AGENDA AND NOTICE OF A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BLACK PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS

COMMITTEE CHAIR: Jacqueline Waggoner  VICE CHAIR: Kelli Bernard

Monday, September 17, 2018
1:00 p.m.

Location:
LA Trade Tech College
400 W. Washington Blvd.
WorkSource Center, Rm 106, Tom Bradley Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM AND DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Items - The public will have an opportunity to speak to any agenda item when the item is called and before action is taken. A Request to Speak Form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the completion of the agenda item. The Chair will determine the order of speaking and unless the Chair grants more or less time, the speaker’s limit is <strong>two (2) minutes</strong> on each agenda item, subject to the <strong>total 20-minute period</strong>.</td>
<td>Commissioner Waggoner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Introductions.</td>
<td>Commissioner Bernard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve minutes from the meeting of Monday, August 20, 2018.</td>
<td>Commissioner Waggoner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Committee Work Plan, Community Report-Back Sessions, and Update on Report Timeline.</td>
<td>Patricia Lally</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation &amp; Discussion: Applying the Racial Equity Toolkit to Employment Concerns.</td>
<td>Patricia Lally</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation &amp; Discussion: Permanent Housing within the Homeless Service Delivery System.</td>
<td>Joshua Hall, Norweeta Milburn, Janey Rountree, Reba Stevens, Rule Buchanan, Melody Darden, Derek Day, Gloria Johnson, Jennifer Rachal</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation &amp; Discussion: Fair Housing.</td>
<td>Chancela Al-Mansour</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation &amp; Discussion: Affordable Housing &amp; Public Housing.</td>
<td>Doug Guthrie, Monique King-Viehland, Sean Spear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Participation
Each Public Participant speaker is limited to two (2) minutes and may address any topic within the Commission’s jurisdiction. A Request to Speak Form must be filled out and submitted to the Secretary prior to the beginning of Public Participation. Subject to the total 20-minute period, each Public Participation speaker is limited to two (2) minutes.

Adjournment

Packets of materials on agenda items are available to the public during normal business hours at 811 Wilshire Boulevard, 6th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. For further information, you may call 213-683-3333. Upon request, sign language interpreters, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for LAHSA meetings. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 Hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. For additional information, contact LAHSA at (213) 683-3333 or TTY (213) 553-8488.
MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BLACK PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS MEETING

Held August 20, 2018

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness Meeting, held at the James Wood Community Center, 400 E. Fifth Street, Los Angeles, California, was called to order at 1:17 p.m. by Commissioner Waggoner.

Attendance
LAHSA Commissioners Present:
Jacqueline Waggoner, Chair
Kelli Bernard, Vice Chair

Committee Members Present:
Va LeCia Adams Kellum  Chancela Al-Mansour  Edward Anderson
Jack Barbour  Wendell Blassingame  Oliver Buie
Chela Demuir-Cartier  Janet Kelly  Veronica Lewis
Juataun Mark  Anita Nelson  Alisa Orduna
Molly Rysman  Suzette Shaw  Brenda Shockley
Sean Spear  Reba Stevens  Pete White
Dhakshike Wickrema

Committee Members Absent:
Rachel Brashier  Brian Ford  Robin Hughes
Monique King-Viehland  Nova Mirari  Lola Smallwood-Cuevas

LAHSA Staff:
Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems
Eileen Bryson, Manager, Executive Support

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum
Roll was called, and quorum was established at 1:17 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions.
Commissioner Waggoner thanked everyone for attending.

Discussion of Committee Work Plan, Recommendation Development Process and Report Timeline.
Patricia Lally, Committee Facilitator, gave the report:

- Patricia Lally explained some of the details around the work plan and asked committee members to join recommendation working groups. Pete White asked for more details on the working groups and the time commitment.
- A draft report will be sent out for comments. The report will be finalized in November and presented to the LAHSA Commission in December.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Presentation and Discussion: Listening Session Overview.
Patricia Lally and Earl Edwards, Committee Facilitators, gave the report:

- Ms. Lally and Mr. Edwards shared comments that were heard at listening sessions as shown in the provided presentation.
• A link to the presentation and listening session notes will be included on the LAHSA website.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Review and approve minutes from the meeting of Monday, July 16, 2018.

Motion: Jacqueline Waggoner moved and Wendell Blassingame seconded acceptance of the minutes as presented.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Presentation & Discussion: Outreach.
Colleen Murphy gave the report, along with Dr. Va LeCia Adams-Kellum and panelists Joseph Robertson, Kenny Clipper, Audrey Pearson, Kennetta Fells, Donald Holt and Lakesha Williams:

• Patricia Lally shared quotes from the listening sessions regarding outreach, assessment, and interim housing.
• Colleen Murphy shared information on Outreach as shown in the provided presentation. There was discussion about interpretation of the data presented, the classification of management staff, and staff salaries.
• Pete White asked about the salary ranges of managers. Sarah Mahin explained that LAHSA does not have the salary information for the other organizations.
• There was discussion about the outreach engagement demographics. There was a request for sub-population data, specifically highlighting transgender demographic information.
• There was a panel discussion of outreach techniques, methodologies, cultural competency, connections, barriers, trauma informed care, education, and lived experience.
• The Committee provided recommendations including: rethinking job descriptions and requirements to remove barriers to employment for Black people and those with homeless lived experience; understanding the Black experience; identifying internalized racism; incorporating accountability, consistency, and stability in outreach program strategies; instituting better accountability for service provision; enabling providers to serve participants despite geographic differences; targeting people for prevention services to avoid displacement; integrating system-wide cultural competency, implicit bias, and trauma-informed care trainings; and creating safe spaces to address mental health and interpersonal relationship challenges.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Presentation & Discussion: Interim Housing.
Josh Hall, Associate Director, System Integration and Dr. Till Von Wachter provided information and data on interim housing:

• Josh Hall gave an overview of interim housing as shown in the provided presentation. There was discussion about the different types of interim housing, funding sources, challenges, and opportunities.
• Dr. Till Von Wachter provided data regarding interim housing as shown in the provided presentation.
• There were requests for more information on outcome and exit data, the geographic distribution of interim housing in relation to the location of Black people experiencing homelessness, and analysis of more recent data.
• There was discussion about the lack of funding for providing strong case management in crisis housing programs and high rates of recidivism.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Presentation & Discussion: Assessment.
Josh Hall and Michael Nailat gave the report:

• The presenters shared information on assessment as shown in the provided presentation.
• There was discussion about how assessment tools are used; how tools could be modified for scale-up or what might be used in addition; the importance of cultural sensitivity in the administration of assessment tools, and the need for further research to understand if the tools adequately capture the vulnerabilities of Black people experiencing homelessness.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Public Participation

Public Speaker: Roman El-Krim shared that there is a need for youth involved in these conversations, that more demographic groups should be investigated in data analysis, and that the VI-SPDAT is too long.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.
1.0 OVERVIEW

At its December 2017 meeting, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) Commission established the Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness to address the issue of sustained overrepresentation of Black people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County. The purpose of the Committee is to provide focused attention to better understand the factors contributing to the overrepresentation of Black people among the population experiencing homelessness, identify opportunities to increase racial equity within the homeless service delivery system, and develop recommendations to more effectively meet the needs of Black people experiencing homelessness.

