many of whom do not have safe, stable housing, on which to focus this research:

- ★ Adults involved with treatment courts with mental health and substance abuse issues
- ★ Adults receiving outpatient case management from Community Treatment Center under commitment orders
- ★ Adults under supervision of probation and parole with mental health and substance use issues
- ★ Adults exiting Brown County Jail with mental health, substance abuse issues

This study does not focus broadly on chronic homelessness occurring throughout Brown County. Nor does it specifically address individuals enrolled in programs and services offered by local nonprofit organizations (NPOs). Nevertheless, a great deal of overlap exists among the needs of the chronically homeless, homeless individuals receiving services from NPOs, and the County consumers who are the focus of this study. As this study progressed, it became evident there are many people in Brown County who are not receiving County services who experience homelessness, wake up in unsafe and unstable living situations, struggle with drugs and alcohol, and cope with a mental illness every day.

DATA AND METHODS

Multiple methods were used to identify the common and specific needs of County consumers and the obstacles that prevent them from acquiring safe and stable housing. We began by reviewing the Sequential Intercept mapping Report for Brown County (released in 2016) where participants indicated that increasing the housing options for the County's vulnerable populations was its top priority for change. Interviews with key stakeholders, surveys completed by case management staff, data gathered from County databases, secondary data from published reports, and literature searches all contributed to the findings presented in this report. The data were compiled and analyzed for relevance to the populations of interest and the County's goal.

INTERVIEWS

We interviewed community experts and key staff beginning with a list of names provided by Erik Pritzl, Executive Director of Brown County Health and Human Services Department. A snowball sample approach followed, as interviewees recommended additional individuals to interview. Most are currently employed by Brown County and community nonprofit organizations that provide direct services to the populations of interest, and several were volunteers (including all four of Brown County's treatment court judges, who were interviewed as a group). Additional interviewees work for the Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care and others represent communities or organizations that are currently implementing notable practices to address the housing needs of their respective homeless populations. While most were individual, face-to-face interviews, three were conducted in small groups, and five were conducted by telephone. In total, we interviewed more than 30 individuals in June and July, 2017.

Interview questions focused on the specific and common housing needs of the populations of interest. All interviewees spoke candidly with the understanding that their responses would remain confidential.

SURVEYS

When applicable, surveys were distributed to case management staff asking staff members to report how many consumers on their current caseloads have low income, a mental illness, alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA) issues, a criminal record, and unsafe and unstable housing. Co-occurring conditions also were noted. Demographic questions pertaining to consumers' gender, age, and race were provided to determine if systemic needs existed within specific population groups.

SECONDARY DATA

Data were procured from several County databases. The AVATAR database, maintained by Brown County Human Services, was used to identify the services consumed by clients who were documented as homeless from January, 2016 to May, 2017. Brown County Jail data was obtained through the jail liaison reflecting the needs of individuals who either requested to meet with the jail liaison or were referred to the jail liaison by another case manager. Data from the probation and parole office were requested but unavailable.

Data also were pulled from a host of national and local sources including, but not limited to, the U.S. Census, 2016 Brown County LIFE Study, and the Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care (the lead agency for homelessness data for Brown County). We reviewed data provided by the Brown County Basic Needs Task Force and Brown County Housing & Homeless Coalition.

EXISTING RESEARCH AND POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Extensive and targeted literature searches contributed to this study in two ways. First and foremost, these searches yielded valuable examples of what other communities are currently doing to address homelessness. Searches were used to corroborate, when necessary, statements from those who were interviewed. Second, significant efforts were made to incorporate existing studies of the effectiveness and efficiency of safe and stable housing practices in other communities. In short, the case studies uncovered through this process were instrumental to the development of alternatives ultimately suggested for Brown County.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Homelessness persists across the United States, confirmed by the Point-in-Time (PIT) Count annually. Mandated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the PIT is an unduplicated count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons that occurs on a single night in January. The 2016 PIT recorded more than 549,000 adults and children experiencing homelessness nationally.¹ This number only includes those who meet HUD's definition of homelessness and who have come into contact with the local Continuum of Care (CoC) provider conducting the count. It does not include individuals experiencing unsafe and/or unstable housing by temporarily sharing housing with friends and family.

¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "HUD 2016 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Homeless Populations and Subpopulations," *hudexchange.info*, last modified Wednesday, March 15, 2017, https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/reportmanagement/published/CoC_PopSub_NatITerrDC_2016.pdf.

A primary obstacle for many individuals experiencing homelessness is the lack of affordable housing. According to the Urban Institute, a leading research institution, "not a single county in the United States has enough affordable housing for all its extremely low-income (ELI) renters."² The difference between the number of units needed and what is available has increased. In 2000, for every 100 ELI renter households in the United States, there were only 37 satisfactory and affordable units available. By 2013, the number of affordable units decreased to 27. While these households are usually eligible for federal housing assistance, as noted by the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, just over one in four truly benefit because housing assistance is not an entitlement program like Social Security, Medicaid, or Medicare.³

For the homeless population, the lack of affordable housing units is not the only obstacle to achieving safe and stable housing. Mental illness and substance abuse significantly impede an individual's ability to both live an independent life and remain housed. Of the individuals documented as homeless during the 2016 PIT, 202,297 (37%) were either severely mentally ill or abused substances chronically. These disorders can cause an individual to become homeless or remain in need of safe and stable housing.

Of those identified in the 2016 Point-in-Time Count, approximately 86,492 (16%) had chronic patterns of homelessness. As noted by the National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC), someone is considered chronically homeless when he or she has a disability, has lived in a place not meant for human habitation for 1 year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years where the combined episodes equal at least 12 months.⁴ Despite the fact that this is not a large percentage of the overall homeless population, this subgroup can account for significant societal costs. As stated by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, chronically homeless individuals have the potential to use more than half of services provided in a given area.⁵

In Brown County, Wisconsin (population 260,401) the homeless population is considerable in size and faces many of the same challenges that exist nationally. According to the Brown County CoC, the 2016 PIT recorded 466 individuals experiencing homelessness.⁶ More broadly, 1,512 people experienced homelessness at one point or another in Brown County in 2016, 56% of whom had a disability. This is the most of any of the 69 counties that form the Balance of State CoC (which excludes Milwaukee, Dane, and Racine Counties). The Balance of State CoC notes the median length of time an individual in Brown County remains homeless before achieving housing is 52 days, with an average wait time of 107.6 days.⁷

² Josh Leopold, Liza Getsinger, Pamela Blumenthal, Katya Abazajian, and Reed Jordan, "The Housing Affordability Gap for Extremely Low-Income Renters in 2013," *Urban Institute*, last modified June 15, 2015, http://www.urban.org/research/publication/housing-affordability-gap-extremely-low-income-renters-2013/view/full_report.

³ "America's rental housing expanding options for diverse and growin demand," *Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard*, last modified December 9, 2015, http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/americas_rental_housing_2015_web.pdf.

⁴ "HUD Publishes Final Rule on Definition of 'Chronic Homelessness,'" *National Low Income Housing Coalition*, last modified December 7, 2015, <http://nlihc.org/article/hud-publishes-final-rule-definition-chronic-homelessness>.

⁵ "Homelessness and Housing," *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration*, last updated June 29, 2017, <https://www.samhsa.gov/homelessness-housing>.

⁶ Carrie Poser, WI Balance of State Continuum of Care, in discussion with the authors, June 2017.

⁷ "System Performance Measures (10/1/2015-9/30/2016)," *Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care*, accessed August 7, 2017, <http://www.wiboscoc.org/system-performance-measures.html>.

Those who experienced homelessness in 2016 had to meet HUD's definition of homeless and use a homelessness service provided by members of Brown County's Continuum of Care. Due to this narrow definition, 1,512 is the minimum number of people who struggled to acquire or retain housing because the definition does not take into account, for instance, individuals who did not come into contact with a local CoC provider. It also does not include those who reside in jail and will not have access to safe and stable housing upon release. Furthermore, there are several organizations in Brown County that provide programming for the homeless that do not use Service Point, the online information management system that is used to generate homeless statistics. Finally, this data does not take into account people who are forced to share housing and cohabitate in unsafe and unstable living arrangements.

The 2017 PIT revealed that chronic homelessness is a problem in Brown County. As stated in the PIT, within the Balance of State CoC, Brown County has the second highest number of chronically homeless households (5) and the highest number of chronically homeless people (32).⁸ For reference, across the Balance of State CoC, the average number of chronically homeless households is 2.3 and the average number of chronically homeless individuals is 9.6. It should be noted, however, that Brown County is one of the largest and most urban communities within the Balance of State CoC.

With regard to securing affordable, stable housing, Brown County residents struggle. Per the National Low Income Housing Coalition, a Wisconsin resident earning the minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour would need to work 89 hours a week to afford a 2 bedroom rental unit.⁹ Federal housing assistance from HUD helps bridge the gap between what individuals can afford and the units that are available, but those in need of housing do not always meet the requirements. For instance, in Green Bay—the largest municipality in Brown County—191 applicants were denied Housing Choice Vouchers (a form of federal housing assistance) from January 1, 2016 through April 30, 2017.¹⁰ Sixty-eight (36%) were denied vouchers because of drug related issues and 123 (64%) were denied because of specific criminal backgrounds. Additionally, due to Brown County's competitive housing market, landlords are able to be selective; having a Housing Choice Voucher does not guarantee housing.

Housing is not the only obstacle that Brown County's consumers and the general homeless population must overcome. They must also deal with the common perception that individuals from urban cities such as Milwaukee or Chicago consume and use supportive services. Throughout the interview process, case management staff and other stakeholders who work closely with Brown County's current clients and the general homeless population unequivocally categorized this notion as false. Undoubtedly, there are exceptions. But for the most part, according to stakeholders, the clients who consume supportive services from Brown County and local NPOs are long-term Brown County residents.