2.0 COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

LAHSA Commission Committee Members:
Jacqueline Waggoner, Chair
Kelli Bernard, Vice-Chair

Committee Members:
Va Lecia Adams Kellum
Chancela Al-Mansour
Edward Anderson
Jack Barbour
Wendell Blassingame
Rachel Brashier
Oliver Buie
Chela Demuir-Cartier
Brian Ford
Robin Hughes
Janet Kelly
Monique King-Viehland
Veronica Lewis
Juataun Mark
Nova Mirari
Anita Nelson
Molly Rysman
Suzette Shaw
Brenda Shockley
Lola Smallwood Cuevas
Sean Spear
Reba Stevens
Pete White
Dhakshike Wickrema

LAHSA Staff Liaisons:
Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems
Erin Cox, Supervisor, Policy & Systems
Eileen Bryson, Commission Liaison

3.0 GOALS

1. Provide Focused Attention and a Forum for Discussion
   a. Hold public monthly meetings on subjects related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   b. Invite public speakers to present on aspects of homelessness and offer recommendations
   c. Host community listening sessions and focus groups across the county to engage advocates, service providers, and community members to better understand key challenges and barriers to service
   d. Expand and adjust discussion of subjects based on feedback and progress
2. Develop and Promote Recommendations
   a. Analyze data related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   b. Apply a racial equity analysis to develop appropriate strategies and recommendations related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   c. Identify and make recommendations to the LAHSA Commission, the County, the City, and other stakeholders on how to improve efforts to address racial disparities impacting Black people experiencing homelessness
   d. Share recommendations and results of the Committee’s work with community members
   e. Produce a report to present data on Black people experiencing homelessness in LA, information gathered from presentations and discussion, and recommendations made by the Committee

4.0 PUBLIC MEETING SCHEDULE

The Committee is holding monthly public meetings and listening sessions over a six-month period to better understand the experiences of Black individuals and households within the homeless service delivery system, including challenges, vulnerabilities, barriers to service, and driving forces of housing instability. Meetings are open to the public and are held in various locations across the County to enable attendance and participation by a diverse group of community members.

Monthly Committee Meetings
The Committee’s monthly meetings invite expert presentations on specific topics in addition to providing an opportunity for public comment from stakeholders and community members to address and better understand each of these issues.

Monday, April 18, 2018 | 1:00 – 5:00 PM
   Los Angeles Services Authority, 811 Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles

Monday, May 21, 2018 | 2:00 – 4:00 PM
   Los Angeles Services Authority, 811 Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles

Monday, June 18, 2018 | 1:00 – 4:30 PM
   Constituent Service Center of Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson, 8475 S. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles

Monday, July 16, 2018 | 1:00 – 4:30 PM
   A.C. Bilbrew Public Library, 150 E. El Segundo Blvd, Los Angeles

Monday, August 20, 2018 | 1:00 – 4:30 PM
   James Wood Community Center, 400 E. 5th Street, Los Angeles

Monday, September 17, 2018 | 1:00 – 5:00 PM
   LA Trade Tech College, WorkSource Center, Rm 106 in Tom Bradley Hall, 400 W. Washington Blvd, Los Angeles

Monday, October 22, 2018 | 1:00 – 4:00 PM
   Holman United Methodist Church, White Hall, 3320 W. Adams Blvd, Los Angeles
Community Listening Sessions
A critical component of the Committee’s work is engaging advocates, service providers, persons with lived experience, and other community members through a series of targeted community listening sessions, to better understand key challenges and opportunities that the Committee’s work should address, and to generate recommendations for improving services.

Friday, May 18, 2018 | 3:00 – 5:00 PM
*James Wood Community Center, 400 E. 5th Street, Los Angeles*

Thursday, June 7, 2018 | 3:00 – 5:00 PM
*Broadway Manchester Service Center, 8525 S. Broadway, Los Angeles*

Thursday, June 14, 2018 | 6:30 – 8:30 PM
*Holman United Methodist Church, White Hall, 3320 W. Adams Blvd, Los Angeles*

Friday, July 13, 2018 | 9:30 – 11:30 AM
*St. Joseph Center, 204 Hampton Drive, Venice*

Friday, July 13, 2018 | 3:00 – 5:00 PM
*Harbor Interfaith Services, 670 W. 9th Street, San Pedro*

Wednesday, August 15, 2018 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
*Chimbole Cultural Center, Manzanita Ballroom, 38350 Sierra Hwy, Palmdale*

Focus Group Listening Sessions
The Committee’s focus group listening sessions provide a platform to engage service providers, populations with lived experience, and community members around vulnerabilities, barriers to service, and systems to better understand the challenges and explore recommendations focused on specific sub-populations and subject-areas.

Friday, May 4, 2018: Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles
*Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority*

Friday, May 4, 2018: Lived Experience Advisory Group
*Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority*

Tuesday, August 14, 2018: Mental Health Providers
*SCHARP Oasis House*

Thursday, August 16, 2018: Mental Health Clients
*SCHARP Oasis House*

Thursday, August 16, 2018: Employment Training Provider
*St. Joseph Center*

Friday, August 17, 2018: Employment Specialist
*People Assisting the Homeless*
Wednesday, September 11, 2018: Employment Advocates  
Los Angeles Black Worker Center

[Date TBD]: Re-Entry Service Providers  
Los Angeles County Office of Diversion and Reentry

Community Report-Back Sessions
The community report-back sessions provide an opportunity for participants to learn about the common themes that emerged during the listening session discussions, as well as to hear and provide feedback on the Committee's proposed recommendations for improving services.

Thursday, September 25 | 6:30 – 9:00 PM  
Holman United Methodist Church, White Hall, 3320 W. Adams Blvd, Los Angeles

Wednesday, September 26 | 2:00 – 5:00 PM  
James Wood Community Center, 400 E. 5th Street, Los Angeles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Potential Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>• Establish Committee purpose &amp; goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use a Racial Equity Toolkit, with clear racial equity outcomes, to examine critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/18</td>
<td>Training on Implicit Bias &amp; Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) Application</td>
<td>• Conduct racial equity training</td>
<td></td>
<td>programs, policies, budget decisions, procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the use of a Racial Equity Toolkit to establish desired racial equity outcomes, identify harms and benefits, and develop strategies to achieve racial equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examine hiring practices and job requirements to eliminate barriers for people of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use a Racial Equity Toolkit, with clear racial equity outcomes, to examine critical programs, policies, budget decisions, procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure racial justice is a focus in the implementation of City &amp; County homeless strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Introduction to LAHSA &amp; the Coordinated Entry System (CES)</td>
<td>• Understand the role of LAHSA and the function of the Coordinated Entry System</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Involve persons with lived experience, persons of color, and service providers in data analysis and research efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/18</td>
<td>Examining Equity in the Homeless Service System through Data</td>
<td>• Understand demographic characteristics and experiences of Black people experiencing homelessness in LA County</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen and expand homelessness prevention programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examine racial equity in the homeless service system through data on program enrollments, housing placements, and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for inclusionary zoning policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Provide information about plan for capturing justice system involvement in CES assessment tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for fair hiring practices to reduce barriers to employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Report to full Committee on themes emerging at listening sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase cultural competency of program staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Provide more in-depth information about housing programs and matching process</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for fair chance housing legislation to prevent rental restrictions based on criminal records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Provide further analysis of recidivism/why people are exiting housing placements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6/18/18</td>
<td>Re-entry &amp; Criminal Justice System Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understand the connection between re-entry and homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explore barriers and possible solutions for accessing housing and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learn about and discuss existing City and County re-entry initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learn about and discuss community-based programs to support formerly-incarcerated persons in accessing safe and stable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Update on community listening sessions and focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apply the RET to address racial inequities impacting formerly-incarcerated Black people at risk of or experiencing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Create one list of listening sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Provide presentation on themes from listening sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs and Services:**

- Advocate for the development and growth of community-rooted programs, providers, and networks owned and/or led by formerly incarcerated individuals to guide successful reentry.
- Increase the scope and scale of criminal justice diversion programs provided by the LA County Office of Diversion and Reentry.
- Expand the use of restorative justice programs.
- Target Black families for homelessness prevention services.
- Adopt use of the Justice Discharge-Vulnerability Index-Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (JD-VI-SPDAT).
- Employ a Black person-centered trauma informed care model.
- Ensure rental and housing search/stability assistance is readily available for those exiting from incarceration.
- Create (or expand funding for) a Re-entry Navigator program to provide peer-to-peer mentorship, guidance, and support for re-entry populations in accessing housing, employment, healthcare, and education services.
- Assess current service provider practices (including how providers ask what people need) to ensure formerly incarcerated individuals are connected to the appropriate services.
- Champion the criminal justice system to be homeless- and housing-informed and
**operate with an anti-racist lens; train law enforcement on implicit bias and institutional racism.**

- Assess current booking criteria and sentencing guidelines; divert all homelessness-related bookings to services rather than jail.
- Review and redesign compliance requirements to be human-centered and racially just.

**Cross-System Coordination:**

- Strengthen working relationships between law enforcement, service, and housing providers.
- Support partnerships with homeless service providers, re-entry agencies, economic development organizations, and unions to provide job training, apprenticeships and a hiring pipeline for formerly incarcerated individuals.
- *Coordinate with appropriate agencies to target and leverage any housing dollars to support those living with criminal history.*
- *Partner with community colleges to create re-entry education programs for persons leaving incarceration.*
- *Generate a network of Reception/Transition Hubs with culturally relevant services.*

**Funding:**

- Fund and build capacity for programs to conduct effective wrap-around service
models for people who are formerly incarcerated and who are, or at risk of becoming, homeless.

- Fund programs that hire Black people who are formerly-incarcerated as caseworkers and managerial staff to support other formerly incarcerated people and employ trauma-informed care training and practices in their services.
- Engage the philanthropic community to leverage funding and strengthen new and existing partnerships.
- Reduce contracting requirements with public agencies; facilitate joint-ventures versus subcontractor models.
- Conduct a fiscal, cost, and power analysis of criminal justice investments and redirect criminal justice spending to early intervention, diversion, and behavioral health services.
- Encourage the City and County to shift investments in high-cost systems, such as the criminal justice system, to housing and service investments to help this population thrive in the community.

Data:
- Increase available data and metrics on homelessness and criminal justice—especially focusing on women and incarceration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Policy and Advocacy</th>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| July 7/16/18 | Child Welfare System Involvement               | • Involve a younger generation of advocates in program and policy design and implementation.  
• Use an advocacy framework that focuses on prevention, public safety, and human rights.  
• Adjust policies to prevent non-violent arrests from removing individuals experiencing homelessness from city- and county-controlled housing placement lists.  
• Redefine the definition of “homelessness” for non-HUD funded projects to include individuals exiting long-term incarceration.  
|            |                                                | • Identify interrupters of intergenerational cycles of homelessness and create appropriate coaching strategies to model desired healthy behaviors and essential life skills.  
• Promote client choice by providing programs and services based on the client’s needs and preferences whenever possible.  
• Offer appropriate referrals to those seeking faith-based counseling.  
• Employ a “targeted” strategy approach when developing programs and services, specifically relying on culturally competent and trained staff (including Black staff).  
• Create effective reunification programs and services that are reflective of housing first policies.  
• Focus on strengths of families (including foster care families and kinship care) and  |
build the family unit support through counseling and training, as well as mental health and behavioral health services.

- Broaden the extended foster care program to include youth up to age 25 with comprehensive, person-centered services including guaranteed housing, education, and employment.
- Increase foster care placements for youth of color with foster care families of color by offering incentives and supports.