NEEDS OF CONSUMERS WITH UNSTABLE HOUSING

First, this report will examine common needs found across all subgroups of consumers. We surveyed 16 Brown County case managers who work with consumers of the treatment courts and Community Treatment Center (CTC) and asked them to estimate the number of persons on their caseloads who experienced selected barriers to housing. Table 1 shows that of 391 consumers served by both programs, slightly less than half (45%, n=177) are believed by staff to have unstable

⁸ Carrie Poser, WI Balance of State Continuum of Care, e-mail message to authors, August 7, 2017.

⁹ "How Much do you Need to Earn to Afford a Modest Apartment in Your State?", *National Low Income Housing Coalition*, accessed August 7, 2017.

¹⁰ Robyn Hallet, Brown County and Green Bay Housing Authority, e-mail message to authors, May 26, 2017.

housing or are homeless. More than half experience substance abuse concerns (57%, n=224), with treatment court consumers more strongly impacted (75%). Excluding jail data, according to CTC and treatment court staff estimates, nearly 9 in 10 consumers suffer from a mental illness (88%, n=343), and more than three-quarters of individuals in these groups are believed to have very low income (77%, n=300).

Table 1. Number of Consumers With Barriers to Self-Sufficiency

Total caseload	Treatment Court n=135		CTC Outpatient n=256		Combined Groups n=391	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Row total	Percent
Criminal record	128	95%	90	35%	218	56%
Substance abuse	101	75%	123	48%	224	57%
Mental illness	96	71%	253	99%	349	89%
Very low income	103	76%	197	77%	300	77%
Homeless/Unstable housing	62	46%	115	45%	177	45%

Source: Survey of staff, June 2017

Note: many consumers experience more than one barrier.

A similar rate of housing instability can be seen in data provided by the Brown County Jail. About half of inmates referred to the jail liaison were discharged from jail in 2016 with housing instability (101 of 198 inmates studied). Table 2 shows that of this group, 88% experienced one or more mental health or substance abuse barriers. In fact, 43% (42 individuals) of those exiting with unstable housing were characterized as having co-occurring mental health and addiction concerns. About 22% of inmates indicated mental health concerns only, while another 22% experienced only substance abuse. Co-occurring conditions were reported more frequently for female inmates (52%) than males (39%). On the other hand, males more often reported concerns related to substance abuse (28%) than females (10%). None of these gender differences were statistically significant.

Table 2. Number of Housing-Unstable Individuals Exiting Jail with Barriers, 2016

Barrier	Total	Male	Female
Mental Health Concern Only	22 (22%)	14 (21%)	8 (26%)
Substance Abuse Concern Only	22 (22%)	19 (28%)	3 (10%)
Both MH and AODA Concerns	42 (43%)	26 (39%)	16 (52%)
No MH or AODA Concerns	12 (12%)	8 (12%)	4 (13%)
Total	98 (100%)	67 (31%)	31 (31%)

Source: Brown County Jail

With the help of the Brown County Human Services staff, data from the County AVATAR database was compiled to determine the number of housing-unstable consumers who were receiving care from any County program. Data on all consumers with a current residence of "homeless" was requested. However, after reviewing the results, we could not be certain that all of these data had been accurately captured at intake. As a result, and this data source was not used to further understand the characteristics of Brown County consumers. Though requested, data from the WI Department of Justice related to Brown County individuals serving probation or parole also could not be obtained.

Consequently, we attempted to derive an approximate number of individuals served by Brown County who experienced homelessness or unstable housing. When the survey results and jail data are taken together, about half of consumers in

treatment courts, CTC outpatient care, and the jail are estimated to have significant housing concerns by case workers who know them. This amounts to an estimated 177 current consumers of the two programs and another 98 individuals who exited jail during 2016. Since the numbers reflect different time periods, we could not combine them directly. A conservative estimate is that some 200 Brown County consumers are likely to experience unsafe or unstable housing.

In addition to housing needs, Brown County consumers require ongoing treatment for mental illnesses and addictions. County case managers indicated the importance of various supportive options for consumers on their caseloads. Table 3 shows these results. Using a 5-point Likert Scale, we selected the two highest responses, "Extremely Important" and "Very Important" and combined them into a single category

Although the samples are small, the strong responses are notable. For both programs, case managers most frequently pointed to the need for ongoing financial assistance for rent. Additionally, CTC staff felt it would be especially important to have longer term, ongoing treatment available, while treatment court staff emphasized the need for temporary housing that included employment coaching, shorter-term treatment, and bi-weekly or monthly check-ins. A structured living situation (implying very close monitoring and management) was not rated as high in importance by either group.

Table 3. Percent of Staff Indicating Supportive Options as Important

	Treatment Court Staff (n=5)	CTC Outpatient Staff (n=11)
Structured living situation	60%	54%
Weekly-daily case management	80%	86%
Bi-weekly or monthly case management	80%	77%
Employment coaching or advocacy	80%	67%
Short term treatment for MI or AODA	80%	70%
Longer term treatment for MI or AODA	80%	92%
Ongoing financial assistance for rent	80%	92%

Note: Percent of staff that indicated extremely or very important

Source: Survey of staff, June 2017

Results from interviews with community and Brown County staff experts on housing and homelessness confirmed these data. Based on numerous sources, County consumers have a host of common housing needs, regardless of the subgroup. A strong theme across interviews is that all consumers need immediate "front end" (as one community stakeholder put it) housing support when they initially exit jail, start treatment court, begin probation or parole, or receive treatment at the CTC. Stated another way, clients would greatly benefit from having a place to stay for at least 60 days when reentering the community from jail or prison or at the start of their respective treatment program so that case management staff has adequate time to link individuals to supportive services and housing. Nearly every stakeholder interviewed said there was a lack of affordable housing in Brown County.

These same interviewees overwhelmingly confirmed consumers lack access to immediate safe and stable housing and an inability to quickly be moved to a safe place while using County services is detrimental to abstaining from substance abuse and criminal activity. Several stakeholders specifically mentioned the challenges single women have when attempting to find a safe, stable place to stay.

Additional challenges are associated with the process of securing a rental unit. In general, consumers, need help building up a rental history, putting down a security deposit, and paying the first month's rent. Substantial advocacy from County case managers often is need for consumers to help consumers secure their own lease. Landlords unwillingness to, in their minds, take a chance on someone they perceive may pose an increased risk to a unit can be alleviated, in part, by case managers' advocacy for their clients. However, based on discussions with interviewees, a vast majority of landlords will not rent to someone with a criminal record, mental illness, or history of substance abuse because of the high demand for rental properties within the City of Green Bay. Simply put, landlords can be picky because the highly competitive local housing market allows them to be.

The last common need among the subgroups is continuous access to support services as they transition out of care. This can take the form of case management, job coaching, medication management, outpatient therapy, and more, depending on the individual's needs. Due to clients' complex needs, coordination between services is especially crucial.

Men and women tend to have different motivations and goals according to several staff. While men often focus on employment and becoming financially self-sufficient, women top priority is commonly regaining custody of their children.

The following sections detail the needs of specific subgroups of consumers in need of safe and stable housing. The groups include consumers with mental illness, consumers with substance abuse concerns, consumers in treatment courts, and consumers exiting the Brown County jail.

CONSUMERS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS

Community experts assert that medication supervision is the foremost need for consumers who have a mental illness. Depending on the client, an individual may need to take multiple medications at different times of day. To complicate matters, sometimes consumers stop taking medications once they begin to feel better. According to case management staff, receiving the proper medications is particularly important because often, individuals with a mental illness who use alcohol and drugs are doing so to use cope with symptoms

Applying for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) is another top priority specific to this group of individuals. Depending on one's diagnosis or disability, he or she may be eligible for federal income. However, the application process may be daunting for consumers and without support and encouragement, many could miss available funding that could be used for various types of housing (e.g., permanently supported housing). There may be existing County programs to assist with this need.

Ultimately, the term "mental illness" deserves additional consideration. It is all-encompassing and used to describe an extensive range of diagnoses. Thus, there is no one size fits all solution to address this population's housing needs. Per stakeholder interviews, some consumers may be able to live in multifamily housing units while others would be best served in separate, permanently supported units. Therefore, a variety of housing options will be necessary to best serve the housing needs of this population.

CONSUMERS WITH SUBSTANCE ABUSE CONCERNS

For those with substance abuse barriers, the opportunity to foster a structured lifestyle is paramount. Over time, according to interview data, accountability in the form of supervision or occasional check-ins would benefit this population's recovery process. In the meantime, providing a safe and stable place to stay is fundamental to recovery. However, a clean

and sober living environment should not isolate this population as many individuals can benefit from social support and positive interactions that promote and advance the recovery process.

CONSUMERS OF TREATMENT COURTS

Interviewees mentioned immediate safe and stable housing as they are accepted into treatment courts is the principal need for this subgroup of consumers. Ideally, this "front end" housing would provide participants a place to stay for at least two months to help the transition from jail. This is especially true for Heroin Court and Drug Court participants where an estimated 85% or more of participants are in jail upon acceptance to the program. Due to limited housing options, treatment court participants sometimes remain in jail pending identification of available housing. A handful of individuals in this population stay at the NEW Community Shelter upon release and entry into the court program. But it is worth noting that individuals with an ankle monitor are not able to stay at this shelter due to its rules and restrictions.

Interviewees reported that individuals enrolled in Veteran's Court are able to access numerous sources of assistance, and do not face as many housing obstacles as other treatment court consumers. However, some housing situations are still not suggested for this population. Regardless of the treatment court, housing should be located close to employment opportunities, public transportation, and other supportive services. It should support development of healthy lifestyles.