Cross-System Coordination:
- Integrate trauma-informed care across DCFS.
- Implement prevention-oriented family supports by DCFS, potentially starting with TAY families.
- Improve access points within DCFS and in the homeless service delivery system.
- Create a human-centered systems design as well as a roadmap for the public to understand how to connect to services.
- Start transition planning earlier for youth exiting the foster care system.
- Encourage DCFS and court to operate within community-based settings.
- Develop cross-system coordination strategies to leverage resources and maximize services, expertise, and outcomes.
- Coordinate with partner agencies to develop more effective support systems for youth in DCFS care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{• Work with partner agencies to ensure transition planning commences with sufficient time to ensure the best outcomes.})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Identify and fund appropriate support systems for former foster care youth.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Increase investments in reunification and address concerns before children ever come into care.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Advocate for funding to support foster care youth seeking higher education or vocational programs.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Ensure data privacy is not compromised while supporting a robust data collection system.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and Advocacy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Advocate for a change in federal policy to extend Independent Living Programs (ILP) to age 24.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Racism Awareness and Trainings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Create and implement a Racial Equity Initiative at LAHSA to further goals aimed at eliminating institutional racism and achieving racial equity within all policies, procedures, and programs.})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{• Understand and employ strategies to address the intersections of oppression})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(such as transgender discrimination and racism).
- **Require ongoing training for mandated reporters, community service providers, foster care parents, DCFS staff, judges, attorneys, and legislators to address implicit bias, institutional racism, and disproportionality.**

**Workforce Development:**
- Develop a plan and process to increase the recruitment and hiring of Black people.
- Support the formulation, expansion, and use of “cultural broker” volunteers.
- **Recruit, incentivize, and support people with lived experience and/or people of color to become social workers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 8/20/18</th>
<th>CES Outreach, Assessment, and Interim Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and discuss CES assessments of Black people experiencing homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and discuss street outreach and engagement services provided to Black people experiencing homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on community listening sessions and focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply the RET to address racial inequities impacting Black people seeking shelter and/or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Email link to access the listening session summary document on the LAHSA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Update data analyses to examine the most recent time period possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs and Services:**
- Hire and train staff to engage people experiencing homelessness by understanding each person’s unique situation and particular needs and interests, and by focusing on a person’s resiliency.
- Train staff to better understand and serve the needs of diverse homeless populations, in particular Black LGBTQ individuals.
- Emphasize consistency and follow-up in outreach worker training and performance standards, and improve accountability for outreach worker engagement.
- Ensure that executive leadership is listening to people doing the work on the ground.
• Ensure that outreach teams involve the individual experiencing homelessness in developing their own housing plan.
• Seek to expand access to interim housing and services within communities, given geographic differences and distribution of resources.
• Design housing programs to include wraparound services.
• Seek participant feedback to improve the quality of services provided.
• Create organizational cultures that emphasize cultural competency & humility and allow staff with lived experience to feel safe and supported.
• Examine and take appropriate steps to ensure racial diversity at all organizational levels, including leadership, management, boards and commissions.
• Create opportunities for education and mentorship to support the development of Black people in leadership.
• Ensure that those administering the assessment tool are trained on how to seek needed information in a culturally competent, trauma-informed manner.
• Expand housing navigation services to enable access for more Black youth.

Cross-System Coordination:
• Advocate for targeted efforts to prevent loss of home-ownership, including education to protect against scams and access to resources to prevent foreclosure.
- Expand learning communities to include non-publicly-funded interim housing providers.
- *Encourage outreach staff to leverage local churches when attempting to identify and support Black people experiencing homelessness.*

**Funding:**
- Examine funding structure of interim housing programs and consider increasing the bed rate to allow for a higher level of case management support (considering the trade-off that this may reduce the total number of beds funded).

**Data:**
- Using quantitative and qualitative data, conduct an analysis to better understand the factors leading to returns to homelessness.
- Conduct listening sessions with clients who have successfully navigated from interim to permanent housing to determine success factors.
- Analyze the geographic distribution of interim housing as compared to the population of Black people experiencing homelessness.
- Ensure staff have sufficient time to enter data to improve the quality of data collection.
- Advocate for funding to support research efforts.
| September 9/17/18 | Permanent Housing | • Learn about housing models within the homeless service system (i.e. rapid re-housing, |

- Engage researchers to evaluate the CES triage tools to identify whether racial disparity exists, whether the vulnerabilities of Black and African American participants are adequately captured, and whether the language and administration of assessment tools is culturally competent.
- Conduct an analysis, based on gender and race, of job classifications and pay scales related to the homeless service delivery system workforce.

**Policy and Advocacy:**
- Dedicate attention to considering the tension between the desire to serve everyone, and the desire to ensure high-quality services and meet the needs of the most vulnerable, given the reality of limited resources.

**Institutional Racism Awareness and Trainings:**
- Train and support staff to identify internalized racism and implicit bias in their thinking and actions.

**Workforce Development:**
- Examine hiring practices and job requirements to ensure that lived experience is valued in hiring process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 10/22/18</td>
<td>Final Review of Recommendations</td>
<td>Review all potential recommendations that have emerged from the Committee’s work and finalize for inclusion in the Committee’s public report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applying the Racial Equity Tool to Employment Concerns

September 17, 2018
The Racial Equity Toolkit is a set of questions to guide us as we assess how our policies, projects, initiatives, and budget decisions benefit and burden communities. This process is intended to disrupt institutional racism and lead us towards more equitable results.
Eliminate racial disparities impacting Black people experiencing homelessness by ensuring racial equity within the homeless crisis response system.
Step 2: Engage Stakeholders and Analyze Data

Black People Experiencing Homelessness

2017 Unsheltered: Employment Status

- Recycling
- Panhandling
- Disabled
- Not looking for work
- Looking for work
- Day labor
- Retired
- Performance
- Part time employment
- Sex work
- Temporary work
- Full time employment
- Seasonal employment
- Student

Source: Economic Roundtable analysis of point-in time 2017 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count data
Note: Employment categories are not mutually exclusive (a person may report more than one). Numbers will not add up to 100%.
24% of all Black full-time workers in LA County are low-wage workers. Low-wage workers are those who earn less than $13.49/hour based on the median wage in LA County of $20.24.

17% of Black people in LA County are unemployed. Unemployment among Black people is the highest in LA County.

Source: L.A. Black Worker Center, 2016
Black households in LA County have the lowest median income. Those same households are also more likely to live in poverty than any other racial group.

Source: L.A. Black Worker Center, 2016
“You are pushing them into housing, knowing that they are only going to make $12.50 [an hour] and now they are saying two or three months later they have to pay 100% of their own rent. You are just recycling the poor.”

-Black Woman, Service Provider
“I am a paycheck away from being homeless myself.” -Black Woman, Social Worker

"We have redlining; we have lack of access to employment; certain groups are being hired into management positions. Black people tried to get hired into entry level positions and they can't even get those jobs." -Black Woman
“So, I came here; eventually I got a job; I got into school. There is a lot of help here, but it is not really for Black people. . . Now it is time for me to get a job. How am I going to get hired? Everybody else in that work were not Black, and they wanted their people in it. I went through that, and it was very difficult for me to get a job there. I got the job, but it wasn't nearly enough to cover half of the rent they were charging me.” -Black Woman with Lived Experience of Homelessness
"When we think about sustainability, we need to be looking at the skill sets that can help funnel kids into careers of the future. We need training programs in and near our community rather than having the community going up to the valley." - Black Woman, Employment Specialist
Step 2: Engage Stakeholders and Analyze Data

Learned from providers and researchers:

1. Employment specialists (serving people experiencing homelessness) often do not have sufficient training and education to provide employment counseling.

2. Some organizations offering job training programs rely solely on private funding. Limited funding limits the number of participants.

3. Training programs and workforce development services are often not easily accessible.

4. Different types of job training are needed.

5. Stronger connections are needed between the homeless service system and the workforce development system.
Step 3: Identifying Burdens/Benefits

1. Black people face employment discrimination.

2. Individuals with a criminal history face another layer of discrimination.

3. Black people are hired for lower-wage jobs and even then are paid less than other people.

4. There are insufficient job training programs that lead to living wage jobs.

5. Income from full-time minimum wage jobs is not enough for an average one-bedroom apartment in Los Angeles.
6. Housing and employment are intertwined. Wraparound services, including housing, are needed to support the transition from unemployment to employment.

7. It is difficult to seek educational or job training opportunities without housing and other supports such as child care, stipends, and other accommodations.
Step 4: Recommendations

Policy and Advocacy:
1. Advocate for legislation to prohibit or restrict the use of criminal records in housing and in employment applications.

Funding:
1. With additional and long-term funding, successful training programs can be expanded to other locations and to serve more people.
2. Stipends, childcare, and housing are needed for training participants to ensure they can successfully complete the training programs and seek employment.

Cross-System Coordination
1. Strengthen collaboration between the homeless service system and workforce development system.
Step 4: Recommendations

Services & Programs

1. Ensure that employment/workforce development staff have the appropriate education and expertise to assist clients seeking career path employment.

2. Develop a way to connect people experiencing homelessness to the most appropriate job training and workforce development opportunities, based on individuals’ needs and preferences.

3. Ensure staff employed within the homeless service system are being paid a living wage.
Permanent Housing

Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness

September 17, 2018
Insights from Community Listening Sessions
"The Shelter-Plus Care program is good but, where is the care? The permanent care facilities only have staff working from 9am-4pm. A lot of the staff have credentials (from USC) but they have no idea how to help individuals experiencing homelessness."

-Black Woman, Advocate with Lived Experience
"I work with the formerly incarcerated. We house the formerly incarcerated. We are talking about people that have served 20 or 30 years in prison and are coming home. They need wrap-around services. In many cases, they couldn't read or write, or they didn't have a GED when they came home and now they got that. They got training or now that they are certified to do something to empower themselves - that programing has to be there. It can't be just, 'give them a house' or 'give them some place to go.' They have to have other services that meet their needs, so they can get out there and feel empowered. Because they still feel hopeless with a voucher in their hand because they can't help themselves."

-Black Man, Service Provider, Formerly Incarcerated
"Rapid re-housing is a great program, and it does work for some people, but for other people who only have 221 or SSI, they are never going to increase their income. After we pull out, 10 times out of 10 they will be homeless. We have to figure out a way to help those people."

-Black Woman, Service Provider
"The criminalization of the mentally ill and being criminalized for using addictive substances are making it hard for people to get homes. Even if you have first and last [month’s] rent, the first thing they are going to do is a background check. If you have been incarcerated, you are not going to be able to get that apartment."

-Black Man, Service Provider
I have a Black boyfriend. When we look for apartments, I have to go alone because they always turn us down when he is around. We have to try to trick them into giving us the apartment, before they find out he is Black. We both have bad credit but "for me they are willing to make an exception, for him they are not."

-Paraphrased from White Youth at LAHSA Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Focus Group
"When we look over in South Park where the Staples Center is, there is a 12% vacancy over there. We got housing, we just don't have it for poor folks or for Black folks. The greatest issue is not being dealt with: folks can't pay their rent and equity firms own most of these single-family homes that they took away from folks in 2008. Most of that was Black folks who lost their homes; nobody got their homes back."

-Black Man, Pastor
Permanent Housing within the Homeless Service Delivery System
Permanent Housing Overview

Estimate of Available Permanent Housing Resources vs. Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Housing Resources (Annual Estimate)*</th>
<th>Active CES Participants (Unhoused)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRH Slots 6,400</td>
<td>25,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH: New Units 2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH: Turnover Units 684</td>
<td>-16,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data are based on anticipated availability of resources in the immediate future. PSH: New Units represent estimated FY 17-18 availability. PSH: Turnover Units estimated based on average monthly turnover in 2017. RRH Slots represent estimated 3,600 slots for adults (LAHSA-funded & DHS-funded), 2,250 for families with children, and 550 for youth.

**Count of individuals and households who have completed a CES triage tool, have had a service interaction in the last 90 days, and have not yet been matched to a housing resource.
Permanent Housing Overview

**Permanent Housing**: Community-based housing, wherein formerly-homeless persons have their own lease and live as independently as possible. Permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing are two primary types of permanent housing assistance provided through the LA County CES.

- Rapid Re-Housing
- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Affordable Housing
Permanent Housing Overview

**Rapid Re-Housing**
- Provides time-limited financial assistance and targeted supportive services
- Helps people solve the practical and immediate challenges in obtaining permanent housing
- Links people to community resources to achieve long-term housing stability
- Currently filled through referrals; will be matched through CES

**Affordable Housing**
- Includes housing assistance programs created by federal, state, and local governments
- Essential component of efforts to meet the housing needs of those experiencing homelessness and to reduce the inflow of households entering homelessness

**Permanent Supportive Housing**
- Permanent housing including rental assistance paired with supportive services
- Assists people with long-term supportive service needs to achieve housing stability
- May be project-based or tenant-based
- Matched through CES
Known Challenges

• **Need for stronger supportive service** component in existing PSH units and for **ensuring services are tailored** to meet the needs of specific subpopulations with unique vulnerabilities

• **Sustaining rent payments** after exiting RRH program, particularly for large families and those with fixed incomes

• **Higher rates of returns to homelessness** for Black people served through the homeless service system

• **Inadequate supply of permanent housing** for all populations
Opportunities

| **Prevention** | Provides participants with financial assistance and housing stabilization services to avoid becoming homeless |
| **Representative Payee** | Provides money management services for people experiencing homelessness, or formerly homeless residents of PH |
| **Shallow Subsidy** | Targets households exiting RRH who require a subsidy to maintain housing stability |
| **Measure H Strategy D7** | Provides supportive services to: |
| | • Bolster existing PSH ($7.5 M in total funding) |
| | • Create new PSH countywide (2,950 new units estimated in FY 18-19) |
STRATEGY D7 – PROVIDE SERVICES AND RENTAL SUBSIDIES IN PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING (PSH)

- Provides Services and Subsidies for PSH
- Non-time-limited affordable housing assistance combined with supportive services
- Integrated Care Model – providing on-site services in client’s homes and in the field
- Maximizes the expertise of each County Department
PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Every client receives a housing subsidy.