CONSUMERS EXITING BROWN COUNTY JAIL

In addition to treatment court consumers, individuals leaving jail into the community would benefit from immediate "front end" housing with no barriers for several reasons. First, restrictions prohibit them from staying at NEW Community Shelter and the other primary shelters in Brown County. St. John the Evangelist Homeless Shelter, for example, is closed during summer months. Second, having a criminal record, many are unable to participate in the Housing Choice Voucher program, a Federal program that subsidizes rental payments of low income individuals. As mentioned previously, in Green Bay, from January 1, 2016 through April 30, 2017, 191 applicants were denied Housing Choice Vouchers. Sixty-eight (36%) were denied because of drug related issues and 123 (64%) were denied because of other criminal issues. Almost 200 individuals still applied for vouchers despite the fact that the application is clear that those with criminal records or drug-related issues are not eligible for a voucher.

According to interviewees, the first few weeks outside of a correctional facility are crucial for ex-offenders. Having a safe, stable, sober place for them to reside for several months while case managers connect them to supportive services is ideal. For instance, one stakeholder spoke of a client bragging that he lasted two weeks without using drugs upon his release from jail. At the time, his only housing option was to stay with family members who used drugs daily. In short, a lack of safe and stable housing can be just as detrimental to a client's future success or recovery as being homeless.

For individuals who have not been recently released from jail or prison and have been on probation and parole for some time, less is known about their specific needs. Probation and parole officers were unable to complete surveys with regard to their caseload. However, due to the similar and overlapping housing needs of the subgroups who are the focus of this study, as well as the overall lack of affordable housing in Brown County, it can be assumed that their needs are similar to those discussed above.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of potential alternatives were examined to address the need for safe and stable housing in Brown County. Although interviews revealed an opinion that the community on the whole appears to need a greater supply of affordable housing, our recommendations reflect Brown County consumers only. All recommendations presented here were selected for their alignment with the needs of Brown County consumers, feasibility of implementation, and their potential sustainability. Suggestions provided by community stakeholders, national best practices, and existing programs and efforts in Brown County were used to develop these alternatives. Additionally, significant consideration was given to the role Brown County can uniquely play in addressing the issue.

The strategies involve immediate placement into a financially subsidized housing situation with some level of treatment and support for consumers, or both. Some individuals will require permanent support, while others may be able to transition to independence in a few months. Figure 1 illustrates that consumers experience a range of severity in needs, and housing alternatives that we have proposed align with the levels of severity. Overall, most strategies involve collaboration with private entities such as nonprofit organizations, landlords, or real-estate developers.

Figure 1.



An overview of the alternatives begin below. The proposed alternatives that follow are divided into three groups. The first group consists of alternatives that result in the addition of more housing units in Brown County. The second highlights new or expanded public/private funding strategies, and the third consists of alternatives that have the potential to assist or improve the situations of those in need of safe and stable housing—though not directly adding housing units or financial support. Comparative cases from other communities also are discussed to provide examples and a starting point for potential adoption in Brown County.

ADDITIONAL HOUSING UNITS

Below, two strategies to create additional housing opportunities for Brown County consumers are highlighted. Both consist of developing affordable housing units that provide support services. The United States Interagency Council on

Homelessness (USICH) advocates the use of supportive housing.¹¹ It states, "Study after study has shown that supportive housing not only resolves homelessness and increases housing stability, but also improves health and lowers public costs by reducing the use of publicly-funded crisis services, including shelters, hospitals, psychiatric centers, jails, and prisons." The USICH states that supportive housing is cost effective, but states that "there is no single model for supportive housing's design." This flexibility allows counties, municipalities, and nonprofit organizations to mold supportive housing models to match consumers' needs. Regardless of the approach, however, supportive housing models focus on providing consumers with a safe and stable home environment while matching them to the appropriate supportive services.

For this assessment, the first model addresses individuals with long-term, significant needs, while the second model focuses on the recovery of individuals with needs expected to be more temporary in nature. Each model includes some degree of supportive services.

EXPAND PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING OPTIONS

In many cases, individuals identified as homeless in January, 2017 were impacted by struggles with mental health. These individuals with more significant illnesses often require care over the long term. Experts reported that without access to regular care, many consumers cycle in and out of homelessness, may be unable to keep jobs, and may require repeated admissions to more intensive services.

The permanent supportive housing alternative aligns with support needed by some of the County's most vulnerable consumers. Treatment and ongoing support of a consumer with mental illness can stabilize an individual's life, enabling that person to hold a job, maintain health, and live a fulfilling life. Almost all surveyed CTC case managers (92%) indicated that having longer-term treatment for mental illness or addiction was extremely important for their consumers. In addition to supportive treatment, there is a strong need for this housing to be financially subsidized or offered with low rent. Nearly every County staff member surveyed indicated that financial assistance was extremely important for those on their caseload.

Those most likely to benefit from permanent supportive housing are consumers of the Community Treatment Center, since most have a diagnosed mental illness and very low incomes. Twelve case managers at the Brown County Community Treatment Center reported the most important resources needed by their consumers were long-term treatment for mental illness and/or addictions along with ongoing financial assistance for housing. Respondents estimated that, of 256 consumers on their combined caseloads, 52% had substance abuse concerns, nearly all had mental illnesses, 75% had very low incomes, and 52% experienced unsafe and unstable housing. Based on these data, at least 125 consumers experience mental illness (at varying levels of severity) and unsafe or unstable housing. Conservatively, 50-75 CTC consumers may benefit from permanent supportive housing options.

While many Brown County consumers exiting jail or participating in treatment courts make steady progress to health and self-sufficiency, others could benefit from permanent supportive housing. Treatment court case workers and Jail Liaison staff estimated that of their 183 consumers, 75% experienced addictions, 71% had a mental illness, 76% had very low income, and 46% had unsafe or unstable housing. Conservatively, another 20-25 current consumers of the treatment

¹¹ "Supportive Housing," *United States Interagency Council on Homelessness*, last updated January 18, 2017, <https://www.usich.gov/solutions/housing/supportive-housing>.

courts may have long-term mental health and addiction challenges and could benefit from permanent or long-term supportive housing.

OVERVIEW

Supportive housing “combines affordable housing with services that help people who face the most complex challenges to live with stability, autonomy, and dignity.”¹² Permanent supportive housing serves disabled individuals, including those who are mentally ill, and/or have a history of substance abuse, or both.¹³ Units are leased indefinitely to clients in order to offer a safe and stable living environment. Permanent supportive housing provides more than a place to live, however. It also connects supportive services to persons on a case by case basis so they have the opportunity to live as independently as possible. These services can include therapy, counseling, financial literacy classes, and other life skills.

Nationally, permanent supportive housing models have been studied and scrutinized across the United States. For instance, in 2007, Portland, Maine examined the total cost of services used by 99 homeless individuals a year prior to being placed in permanent supportive housing and compared the costs to the following year. One year after being housed, the total cost of care savings was \$944 dollars per person. In addition to vastly reducing emergency shelter use (by 98%) and the number of days spent in jail, substance abuse treatment increased by 22% (78 more contacts) and psychiatric hospitalizations decreased by 38% (\$182,483). Mental health care services increased 35%. At the same time, the cost of mental health services declined by 41%, implying that, after receiving housing, consumers used less costly outpatient services.

Similarly, in 2012, researchers assessed 41 chronically homeless individuals in Knoxville, Tennessee and compared their service cost records the year prior to receiving permanent supportive housing with the year after. There was a 99% decrease in jail costs, an 86% decrease in days in jail, use of inpatient mental health services decreased by 23% (\$21,418), and the number of individuals who stayed overnight in a mental health care facility decreased from eight to four.

In a review of 32 evaluations of supportive housing programs around the U.S., the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) found evidence that supportive housing has positive effects on mental and physical health, employment, and other outcomes that lead to more stable and productive lives for those they serve. Not only does supportive housing improve people’s lives, evidence shows that it saves communities and public agencies significant dollars in decreased use of homeless shelters, health care services, jails, and police services. Further evidence shows that these outcomes improve the safety and environment of neighborhoods.¹⁴

According to community experts and stakeholders, Brown County currently has limited supportive housing options available for persons experiencing barriers such as a criminal history and mental illness. Most sites disqualify persons with criminal backgrounds or for drug use, two issues that face many County consumers. Other sites provide support for older adults or persons with physical disabilities. In early 2017, NEWCAP, Inc., a social service provider, received federal funding

¹² "What is Supportive Housing?," *Corporation for Supported Housing*, accessed August 8, 2017, <http://www.csh.org/supportive-housing-facts/introduction-to-supportive-housing/>.

¹³ "The Applicability of Housing First Models to Homeless Persons with Serious Mental Illness," *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*, July, 2007, <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/hsgfirst.pdf>.

¹⁴ "Evidence," *Corporation for Supportive Housing*, accessed August 7, 2017, <http://www.csh.org/supportive-housing-facts/evidence/>.

to provide supportive housing to 45 chronically homeless individuals with disabilities in Brown County. It is possible that some Brown County consumers will be served by this NEWCAP program, but only the few meeting the stringent HUD definition of homelessness. Furthermore, these units are projected to be full in fall, 2017.

STRUCTURE OF HOUSING FACILITIES

Permanent supportive housing can take a variety of forms, including individual scattered site units, group homes, or single-site units, where all supportive housing is located in one unit. Another alternative is a “mixed tenancy” model where a mixture of supportive and non-supportive units are located together in a single unit. Brown County may want to consider both single-site and scattered site options for subsets of individuals receiving County services.

There are numerous examples of successful models that use each approach. As noted above, NEWCAP, Inc. operates a scattered-site permanent supportive housing model, where NEWCAP holds the lease with landlords throughout Brown County, sublets to participants, and provides weekly case management services. Program participants pay 30% of income to NEWCAP as rent. The Fox Cities Housing Partnership employs a scattered site permanent supportive housing model, with its own staff serving in the role of treatment facilitator as they connect individuals with necessary services and community resources.