Intensive Case Management Services (ICMS)

Linkage to primary care

Linkage to mental health and substance use disorder services

Housing Location Services

Linkage to Benefits Advocacy

Linkage to additional services:
- IHSS
- IHCG
- ALWP
- ERC

Health Services
Los Angeles County
MEASURE H: STRATEGY D7 PROVIDE SERVICES AND SUBSIDIES FOR PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

(1) DHS: Intensive Case Management Services (ICMS)

(2) DMH: Housing Full Service Partnership (Housing FSP)

(3) DPH-SAPC: Client Engagement & Navigation Services (CENS)

(4) DHS: Services Funding for Existing Project Based Sites
Insights from Panelists

**Moderators:**
Josh Hall, LAHSA
Reba Stevens, LAHSA Lived Experience Advisory Board

**Panelists:**
- Rule Buchanan, Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles
- Melody Darden, LA LGBT Center
- Derek Day, Brilliant Corners
- Gloria Johnson, LAHSA Lived Experience Advisory Board
- Jennifer Rachal, People Assisting the Homeless (PATH)
Discussion of Potential Recommendations
Examining Equity in the Homeless Service System Through Data
For the LAHSA Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness
Key Questions

Who is being housed through rapid re-housing or permanent supportive housing?

What are the outcomes for people housed through rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing?
Data sources used

- **Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count**
  - Gives a snapshot of homelessness in LA County
  - Mandated by US Department of Housing and Urban Development
  - Conducted annually in January
  - Includes unsheltered (metro lines, county parks, riverbeds) and sheltered (emergency shelters, transitional housing, and Safe Havens).

- **Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)**
  - Records information about clients who access housing and homeless services in LA County
  - Mandated by US Department of Housing and Urban Development
  - Data collected at intake into Coordinated Entry System
  - Includes homeless and those at-risk of homelessness
Who is housed through permanent housing programs?
Permanent Housing vs. Homeless Population

Source: HMIS Intake Jan 2017 – Dec 2017

POPULATION HOUSED IN PH PROGRAMS (2017)
- Black 44%
- Latinx 30%
- White 18%
- Other/Unknown 8%

HOMELESS POINT-IN-TIME POPULATION (2017)
- Black 40%
- Latinx 35%
- White 20%
- Other/Unknown 5%

Source: Greater LA Homeless Count
Does not include Long Beach, Pasadena, or Glendale
Permanent housing placements by race/ethnic group

Source: HMIS intake data, Jan 2014 – Jun 2018, all entries
Do people of different race/ethnic groups have similar outcomes after placement into housing?
What is a housing placement rate?

Housing placement rate = rate at which clients enrolled in rapid re-housing are placed into housing.

What is “time to placement?”

Time to placement = time between enrollment in rapid re-housing and placement into housing.
## Rapid Re-housing
### Placement Rates and Time to Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Placement Rate</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Placement (in Days)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Placements</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Placement Rate</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Placement (in Days)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Placements</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS data, 2014-2018. These are single adults and families that received a housing service through RRH. Time to placement is the number of days between enrollment and move-in date.
### Rapid Re-housing

#### Exit rates and placements for single adults who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit to...</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exits</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>876</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited RRH programs between 2010-2016


These are single adults who exited and received a housing service through RRH.
Rapid Re-housing  
Exit rates and placements for families who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Exit Rate</strong></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Exits</strong></td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS data, 2014-2018, family corresponds to at least one adult with a child.
Statistics for head of household. These are families who exited and received a housing service through RRH.
* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited RRH programs between 2010-2016

---
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### Permanent Supportive Housing

Exit rates and placements for single adults who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Exit Rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Type</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Exits**

| Total Exits | 1,168 | 396   | 409   |

**Recidivism Rate***

| Recidivism Rate* | 14.2% | 8.0%  | 7.3%  |


* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited PSH programs between 2010-2016.
Permanent Supportive Housing
Exit rates and placements for families who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Exit Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollments</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Exits | 173 | 87  | 26  |
| Recidivism Rate* | 13.5% | 4.2% | 3.7% |

Source: HMIS data, 2014-2018, a family corresponds to at least one adult with a child. Statistics for head of household.

* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited PSH programs between 2010-2016
Key Takeaways

For Rapid Re-housing:
• There are no significant differences in placement rate in rapid re-housing across race/ethnicity.
• The time to placement in rapid re-housing is slightly longer for Black individuals and Black families than for other race groups.
• There are marginal differences in recidivism rates and exit destinations.

For Permanent Supportive Housing:
• Black individuals and Black families experience higher exit rates to destinations that are not other permanent housing options.
• Both Black individuals and Black families have higher recidivism rates (i.e. rates at which they are seeking interim housing or outreach services after exiting permanent supportive housing).
Questions?
Appendix
Defining outcomes

Housing placement outcomes on the following slides defined as follows:

1. **Permanent housing**, differentiated by subsidy receipt:
   1. Permanent housing with subsidy: Permanent Supportive Housing; rent or own with some housing subsidy
   2. Permanent housing without subsidy: Living with family or friends; moving into an apartment or a motel without subsidy, own without subsidy

2. **Transitional Housing**

3. **Interim housing**: Emergency shelter; Safe Haven; bridge housing

4. **Institutions**: Psychiatric hospital or facility; substance abuse treatment facility; nursing home or other long-term residence

5. **No Placement**: Place not meant for human habitation; jail or prison; hospital

6. **Unknown Housing Placement**
## Rapid Re-housing Placement Rates and Time to Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Placement Rate</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Placement (in Days)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Placements</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS data, 2014-2018. These are single adults and families that received a housing service through RRH. Time to placement is the number of days between enrollment and move-in date.
## Rapid Re-housing
### Exit rates and placements for TAY who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit to...</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Exit Rate</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rate</strong>*</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exits</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are TAY who exited and received a housing service through RRH.
* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited RRH programs between 2010-2016
Permanent Supportive Housing
Exit rates and placements for TAY who exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit to...</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing with Subsidy</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perm. Housing without Subsidy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Housing</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recidivism Rate***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total exits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HMIS data, 2014-2018, TAY
These are TAY who exited and received PSH.