Although costly and more complicated to develop, a single-site unit can be an appropriate structure for those needing higher-level or around the clock supervision. Centralizing consumers into one setting enables the efficient delivery of treatment, medication monitoring, and closer supervision. Milwaukee County opened the Thurgood Marshall House in 2016, an example of permanent, supportive, single-site housing with 24 individual units for low-income adults. Residents can continue to be housed in the apartments and receive services and support indefinitely. Exhibit 1 highlights the facility and its structure. However, critics of the single-site model assert that individuals with addictions or mental illnesses should not be housed together, where they may negatively influence each other.

APPROACH TO TREATMENT

Another hallmark of permanent supportive housing is the availability of significant supportive services. Three general approaches to treatment include on-site care, community-based care, and mobile treatment. The optimal approach varies with the needs of consumers and housing structure. Single-site units typically offer treatment more frequently, while scattered sites more often provide community-based or mobile care. Brown County has the option of delivering support services itself, using existing case management staff, or contracting with a nonprofit social service organization to do so.

FINANCING AND DEVELOPMENT

According to CSH, supportive housing can be created through a building strategy or a leasing strategy. Brown County could consider building new permanent housing units, re-purposing suitable buildings, or refurbishing existing structures such as hotels. Many residents would have the ability to pay a portion of their rent costs using Social Security benefits. In fact, one form of typical support provided in this form of housing is assisting consumers to apply for benefit programs for which they are eligible. Partnering with local nonprofit housing organizations, developers, and the city of Green Bay, Brown County has the opportunity to leverage various sources of federal and state dollars to support development of permanent supportive housing. More information on collaboration and funding opportunities are discussed below.

EXHIBIT 1. PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
THURGOOD MARSHALL APARTMENTS, MILWAUKEE, WI

Description: Opened in October, 2016 as part of Milwaukee County's initiative to end chronic homelessness, the Thurgood Marshall Apartments provide housing options for chronically homeless people struggling with alcoholism. Residents of the 24 one-bedroom apartments can obtain around-the-clock mental health and social services on-site from Wisconsin Community Services, a non-profit organization specializing in the supportive services required by residents.

Funding: Built by Cardinal Capital Management, Inc., a national housing developer, the project was made possible by an array of public and private partners, including Milwaukee County, which provided \$500K innovation grant, the City of Milwaukee Housing Trust fund contribution of \$385,000, and WHEDA (with a \$2.75 million low-income housing tax credits purchased by PNC).

Partners: Launched by County Executive Chris Abele, other partners that participated included the Halyard Park Neighborhood Association, local elected officials, the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Milwaukee County Behavioral Health Division. First Business Bank provided a \$1.2 million construction loan.

Effectiveness: Similar models, implemented by Portland, Maine and Denver, Colorado have shown that permanent supportive housing leads to substantial decreases in incarceration costs, emergency shelter use, and inpatient treatment costs. In both cases, there was also an increase in participants' wages and the number of outpatient services they used.

Why it would work in Brown County: This model provides a long term housing solution for the chronically homeless who have a mental illness. It also allows for continuous care to be provided collaboratively with area nonprofits. Additional HUD funding could be leveraged by addressing this population's needs because HUD has designated chronic homelessness as a priority when awarding funding.

Additional Information:

<http://www.wpr.org/milwaukee-opens-states-first-housing-development-aimed-ending-chronic-homelessness>

<http://urbanmilwaukee.com/pressrelease/milwaukee-county-announces-new-milestone-in-efforts-to-end-chronic-homelessness/>

https://shnny.org/uploads/Supportive_Housing_in_Maine.pdf

<https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/hsgfirst.pdf>

https://shnny.org/uploads/Supportive_Housing_in_Denver.pdf

BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF THIS APPROACH FOR BROWN COUNTY

The County has the potential to achieve significant savings with reduced use of some of its most costly services. Research indicates that a significant percentage of consumers residing in permanent supportive housing will stabilize, reducing repeated inpatient admissions and related staff time needed for intake and processing. In fact, the Brown County Jail recently hired an additional staff person to work with individuals with mental illness and addictions, and so did at least two local homeless agencies. By providing housing and the resulting stability, Brown County has the potential to reduce the number of these individuals that wait in jail for housing, reduce resources required to assist them, thereby reduce costs and overcrowding.

Indirect benefits also are possible as a result of greater efficiencies when assisting chronically homeless individuals. Currently, the Green Bay Police Department, health care providers, landlords, homeless shelters, and others incur significant costs related to increased staffing, repeated police calls, readmissions, when unstable individuals repeatedly interact with public safety and health system in the County. Pursuing this alternative also has the potential to alleviate some pressure facing local nonprofit housing providers. According to our interviews, several nonprofit emergency shelters have added staff with expertise in mental health and treatment of addiction. These resources can be directed to other needs, including prevention and early intervention programs, which could reduce community costs.

The cost to develop or refurbish a single-site permanent supportive housing facility would require time and effort by the County staff to develop a funding strategy and supportive service delivery plan. Partners such as developers (a nonprofit or commercial builder) that might qualify for LHITC, a private lender, local housing authorities, private funders, and possibly supportive service providers or other nonprofit organizations would be needed.

Should Brown County pursue a scattered-site approach, securing landlords to participate has already proven challenging for NEWCAP, Inc. in recent months. However, the County's supervision of its consumers through treatment court programs and case management has the potential to make participation more palatable for landlords. According to numerous interviews, the housing rental market seems to be a "seller's" market in Brown County, with affordable housing opportunities obtained by more "desirable" lessees, such as individuals with cleaner records. WESTCAP, in western Wisconsin, has developed assurances and financial incentives to encourage participation by landlords, paying a doubled security deposit or paying first and last month's rent.

Developing a supportive service delivery approach may be a challenge. Brown County must analyze the implications of providing case management support directly (e.g., licensing considerations, staffing available) or consider contracting with a local agency. If permanent housing is expanded, the County may end up providing more outpatient services than previously, as some other similar programs have found. However, an increased need for outpatient services could be offset by the savings the permanent supportive housing model has the potential to generate.

EXPAND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING OPTIONS

Most homeless individuals are not chronically homeless or in need of long-term support. Rather, they have experienced a life crisis that leads to the temporary loss of housing and require some time to regain stability. Brown County could expand a variety of temporary housing options tailored to its identified consumers to enable them to have short-term housing while they transition to more permanent housing options. These units could be used repeatedly by County consumers while receiving County services.

OVERVIEW

Transitional housing is the provision of affordable housing with supportive services for homeless individuals for up to 24 months, where they develop the plans, skills, and means to move on into a stable and permanent living situation. The concept of transitional housing arose with prominence in the 1980s to increase the likelihood that those released from institutions would sustain independent living in the community after having developed the skills they would need by participating in supportive programs. In recent years, HUD is increasing its focus and funding on an approach known as “rapid re-housing,” or movement by homeless individuals directly into permanent, sustainable housing with some support, eliminating shorter-term transitional housing. However, we envision Brown County’s strategy as one which will provide temporary use by County consumers of the same additional housing units, thus making it more of a transitional housing strategy.

Brown County survey data indicate the need for temporary or transitional supportive housing. Five treatment court caseworkers estimated that 34% (n=46) of their consumers had housing concerns, 72% had substance abuse concerns, and 59% had mental illnesses. Moreover, the Brown County Jail data showed that 26 individuals on the current caseload had housing concerns, and 90% of them had mental health, AODA, or co-occurring conditions. Finally, of the 137 CTC consumers with housing concerns, many have mental health needs that would not require permanent support, but are likely to need housing support to help them stabilize. Conservatively, Brown County could potentially provide transitional supportive housing for 125 to 150 consumers.

Interviews with local experts and secondary data indicate a need for this short-term supported option, especially for individuals transitioning out of jail or beginning treatment court. Nearly all of these consumers have criminal records, posing a well-known barrier to obtaining housing vouchers, housing rental, and employment. Currently, because of the dearth of affordable rentals available, landlords can choose to rent to individuals who have not committed a crime. In fact, the majority of local experts suggested that inadequate housing options may lead County consumers to exit jail into local homeless shelters, and in some cases, to remain in jail longer until housing can be secured. These options do not offer an environment supportive of recovery for the consumer and County resources are not used in an optimal way.

This proposed alternative provides transitional support for consumers and avoids placing the County in the position of having to secure new housing units on an ongoing basis. Under ideal circumstances, the County would provide certain consumers with permanent housing upon exit from jail or beginning of treatment by rapidly placing them into permanent housing, an emerging trend in community housing.

STRUCTURE OF HOUSING FACILITIES

The strategies to create and manage transitional housing parallel the strategies to create permanent supportive housing. Brown County could own or lease a single-site facility with multiple residential units, own or contract for a supported congregate living arrangement, or secure multiple scattered sites by purchasing or leasing well-suited units from local organizations or landlords. In fact, the County could consider deploying several of these options to align with various distinct needs of consumer segments.

This report does not map out particular housing options for consumer segments, rather we suggest that the County include staff in decisions about the best housing situation to establish for consumer groups. There is not a "one size fits all" housing approach for Brown County consumers who are becoming more stable in the short term. Brown County has an opportunity to develop housing facilities to optimally serve defined populations. For example, several interviewees had clear ideas

about suitable housing for treatment court consumers. The treatment court programs offer an excellent opportunity for targeted housing options. Currently, 46 participants in the treatment court programs experience housing concerns. Individuals accepted into a treatment court could immediately exit jail and move into a Brown County supported transitional housing unit for several months. The County could secure a number of scattered site apartments for consumers suited for an individual living situation and also refurbish a home that houses 8-10 consumers in a more structured clean and sober congregate program suitable for them. Alternatively, the County could contract for housing units from a local nonprofit organization. The combination of approaches provides flexibility. Experts believed that providing safe and stable "front end" housing to treatment court participants could facilitate their successful recovery and move them through the program more efficiently.

APPROACH TO TREATMENT

While consumers with serious mental illnesses and addictions require permanent supervision and support, Brown County consumers viewed as most appropriate for transitional housing may require periodic case management and less structured living situations. Some will require a structured, monitored living situation for a year or more. For others, an ideal situation could place recovering alcoholics together in a setting where they keep each other accountable through sobriety programs or check-ins. The County might provide onsite around-the-clock monitoring and supervision at one site for consumers in recovery, and at another site, offer much more limited case management. Consumers that exit County jail facilities often need support to develop a plan for employment, housing, and new way of life after being in jail. They may need to build employment skills, locate a job, and establish a credit history. Treatment may include mental and behavioral health counseling and the development of life skills.

The County has the opportunity to designate its own case management staff to deliver supportive services or to partner with other community organizations. The Ecumenical Partnership for Housing (EPH), a Green Bay nonprofit organization with over 20 transitional housing units for families, owns and maintains homes while partnering with The Salvation Army to deliver case management services. The two organizations offer a coordinated and highly effective program through close collaboration. In another model, the Fox Cities Housing Partnership owns transitional housing units and its own staff members serve as case managers who help families make connections with other supportive resources.

If the County implemented a similar model, with a community organization providing the physical housing and Brown County providing treatment, federal funding could be leveraged. The allocation of County staff would count toward the match dollars required by HUD on applications for funding. According to our interviewees, community organizations have challenges fronting these match dollars, and the County might be in the best position to meet this need.

FINANCING AND DEVELOPMENT

Again, a building strategy or a leasing strategy could be used to obtain transitional housing units. Brown County could consider partnering with NeighborWorks or other developers to build new units, re-purpose suitable buildings, or refurbish existing structures such as hotels. The County could establish ongoing leases with other partners, such as existing nonprofit organizations or landlords. Neighborworks current partnership with Newcap is highlighted in Exhibit 2. According to community experts, landlords are much more likely to lease apartments to Brown County itself than to the individual consumers. The funding options discussed with regard to permanent support housing could also be applied to transitional housing.

Depending on Brown County's preference, consumers could reside in this housing rent-free for the entire time or for a few months. The County could choose to charge an affordable or graduated rental fee, in essence, sub-letting the unit to the consumer. Wages or public benefits could be used by consumers to pay affordable rental costs.

EXHIBIT 2. SCATTERED-SITE HOUSING

WISCONSIN NEWCAP & NEIGHBORWORKS, GREEN BAY, WI

Description: In 2017, Newcap, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, received a grant from HUD to house chronically homeless individuals in Green Bay, Wisconsin. Due to a competitive housing market, however, it was difficult to find landlords willing to house clients who lacked a positive rental history or had a mental illness. However, contrary to landlords who rent a property for personal financial gain, NeighborWorks' strives to provide housing opportunities for people so that their lives may improve and the surrounding community can grow stronger. Partnering with NeighborWorks, also a 501(c)(3), allowed Newcap to provide safe and stable housing for multiple clients while simultaneously connecting them to supportive services.

Leasing a property from NeighborWorks allows Newcap to sublease the unit to a chronically homeless individual with the understanding that NeighborWorks will be reimbursed should damages to the unit exceed the security deposit. Clients also benefit because Newcap holds the lease and clients do not need to worry about paying the first month's rent in advance or about being taken advantage of by absentee landlords.

Funding: A client pays 30% of his or her gross adjusted income to Newcap and, because the client meets HUD's definition of chronically homeless, HUD pays the remainder.

Partners: Newcap provides case management and NeighborWorks contributes property management.

Effectiveness: The scattered-site housing model is an effective way to quickly build up a supply of affordable housing without having to build or own units.

Why it would work in Brown County: NeighborWorks' units are located within Green Bay, which would allow Brown County's clients access to transportation, employment opportunities, and supportive services. Brown County would not need to build any housing and it would not need to provide property management. Having a nonprofit provide property management is ideal in a scattered-site supportive housing model because, as stated by Coalition Homes and the Corporation for Supportive Housing, all partners "must have a shared commitment to the success of the community and each of the tenants that resides in the building." Finally, NeighborWorks owns a variety of properties from which to choose, and Brown County could decide how many consumers are placed in a unit and for what duration.

Additional Information:

http://newcap.org/program_category/crisis/

<http://nwwgreenbay.org/>

<http://www.csh.org/toolkit/public-housing-agencies-toolkit/primer-on-homelessness-and-supportive-housing/supportive-housing/>

http://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Tool_PropertyMgmtManual.pdf

BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES FOR BROWN COUNTY

A transitional housing model could be implemented more quickly than permanent supportive housing due to the lower level of support needed. Financial opportunities and benefits are similar to benefits previously described regarding the permanent housing proposal. As discussed earlier, the County may accrue cost savings as consumers complete programs more efficiently and effectively while residing in an environment conducive to recovery. Transitional housing has the potential to improve outcomes and lower recidivism for ex-offenders, treatment court participants, and consumers with mental illness. Exhibit 3 illustrates an evaluation of a treatment court program showing these improved results for consumers. Other than the financial investment and planning required, few challenges were identified.

EXHIBIT 3. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING

DRUG COURT TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM, SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Description: The San Francisco Drug Court was established as a means to divert drug users away from the traditional prison system and into a supervised, intensive drug treatment program. At the same time, those who are enrolled receive services to address education, job training, and housing needs. In 2008, the City and County of San Francisco expanded its housing efforts by implementing a transitional housing program for participants who were homeless or did not have access to safe and stable housing. Developed as a 15-month pilot program, participants were given rooms in a privately owned, single resident occupancy hotel. During this time, the program served 110 Drug Court participants. The program was supported by a Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) federal grant.

In addition to the unique nature of the program, a study was completed to assess the outcomes of the program. Participants in the programs were compared with a control group—Drug Court participants who did not participate in the housing program—using three Drug Court outcomes: retention, graduation, and recidivism. Those who participated in the housing program stayed in Drug Court 72 days longer than those in the control group and graduation rates increased by 60%. There was no difference between the two groups regarding recidivism. The average length of stay in the transitional housing units among study sample participants was 40 days. The median length of stay was 28 days (Outcome Study). Although the sample was relatively small, the study illustrates support for the transitional housing program across several important metrics.

Funding: A BJA federal grant supplied funding for the pilot program.

Partners: The Pontiac Hotel provided single occupancy rooms for participants.

Effectiveness: Graduation rates increased by 60%.

Why it would work in Brown County Multiple interview subjects insisted that participants in the treatment court lacked immediate housing. As stated by stakeholders, the lack of immediate housing interferes with clients' ability to comply with program requirements. Also, the lack of immediate housing has, at times, required treatment court participants to remain housed in Brown County Jail.

Additional Information:

<http://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/divisions/collaborative/drug-court>

<http://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/2676%20Outcome%20on%20SF%20Drug%20Court%20Transitional%20Housing%20Program.pdf>

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FUNDING STRATEGIES

The following alternatives address expanded or unique strategies to finance additional safe and stable housing services. The first alternative is a discussion of the Pay for Success model. While the model has only been implemented in a few communities, it represents a new and innovative way to finance the provision of social services. The second alternative focuses on the expansion of existing funding opportunities, namely WHEDA programs such as Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. The third alternative offers a broader discussion of additional grants or funding options. For example, several community stakeholders mentioned the value of obtaining private, unrestricted dollars to expand existing safe and stable housing options. The third and fourth alternatives address potential partnerships as well as additional opportunities.

PAY FOR SUCCESS MODEL

A relatively new model for providing social services, pay for success, connects governments, private investors, and nonprofit service providers. The model begins with an identified social issue or need that has been historically difficult to address—reducing homelessness and improving safe and stable housing in this case. Once a problem is identified, usually by a County, municipality, or state, private funders are solicited to provide upfront resources to a service provider. Detailed, predetermined outcome measures are developed and the provider delivers services with the goal of meeting or exceeding the outcome expectations. Finally, the government repays the initial investment from the private funders only if the established outcomes are achieved (Third Sector Capital Partners, *What is Pay for Success*, 2017). In short, the model shifts the risk of developing new programs and services from the public sector to private investors and nonprofit service providers. Additionally, the model focuses on outcomes, rather than outputs or processes (Urban Institute, *Pay for Success FAQs*, 2017). Stakeholder collaboration, accountability, performance measures, and innovation are foundations of this model.

Although the number of pay for success projects across the United States is still relatively small, it has been used to address homelessness and safe and stable housing in several cities and states—additional social issues have included education, substance abuse, the environment, and recidivism, among others. To address the issues of homelessness and safe and stable housing in Brown County using a pay for success model, efforts would be needed to identify community resources to fund the initial investment and outcome measures would need to be defined. Nonetheless, the potential benefits of the project are significant and initial results in existing cases appear encouraging, particularly in Massachusetts and Santa Clara County, California. The latter is highlighted below.

EXHIBIT 4. PAY FOR SUCCESS MODEL

PROJECT WELCOME HOME, SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CA

Description: In 2015, Santa Clara County implemented the first Pay for Success initiative in the State of California. The County partnered with Adobe Services—a nonprofit service provider—to deliver housing and supportive services to roughly 150-200 chronically homeless individuals for a six year period. Those with mental health, physical disabilities, and drug and alcohol addictions were specifically targeted for the program. Selected individuals were then given permanent supportive housing, clinical services, and treatment using a Housing First strategy. Overall, according to Project Welcome Home, “The project’s target impact is for more than 80% of participants to achieve 12 months of continuous housing tenancy.”