* Recidivism rate is computed for people who exited PSH programs between 2010-2016
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Nation’s largest non-profit civil rights organization dedicated to securing and promoting fair housing

HRC was founded in 1968, the same year Congress passed the Fair Housing Act

Over the past ten years, HRC has assisted more than 250,000 residents throughout Los Angeles and Ventura Counties

Languages: English, Spanish, Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Armenian, Russian and American Sign Language (ASL)
PROGRAMS & SERVICES

Counseling & Outreach
- Landlord-Tenant Counseling
- Outreach & Public Education
- Free monthly rental listing

Fair Housing Enforcement
- Discrimination Complaint Investigation
- Litigation & Advocacy
1866 First Civil Rights Act

1964 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

1973 Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act

1975 Age Discrimination Act

1968 • Federal Fair Housing Act (FHA)

1988 Fair Housing Amendment Act (FHAA)
CALIFORNIA LAWS

1959 • Unruh Civil Rights Act

1963 • Rumford Fair Housing Act
  • 1964: Proposition 14
  • 1967: Reitman v. Mulkey (U.S. Supreme Court)

1968 • Disabled Persons Act

1980 • Fair Housing and Employment Act (FEHA)

1994 • Made substantially equivalent with Federal Fair Housing Laws

©2018
CALIFORNIA PROTECTED CLASSES

- Marital Status
- Sexual Orientation
- Age
- Ancestry
- Medical Condition
- Source of Income
- Gender Expression
- Gender Identity
- Gender
- Genetic Information
- Citizenship
- Primary Language
- Immigration Status

Other California Protections:
- Arbitrary Discrimination
- Perception
- Association
GENTRIFICATION/DISPLACEMENT - HOW WE’RE HERE

- 1. Government mandated segregation - yes, even in Los Angeles
- 2. Restrictive Covenants
- 3. Predatory Lending
- 4. Redlining: U.S. backed private lending only to non-redlined neighborhoods which were Anglo-Saxon Caucasian. Home improvement loans also only went to those neighborhoods. This led to the dilapidation and blight in black and brown neighborhoods which were often in urban areas near downtowns. Created under valued housing prices. Today, millennials are moving in. Why? Hip and “urban” loving, will create charter schools so not reliant on current school system, want to live near downtown not suburbs, love newly created public transit systems, and many make more $$ than current urban residents and if they don’t, they’re willing to share housing.

The following maps show how the actions of the U.S. government created the displacement that many of our communities are experiencing today - in addition to the overwhelming disparity of wealth between white and black/brown households.
Where do Blacks live?

Los Angeles City and County remain starkly segregated with Black and Hispanic residents facing the highest levels of segregation and often having limited residential options outside of areas with R/ECAPs, which are majority non-White census tracts with poverty rates of 40% or more.

Black Angelenos primarily live in South LA and in cities and unincorporated areas in LA County that border South LA, such as Inglewood, Compton, Carson, and Gardena. The Antelope Valley and farther areas of the County such as Lancaster and Palmdale also have significant Black populations who have migrated from the City. Until recently, Pacoima in the SFV also had a large Black population. Other significant but rapidly declining Black populations in Pasadena and Altadena in the San Gabriel Valley.
L.A. City by Race: **1990 to 2010:**

White population: From 1,293,927 (37.2% of the total population) to 1,083,347 (28.6% of the total population)

Black Population: From 453,181 (13.0% of the total population) to 372,536 (9.8% of the total population a decrease of 49,779 or 11.8%)

Hispanic Population: From 1,389,413 (39.9% of the total population) to 1,718,263 (46.6% of the total population), an increase of 328,850 or 23.7% . By 2010, the Hispanic population was 1,838,233 (48.5% of the total population), an increase of 119,970 or 7.0%.

Asian/API population: From 320,157 (9.2% of the total population) to 466,041 (12.3% of the total population).

**2010-2017:**

Between 2010 and 2015, the White population increased from 1,083,347 (28.6% of the population) to 1,119,405 (28.2% of the population), an increase of 36,058 or 3.3%.

Black population: From 372,536 (9.8% of the total population) to 355,984 (9.0% of the total population), a decrease of 16,552 or 4.4%

Hispanic population: From 1,838,233 (48.5% of the population) to 1,936,732, an increase of 98,499 or 5.4%

Asian/API: From 466,041 (12.3% of the total population) to 457,556 (11.5% of the total population), a decrease of 8,485 or 1.8%
Los Angeles is Segregated by Race. Indicators of segregation:

- **Dissimilarity Index Values by Race and Ethnicity for Los Angeles**
  
  One commonly used metric for segregation is the Dissimilarity Index. The Dissimilarity Index measures the percentage of a certain group’s population that would have to move to a different census tract in order to be evenly distributed within a City or metropolitan area in relation to another group. The higher the Dissimilarity Index, the higher the extent of the segregation.

  For example, if a City’s Black/White Dissimilarity Index was 65, then 65% of Black residents would need to move to another neighborhood in order for Blacks and Whites to be evenly distributed across all neighborhoods in the city.


  Source: HUD AFFH Tool Table 3-
• **Isolation and exposure indices to measure segregation.** These indices, when taken together, capture the neighborhood demographics experienced, on average, by members of a particular racial or ethnic groups within a City or metropolitan area. The Isolation Index measures the extent to which minority members are exposed only to one another. Values for the Isolation Index range from 0 to 100.

• Isolation Index:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Los Angeles, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Exposure Index is a group's exposure to all racial groups. Values for the Exposure Index also range from 0 to 100. A larger value means that the average group member lives in a census tract with a higher percentage of people from other group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/White</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/White</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Black</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Black</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Black</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Hispanic</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Hispanic</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Asian</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Asian</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Asian</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Communities, Diversity and Disparities
Race/Ethnicity

5 – Map: Los Angeles Region Race/Ethnicity

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity

Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs

Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
8 – Map: Los Angeles City Black Population

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
7 – Map: Los Angeles City Hispanic Population

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
9 – Map: Los Angeles City Asian American and Pacific Islander Population

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
10 – Map: Los Angeles City Non-Hispanic White Population

HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

Name: Map 1 - Race/Ethnicity
Description: Current race/ethnicity dot density map for Jurisdiction and Region with R/ECAPs
Jurisdiction: Los Angeles (CDBG, HOME, ESG)
Region: Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA
### L.A.: Subsidized Housing by Race and Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Los Angeles, CA CDBG, HOME, ESG) Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>23.98%</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>69.99%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Based Section 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
<td>5,617</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>31.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
<td>851</td>
<td>30.13%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>35.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,449</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>23,039</td>
<td>53.89%</td>
<td>9,005</td>
<td>21.06%</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>510,140</td>
<td>38.62%</td>
<td>146,570</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>471,240</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
<td>162,019</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>73,675</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>16.35%</td>
<td>126,635</td>
<td>43.88%</td>
<td>34,589</td>
<td>11.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,300</td>
<td>22.83%</td>
<td>70,530</td>
<td>14.34%</td>
<td>232,130</td>
<td>47.19%</td>
<td>54,289</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-80% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>181,610</td>
<td>25.11%</td>
<td>96,015</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>338,220</td>
<td>46.76%</td>
<td>79,799</td>
<td>11.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA) Region</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>62.56%</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-Based Section 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,154</td>
<td>23.86%</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>10,365</td>
<td>27.02%</td>
<td>11,753</td>
<td>30.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>33.38%</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>21.39%</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>35.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,766,510</td>
<td>41.80%</td>
<td>333,080</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>1,405,070</td>
<td>33.25%</td>
<td>629,349</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>215,775</td>
<td>29.59%</td>
<td>86,225</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
<td>305,885</td>
<td>41.95%</td>
<td>105,314</td>
<td>14.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>343,565</td>
<td>26.07%</td>
<td>135,740</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>587,685</td>
<td>44.60%</td>
<td>175,814</td>
<td>13.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-80% of AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>590,895</td>
<td>28.77%</td>
<td>195,155</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>905,370</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>272,549</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Data Sources: Decennial Census; APSh; CHAS

**Note 2:** #s presented are numbers of households not individuals.
City of Los Angeles: Opportunity Indicators based on location, by Race/Ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Los Angeles, CA CDBG, HOME, ESG)</th>
<th>Low Poverty Index</th>
<th>School Proficiency Index</th>
<th>Labor Market Index</th>
<th>Transit Index</th>
<th>Low Transportation Cost Index</th>
<th>Jobs Proximity Index</th>
<th>Environmental Health Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>57.93</td>
<td>66.39</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>82.87</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>32.64</td>
<td>85.39</td>
<td>88.08</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>84.89</td>
<td>87.23</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>55.02</td>
<td>54.13</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>87.77</td>
<td>46.88</td>
<td>12.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>37.48</td>
<td>50.46</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>86.17</td>
<td>46.39</td>
<td>14.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population below federal poverty line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>87.84</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>89.53</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>89.79</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>49.34</td>
<td>88.18</td>
<td>92.15</td>
<td>49.66</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>87.46</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA Region)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>76.59</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>46.74</td>
<td>38.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>81.34</td>
<td>83.42</td>
<td>46.12</td>
<td>23.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>43.05</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>80.65</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>43.16</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>55.68</td>
<td>64.53</td>
<td>57.42</td>
<td>78.82</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>31.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>48.97</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>48.40</td>
<td>78.04</td>
<td>81.53</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population below federal poverty line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>61.26</td>
<td>59.07</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>84.23</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>32.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>83.34</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>83.28</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>43.89</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>45.15</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>82.27</td>
<td>86.69</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>80.82</td>
<td>84.18</td>
<td>47.51</td>
<td>25.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Decennial Census; ACS; Great Schools; Common Core of Data; SABINS; LAI; LEHD; NATA
Refer to the Data Documentation for details (www.hudexchange.info).
LA City and County conducted a Resident Fair Housing survey during Winter 2016/Spring 2017:

- 6,700 responses from residents of the City and County of Los Angeles. The Resident Fair Housing Survey was intended for residents to provide input on community and fair housing issues.
- Translated into 7 languages
- City of Los Angeles accounted for 2,505 surveys (out of the total 6,757)
- 732 survey respondents reported having been discriminated against in their housing either by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Disability, Source of Income, or other factors.
- Of the total, 4.6% reported being discriminated against by gender. The majority of those respondents (71.4%) were female, 17.9% were male, and 10.7% were transgender.
- **28.1% reported being discriminated against by Race/Ethnicity.**
- Of those, **48.0% were Black**, 23.8% were Latino/a or Hispanic, 14.1% were Other Race, 9.7% were Native American, 3.1% were Asian, 1.3% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, BLACK SEGREGATION, BLACK HOMELESSNESS causes:

- Government enforced by laws and public policies (restrictive covenants, zoning restrictions, targeted policing and incarceration)
- Racism and Community Opposition
- Private Industry supported (rental housing discrimination, predatory lending, scams leading to foreclosures of Black owned homes)
- Lack of Tenant Protections against rent increases, eviction, retaliation, harassment, invasive rules
- Enforcement of rules/policies having a disparate impact on Black people (discrimination against Section 8 recipients; use of criminal history for denial of housing and credit; discrimination against Black boys and men)
- Household size and composition issues
- Lack of Access to subsidized housing opportunities (targeted marketing of units to non-Blacks, discriminatory enforcement of rules)
- Low Access to proficient schools and disproportionate disciplining of Black children
Causes continued:

- Severe housing cost burden (income vs. rent) leading to Displacement
- Unsafe and uninhabitable housing
- Low economic mobility – lack of employment training and opportunities. Discrimination in education and employment, use of criminal history to deny employment
- Disinvestment in segregated neighborhoods followed by an infusion of public and private capital and public improvements such as parks, bike lanes and public transit corridors/expansion of Metro lines.
- Environmental Health Issues (lack of clean water, air, and parks)
- Lack of community revitalization strategies (misguided strategies)
- Lack of beneficial private investments in Black neighborhoods
  - Housing
  - Grocery Stores
  - Banks
  - Employment (with livable wages)
- Lack of regional and interagency cooperation
Other Contributing factors for Black Displacement

• Loss of housing of and/or lack of support for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and other crimes against Blacks

• Intra-discrimination, bias and stigma (e.g., against LGBTQ, mental healthcare)

• Reduction in Services and Facilities in RSO units

• Ostracization (isolation, not feeling wanted)

• Loss of family, friend and support networks

• Loss of social support, infrastructure, access to healthcare (places of worship, gathering places, community)
HRC AT 50!

PLEASE CALL
(800) 477-5977
info@housingrightscenter.org

OR VISIT OUR WEBSITE
www.housingrightscenter.org