As determined by the pay for success model, the County will only repay the funders if Adobe Services is able to meet specific milestones. For example, for each participant who maintains continuous housing for 3 months, \$1,242 is paid by the County. Subsequent milestones include 6, 9, and 12 months. The cumulative payment through 12 months is \$12,420 per individual. Additional, smaller payments are made for additional months of stable housing tenancy after the first year. If the overall goal is met, the principal contribution—and associated interest—from each funder would be fully repaid. Total additional success payments are capped at \$8 million. An evaluation of the project and the determination of success payments is being completed by the University of California, San Francisco.

Funding: In total, private funders provided \$6.9 million with minimal to no interest requirements to begin the project.

Partners: Partners included the Sobrato Family Foundation, The California Endowment, The Health Trust, The Reinvestment Fund (TRF), Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH), The James Irvine Foundation, and Google.org

Effectiveness: A key factor in determining pay for success’s effectiveness is participating organizations ability to measure savings. Also, using a results oriented approach allows key stakeholders to determine which service providers efficiently deliver services and generate the greatest impact.

Why it would work in Brown County: Brown County, through its AVATAR database, has the capability to track benchmarks. As a whole, the pay for success approach engages government, nonprofits, and private donors; such collaboration can potentially earn additional federal funding. Finally, politically conservative and liberal groups have advocated for pay for success, making it a politically acceptable approach.

Additional Information:

<https://www.sccgov.org/sites/opa/nr/Pages/ProjectWelcomeHome.aspx>

<http://www.thirdsectorcap.org/santa-clara-homelessness/>

<http://pfs.urban.org/>

<http://www.payforsuccess.org/learn/basics/>

<https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/12/reducing-recidivism/421323/>

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/annefield/2016/02/27/social-impact-bonds-something-republicans-and-democrats-agree-on/#6f3b96922928>

EXPANDED USE OF WHEDA PROGRAMS

Developers in Brown County appear to under-utilize a federal program that generates affordable housing relative to surrounding counties. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program was created by the U.S. government to encourage private developers to construct or rehabilitate properties for individuals or families with low-to-moderate income, older adults, or individuals with special needs.¹⁵ Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA) administers LIHTC in Wisconsin, and real estate developers apply for tax credits. These tax credits enable developers to reduce the amount of lending needed for a housing project so that they are able to offer lower rents for a minimum of 30 years. Funding can be used to develop new multi-family or scattered sites units or to rehabilitate existing property.

Since the start of the LIHTC program, developers in Brown County have emphasized much needed housing for the elderly. Table 4 shows that, all told, 2,081 units have been built through the program, with three-quarters designated for older adults and only 504 units for low-income families. An additional 64 units provide supported housing. In contrast, neighboring counties exhibit higher rates of development of units serving the needs of low income families overall and per 10,000 population.

Table 4. County Low Income Housing Units by Type

Type	Brown (23 projects)	Outagamie (20 projects)	Winnebago (34 projects)
Family units	504	432	817
Elderly units	1513	983	1190
Supported units	64	0	78
Total units	2081	1415	2085
Percent of units for families	24%	31%	39%
Family units per 10,000	19.5	23.7	48.3

In addition, Table 5 shows that between 2012-2016, WHEDA awarded nearly \$2 million in tax credits to Brown County developers, who built 239 new units with 50 designated for low income veterans. One project occurred in 2012, two in 2013, and one in 2014, with no new projects funded in 2015 or 2016. In 2016, no applications were proposed by local developers while in 2015, two projects that totaled almost 90 family units were proposed but not funded.¹⁶ Over the same time period, Outagamie County developers built affordable housing units at twice Brown County's population-adjusted rate, creating 319 low income units with almost \$3 million in tax credits while Winnebago County added 339 units with \$2.3 million in tax credits.

¹⁵ Ed Gramlich, "Low Income Housing Tax Credits," *National Low Income Housing Coalition*, accessed August 7, 2017, http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/Sec5.10_LIHTC_2015.pdf.

¹⁶ "Annual Reports," *Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Administration*, accessed August 7, 2017, <https://www.wheda.com/annual-report/>.

Table 5. Recent WHEDA Low Income Tax Credit Program Activity

	Brown	Outagamie	Winnebago
Population	257,897	182,365	169,032
Units developed	239	319	339
Units per 10,000	9.27	17.49	20.06
Dollar value	\$1,956,047	\$2,899,473	\$2,336,805

Note: 2012-2016

Brown County cannot apply for tax credits itself, but through its leadership and position of influence, can encourage greater use of this LIHTC program by developers to expand affordable housing opportunities for local families, including those using County services. NeighborWorks, Inc. is one nonprofit local developer that might apply for funding with County collaboration, designating the affordable units for a permanent housing development. This would be an indirect strategy to influence development that would have many benefits for the County. First, there would be expanded affordable housing options for County consumers. Second, Brown County could leverage these dollars to increase the likelihood that it would receive additional federal dollars for the chronically homeless, many of whom are existing County consumers. Third, this funding source could be combined with a mix of other sources to provide a significant portion of funding for larger projects.

WHEDA runs a Housing Grant Program that makes annual grants ranging from \$7,000 to \$25,000 to nonprofit organizations and housing authorities for the purpose of "improving the state's housing for special needs programs."¹⁷ Aligning well with Brown County's targeted consumers, the program serves homeless individuals, alcohol or drug dependent persons, individuals with chronic mental illness, and others. Grants are used to fund upgrades to physical housing units in two categories: Emergency or Transitional Housing and Permanent Supportive Housing, the two policy alternatives recommended in this report (above). Typically, each year almost half of all applications are awarded funding. In 2016, 48 applications were received and 28 were funded, with \$500,000 in grants distributed. Only one Brown County organization received funding during 2014, 2015, and 2016-- a collaborative grant to an organization that provides services in three counties.

LEVERAGE FUNDING THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS

Whether mounting a major development initiative to create new units or raising funding for other projects, combining a variety of sources can pull together the necessary resources to complete the project. In 2016, a collaborative approach to funding enabled the Thurgood Marshall House in Milwaukee to obtain millions of dollars through a mix of revenue sources to build a 24-unit single-site permanent supportive housing facility. The funding plan utilized federal tax credits, local government sources, HUD funding, a mortgage loan, and grants from private sources.

A large percentage of community stakeholders representing housing-related nonprofit organizations and experts from other communities suggested the need for more projects that include collaboration between Brown County government and Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition (BCHHC) nonprofit agencies. An expert with in-depth knowledge of

¹⁷"Housing Grant Program," *Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Administration*, accessed August 7, 2017, <https://www.wheda.com/Housing-Grant-Program/>

HUD programs noted that the housing system in Brown County significantly under-utilizes several key grant programs, stating “when you don’t have key players at the table, key opportunities will be missed.” HUD offers a wide array of funding opportunities for a variety of different purposes, niche consumer groups, and organizations. Simply understanding the funding opportunities requires experience and expertise and pursuing them requires planning and time to collaborate with partners to maximize chances. By pursuing additional funding for housing, Brown County would expand opportunities for its own consumers, increasing their chances of success.

In Brown County, HUD funding is distributed through the Brown County Balance of State CoC and led by the BCHHC. According to our interviews, at times, funding opportunities (mostly from HUD) cannot be pursued due to insufficient local matching dollars. Local agencies are not typically able to produce the level of funding needed for the required local match. Brown County, however, has the potential to meet the match level required due to its resources, caseload, and scope of services. Brown County could achieve this local match by providing staff—for a permanent supportive housing program or treatment court, for example—or investing its funds to lease several scattered site units designated for Brown County consumers.

Most funders now require at least minimal collaboration and shared effort by applicants. In addition, most funding is awarded to nonprofit housing organizations, although in some cases local governments can apply. HUD publishes notices of funding available through its competitive grant program each year and has established chronic homelessness as a priority in awarding funding for its competitive grant programs. In 2017, grants included capacity building projects, continuum of care rapid rehousing initiatives, lead abatement grants, and others. Local nonprofit organizations have staff members with knowledge of these funding streams and opportunities. By partnering, the County would not only increase its chances of obtaining additional funding, but it could develop supportive programs for individuals in Brown County, many of whom currently move between County and nonprofit organizations for shelter and services.

Another potential partner for collaboration is the city of Green Bay. In particular, the City receives HOME Investment Partnerships funding, which funds “a wide range of activities including building, buying, and/or rehabilitating affordable housing...or providing direct rental assistance to low-income people.”¹⁸ Jurisdictions may provide tenant-based rental assistance contracts of up to two years. From 2015-2019, Green Bay will receive almost \$2 million in HOME funding, including \$1 million in Community Development Block grants in 2017 to, for example, “provide decent housing and a suitable living environment, and to expand economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons.”¹⁹ Green Bay must develop a consolidated plan for development but, in recent years, this plan has not specifically focused on addressing chronic homelessness. Brown County could work with the city to tackle the issue of chronic homeless or housing for persons with addiction or mental illness.

ADDITIONAL GRANTS AND FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Funding may be available for specific purposes. An example of this is the WI Department of Justice grants for Treatment Alternatives Diversion and Enhancement. Six million dollars will be awarded to counties in Wisconsin to fund projects

¹⁸ "Home Investment Partnerships Program," *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*, accessed August 7, 2017, https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing/programs/home/.

¹⁹ "Green Bay, WI," *U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*, accessed August 8, 2017, <https://www.hudexchange.info/grantees/green-bay-wi/?program=2>.

related to treatment courts based on a competitive process. Applications are typically due in the summer, and a 25% local cash match is required for all projects. Three categories of funding include planning/implementation, implementation, and enhancement. Proposals should focus on evidence-based strategies to improve program effectiveness. Brown County should explore the possibility of including some of the costs of providing transitional housing programs for treatment court consumers under this grant.

Brown County has an opportunity to partner with other nonprofit organizations to seek significant private funding for housing and homelessness-related projects. The U.S. Venture Open Fund for Basic Needs is a special fund dedicated to addressing the causes of poverty, developing solutions to move people from poverty, and to directly assist individuals who struggle with meeting basic needs, including the low-income elderly or significantly disabled. Locally, the Greater Green Bay Community Foundation (GGBCF) administers the program. Collaborative grants of up to \$25,000 fund planning activities while implementation grants can request up to \$300,000 over three years. Foundation staff indicated that a collaborative project with involvement by Brown County partners would be viewed positively by this funder.

SUPPLEMENTARY ALTERNATIVES

In addition to policy options that directly address the shortage of affordable, safe and stable housing units in Brown County and new or expanded sources of funding, there are other alternatives available to the County that could improve the status quo. Stated another way, they do not directly add or pay for existing services, but their impact could be important, nonetheless. These alternatives could be adopted and implemented on their own, or they could supplement additional, larger options similar to those discussed above. Regardless, the options generally require limited to no additional costs for the County or taxpayers. The first alternative highlights the importance of government and community support. The second addresses the potential need to expand available information on homelessness services in the County, and the third involves the development of a comprehensive homelessness plan.

GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Beyond the need for more available housing units, one of the most consistent themes that emerged from interviews with community stakeholders is the need for stronger, more public support for homelessness initiatives from Brown County government and an appeal for broad, comprehensive community support and understanding. These individuals indicated a general lack of concern for homelessness among Brown County residents or a belief that it is not a problem. According to data collected for the 2016 Brown County LIFE Study, nearly 75% of surveyed Brown County residents indicated the County was fair, good, or excellent as a place where people with low incomes can meet their basic needs for things such as food and housing.²⁰ Additionally, roughly 22% of community leaders placed a high priority on expanding housing opportunities for low income residents—one of the lowest priorities among those reported. In short, most members of the community believe enough is being done to address homelessness and there appears to be little support to do more.

According to those interviewed for this analysis, clear and public support from Brown County government would improve public awareness of the problem and potentially stimulate additional philanthropic support from the community. Efforts to expand public and community support could include a multitude of strategies. For example, the County could work with local nonprofits to expand and highlight existing Brown County Hunger and Homeless Awareness Week events in

²⁰ UW-Green Bay Center for Public Affairs and St. Norbert College Strategic Research Institute, "LIFE Study," *The Greater Green Bay Community Foundation*, accessed August 8, 2017, <http://www.greatergbc.org/media/16805/LIFE%20Study%20Full%20Report.pdf>.

November. Another possible option could include a County-community partnership to develop an annual homeless summit to address needs and potential solutions. A case from San Bernardino is highlighted below. Regardless of the strategy, community stakeholders agree that additional, highly visible County leadership on the issue would be a low-cost, but highly valuable strategy to further addresses homelessness as well as safe and stable housing.

EXHIBIT 5. PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

ANNUAL HOMELESS SUMMIT, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA

Description: On November 9, 2016 the San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership (SBCHP) hosted its 10th Annual Homeless Summit. During the one-day event, roughly 300 people representing a wide spectrum of community stakeholders met to discuss the current state of homelessness in the County, best practices, and new approaches to the problem. Guest speakers included nationally recognized experts on homelessness and safe and stable housing as well as several County supervisors. Topics ranged from causes of homelessness and coordinated entry workflow to supportive housing models. The annual event is free of charge for attendees.

All of the presentations from the summit are available online, at the San Bernardino County website. The presentations include PowerPoint presentations, videos, handouts, infographics, and links to supplementary information. Additionally, the website includes indicators of potential homelessness from each municipality located within the County. Examples include basic demographics, housing supply, affordability, health, and welfare benefits received by residents.

The County (i.e., Office of Homeless Services) has played a significant and clear leadership role in the SBCHP, annual summit, and the management of data and information online. In addition to these efforts, San Bernardino County has been instrumental in the development of long-term planning documents, the implementation of annual point-in-time counts, and the coordination of additional homelessness partnerships. In short, bringing partners to the table cultivates an environment of cooperation and collaboration throughout the community.

Funding: Not available at this time.

Partners: Community stakeholders, including state and local governments, nonprofits, businesses, educators, faith-based organizations.

Effectiveness: Approximately 300 people attended the 2016 Annual Homeless Summit.

Why it would work in Brown County: What can Brown County do as a county that no one else can do? It can be a pioneer by bringing decisionmakers and leaders from all sectors together to collaborate and engage and inform the community about homelessness. A similar event may be well received in Brown County. According to the 2016 LIFE Study, 39% of respondents did not feel that they could have an impact on the decisions of community leaders.

Additional Information:

<http://wp.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/community-projects/annual-homeless-summit/>

<http://www.greatergbc.org/media/16805/LIFE%20Study%20Full%20Report.pdf>

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COUNTY WEBSITE IMPROVEMENTS

For those in need of safe and stable housing in Brown County, there are various sources from which they can receive information and resources. Initial contact points could include, for example, the Brown County Homeless & Housing Coalition (BCHHC), Brown County United Way 2-1-1, Family Services Crisis Center, or any of the shelters located in the County. The BCHHC, in particular, provides information and links for different types of housing needs (e.g., transitional, permanent).

In other communities, county governments also play a significant role in the effort to disseminate information about homelessness and safe and stable housing. Expanding the amount and type of information on the County website would be one of the most straightforward and cost-effective strategies. For communities that have already adopted this strategy, robust websites essentially serve as a centralized location for housing services available in the County, whether through nonprofit providers, the County, or municipalities. The websites are easy to navigate, provide information on specific needs and, in some cases, present the information using language that conveys understanding and compassion. In other cases, the websites of community partnerships, coalitions, and councils are essentially built into the County website.

Following this strategy, Brown County could expand its current website to directly address homelessness and include strong support for reducing homelessness in the community. A portion of the website could be dedicated to providing information for those in need of housing services. Additional, specific sections could be added to address different populations such as veterans, those who are being released from jail, and those with AODA or mental health barriers. Beyond the cost of initially creating the web pages and collecting information, the ongoing cost to the County would be relatively small. Two cases are presented below. The case from Wake County, NC addresses homelessness and housing specifically, while the Franklin County, OH case addresses housing from the perspective of a specific group—those transitioning back into the community from correctional or rehabilitative institutions.

COMPREHENSIVE HOMELESSNESS PLAN

Homelessness and the need to expand safe and stable housing in Brown County has received considerable attention from various stakeholders that include nonprofit service providers, foundations, and public agencies. The majority of those interviewed for this analysis could easily describe a multitude of specific efforts made to improve and expand the overall system of care over the last several years. To continue this momentum, Brown County and area nonprofits have the potential to benefit from a more detailed, comprehensive plan to address homelessness and safe and stable housing. Long-term planning is familiar to many government and public agencies, as 10-year capital improvement plans are a common method of addressing long-term capital needs, for example. A similar approach to addressing housing needs in Brown County could be developed with assistance from existing community partners and providers.

EXHIBIT 6. PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COUNTY WEBSITE IMPROVEMENTS CENTRALIZED RESOURCES, WAKE COUNTY, NC

Description: Located under its Department of Human Services, Wake County provides a centralized location for homelessness and housing resources in the county. The website includes information, contact methods, and links to services such as supportive housing, rental assistance, homeless services, and affordable housing. Although a primary focus is placed on the services offered by the county specifically, additional links are provided for federal state, municipal and nonprofit organizations that provide related services.

Another unique aspect of the Wake County website is the language it uses to describe homelessness in the community and the efforts currently underway to address it. The description acknowledges homelessness as a problem in the community and the many factors that can contribute to the need for safe and stable housing. For example, the description includes the following:

“Homelessness is a sad reality for some citizens. Men, women, families and youth experience homelessness for a variety of reasons, such as lack of affordable housing, low-paying jobs, substance and alcohol abuse, mental illness and family conflict. Criminal records, bad credit, poor employment histories and deficient independent living skills are additional causes...A concentrated effort is under way to solve the problem of homelessness in Wake County. After many years of discussion and growing frustration with [previous approaches] ...this comprehensive plan is now being implemented across the community.”

Funding: Compared with other alternatives, a webpage renovation is a relatively inexpensive one time cost.

Partners: N/A

Effectiveness: Addressing homelessness on the Brown County Human Services web page is a cost effective way to consolidate and disseminate information to consumers. A stakeholder interviewed for this study described Brown County as “resource rich,” but lamented at the lack of coordination of services. An updated webpage addresses this concern.

Why it would work in Brown County: Currently, Brown County’s website lacks information pertaining to homelessness and homelessness specific resources.

Additional Information:

<http://www.wakegov.com/humanservices/housing/services/Pages/homelessness.aspx>

Several hundred municipalities and counties across the United States have developed multi-year plans to address homelessness and broader housing concerns. Examples include Washington County, OR, Middlesex County, NJ, Orange County, CA, and the city of Portland, OR. Generally, these plans include similar components such as guiding principles, a discussion of existing conditions and costs, and a general plan with multiple strategies. To ensure accountability, plans generally assign specific roles to community stakeholders, including public agencies and NPOs, to ensure proper implementation. Some communities also develop annual reports that detail progress, trends, updated statistics, and challenges. In most cases, county government takes a leading role in the development and implementation of the plan, which is often included on the county website.

EXHIBIT 8. COMPREHENSIVE HOMELESS PLAN 10 YEAR PLAN TO END HOMELESSNESS, ARLINGTON, VA

Description: Now in its ninth year, Arlington County launched its 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness in 2008. Developed by over 100 community stakeholders—more than half of the planning committee consisted of County employees—the goal of the plan was to effectively end homelessness in Arlington County. While it covers a multitude of services often needed by homeless populations (e.g., supportive services, recovery assistance, mental health care, education, prevention, and employment), the first goal of the plan was to address affordable housing. Of the 24 action steps recommended to achieve this goal, examples include increasing the supply of permanent supportive housing units, increasing the number of slots available in the existing Transitional Housing Program, and improving rapid re-housing initiatives. For nearly all of these steps, the Arlington County Department of Human Services is assigned a key role.

A unique and important feature of the homelessness and housing plan in Arlington County is an annual progress report that highlights data, trends, successes, and challenges. In particular, the report details the percentage of individuals that have left shelters to live in permanent or stable housing. Since 2013, the most notable increases have occurred among those coming from domestic violence and individual shelters. The number of people served with permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing also has increased dramatically. Overall, without the initial 10 year plan and subsequent annual reports, the ability to track, use, and present this type of data likely would be much more difficult.

Funding: The committees that were formed to enact the 10 year plan “work in concert to ensure that available federal, state, and local resources are used strategically to meet the needs of Arlington homeless households.”

Partners: Five committees, comprised of both County employees and continuum of care providers, support the implementation of the 10 year plan to end homelessness. As a whole, Arlington County Department of Human Services (DHS) works cohesively with the local CoC. For example, in 2016, Arlington County DHS submitted an application for HUD funding on behalf of the CoC.

Effectiveness: As part of its 10 year plan to end homelessness, Arlington succeeded in housing 100 of its most vulnerable homeless persons.

Why it would work in Brown County: Arlington’s plan corroborates several themes Brown County stakeholders consistently highlighted as top priorities. First, it coordinates and cooperates with the local CoC. Second, through committees and collaboration, it brings together decisionmakers from various sectors. Last, the plan puts an emphasis on increasing the number of housing units available.

Additional Information:

<https://publicassistance.arlingtonva.us/10yp/>

<https://publicassistance.arlingtonva.us/10yp/100-homes/>

INCREASE COORDINATION WITH COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

The County may have an opportunity to increase effectiveness and efficiency both internally and externally. Based on interviews with numerous internal County personnel, there may be ways to improve the process of moving consumers out of jail and into safe and stable housing, treatment court, or other treatment. Moreover, others stated a desire to have more formal awareness of their Brown County partner program roles and functions, housing resources and programs in

the community, and how they might collaborate. The proposed "additional housing" alternatives in this report might facilitate increased coordination.

Regarding external collaboration, Brown County may benefit from an expanded role with the Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition, working as a key stakeholder to support the role of the BCHHC. In doing so, Brown County will have the opportunity to catalyze local partners to apply for funding and address the issue of homelessness in the area in a more coordinated and intentional way, thus benefiting Brown County consumers directly and reducing the need for inpatient services and jail. Several individuals we interviewed from outside the area observed that Brown County is known for having a fragmented approach to housing and homelessness, a perception also acknowledged by local interviewees. Often, two or three local organizations collaborate at a time. Occasionally, local agencies compete for the same dollars. If Brown County participated meaningfully in joint planning, encouraged the involvement of other housing agency decision-makers, and partnered with the BCHHC in meaningful planning, the community as a whole would benefit.

The County may want to examine the activities of West Central CoC led by WestCAP. Chippewa County Human Services staff participate regularly and have a coordinated approach to applying for grants. According to an individual we interviewed, "everyone is staying in their lanes but working together." Moreover, the group brought together several sources of public and private funding for a staff position to manage the point of entry system. They have plans to hire a housing navigator position to work as an advocate with landlords and speed up the process of determining eligibility and moving people into programs. The BCHHC has an opportunity to replicate that process or adapt it locally, or pursue other community-benefiting projects. Brown County's involvement could catalyze this coordinated planning.

CONCLUSION

The root causes of homelessness and unsafe and unstable living conditions, while complex, are not insurmountable. Other communities have taken substantive measures to address both the housing needs and other inherent obstacles that prevent their community members from obtaining safe and stable housing. In fact, there is a myriad of potential policy options which to choose.

By examining the needs of consumers and actions taken in other communities, several feasible solutions emerged and should be considered by county leaders to support consumers. A common theme, reiterated by a vast majority of stakeholders, is that consumers who have been diagnosed with a mental illness need the most assistance. Asking this population, as well as those with AODA barriers, to meet a series of requirements prior to obtaining safe and stable housing is generally ineffective. Implementing an affordable, supportive housing model that provides a living environment conducive to recovery, while simultaneously connecting consumers to the services they need, has been shown to reduce chronic homelessness as well as the cost to service providers and taxpayers.

Tried and true funding sources exist to finance these alternatives, but without proposals that blend public and private financing, these revenue sources will continue to bypass the Brown County community. Innovative new approaches and the possibilities created by the promise of unrestricted dollars have potential, but the community must work together to plan and create options for affordable housing for its people. The community also must be willing to acknowledge the problem of homelessness to a greater degree and be willing to commit additional efforts to improving the lives of these individuals. With the credibility to influence other organizations and, in general, raise public awareness about homelessness, Brown County is in a unique position to stimulate this local action. The County has an opportunity to raise its profile and collaborate to a greater extent with other public and private funders, partners, and advocates.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHOSE REPRESENTATIVES PARTICIPATED IN INTERVIEWS

- Brown County Community Treatment Center Staff
- Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition, Inc. Board
- Brown County Housing Authority Staff
- Brown County Jail
- Brown County Treatment Court Staff
- Brown County Treatment Court Judges
- Ecumenical Partnership for Housing
- Family Services of Northeast Wisconsin, Inc.
- Greater Green Bay Community Foundation, Inc.
- Green Bay Housing Authority Staff
- Housing Partnership of the Fox Cities
- NeighborWorks, Inc.
- New Community Shelter, Inc.
- Newcap, Inc.
- Green Bay Police Department
- Green Bay Department of Community and Economic Development
- Oxford House, Inc.
- WestCAP, Inc.
- Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care
- Wisconsin Department of Corrections

APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY

Continuum of Care (Coc): The Continuum of Care (CoC) Program is designed to promote communitywide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness; provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, and State and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals and families while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused to homeless individuals, families, and communities by homelessness; promote access to and effect utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and families; and optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families.

Homeless: defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, an individual is considered homeless when an (1) individual and families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence and includes a subset for an individual who resided in an emergency shelter or a place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided; (2) individuals and families who will imminently lose their primary nighttime residence; (3) unaccompanied youth and families with children and youth who are defined as homeless under other federal statutes who do not otherwise qualify as homeless under this definition; and (4) individuals and families who are fleeing, or are attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence against the individual or a family member.

Housing First: an approach to quickly and successfully connect individuals and families experiencing homelessness to permanent housing without preconditions and barriers to entry, such as sobriety, treatment or service participation requirements. Supportive services are offered to maximize housing stability and prevent returns to homelessness as opposed to addressing predetermined treatment goals prior to permanent housing entry.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH): for persons with disabilities and rapid re-housing. Permanent supportive housing is permanent housing with indefinite leasing or rental assistance paired with supportive services to assist homeless persons with a disability or families with an adult or child member with a disability achieve housing stability.

Rapid re-housing (RRH): emphasizes housing search and relocation services and short- and medium-term rental assistance to move homeless persons and families (with or without a disability) as rapidly as possible into permanent housing.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI): a Federal income supplement program designed to help aged, blind, and disabled people pay for basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter.

Safe and Stable Housing: a term used to describe housing that is affordable, and not overcrowded and doubled up with friends and family members.

Transitional housing (TH): is designed to provide homeless individuals and families with the interim stability and support to successfully move to and maintain permanent housing. Transitional housing may be used to cover the costs of up to 24 months of housing with accompanying supportive services. Program participants must have a lease (or sublease) or occupancy agreement in place when residing in transitional housing.





Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care (WIBOSCOC): a 501(c)3 non-profit organization serving all the counties in Wisconsin, except Dane, Milwaukee, and Racine. Its purpose includes (but is not limited to):

- Ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of housing and supportive services to individuals and families experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness;
- Promoting community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness;
- Providing funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, States, and local governments to re-house individuals and families experiencing homelessness rapidly;
- Promoting access to and effective use of mainstream programs by individuals and families experiencing homelessness






APPENDIX C: SURVEY OF BROWN COUNTY CASE MANAGERS

This survey is being conducted by the UW-Green Bay Center for Public Affairs on behalf of the Brown County Safe and Stable Housing assessment. Your answers are anonymous and will be combined with others to present a broad estimate of needs of Brown County consumers who experience housing challenges.

1. Which position do you hold?
 - Treatment court case manager or supervisor
 - Treatment court judge
 - Community Treatment Center case manager or supervisor
 - Probation and parole officer
 - Jail liaison
 - Police Officer
 - Other _____
2. What is the current number of individuals on your active caseload?
3. Approximately how many of individuals on your active caseload are served in the following programs? (one person may be in more than one program)

Treatment court (any)	
Brown Co Community Treatment Center Outpatient Services	
Probation/Parole	
Other	

4. Approximately how many of individuals on your active caseload experience the following needs (one person may have several needs)

Criminal record	
Drug or alcohol addiction	
Mental illness	
Current/potential for unstable or very low income	
Homeless, unstable, or unsafe housing situation	

5. How important/unimportant would some of the following program options be for those individuals that you serve?

	Extremely important	Very important	Moderately important	Slightly important	Not at all important
Group living situation	•	•	•	•	•
Weekly or daily case management	•	•	•	•	•
Bi-weekly or monthly case management	•	•	•	•	•
Employment coaching or advocacy	•	•	•	•	•
Short-term treatment for mental or addiction concerns	•	•	•	•	•
Long-term treatment for mental or addiction concerns	•	•	•	•	•
Ongoing financial assistance for rent or other housing-related need	•	•	•	•	•
Other	•	•	•	•	•

6. What is the one most important change you'd like to see in our community that would help your consumers transition to and remain in safe and stable housing situations?