

MEETING: Disability Services Advisory Council

DATE: Friday, January 19, 2018

TIME: 10:30AM –11:45AM

LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments

5th Floor, Buford Meeting Room

859 Willamette Street

Eugene, OR 97401

CONTACT: Kate Scott, 541-682-4137; kscott2@lcog.org

1. DSAC Agenda

Documents:

[01-19-18 DSAC AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. DSAC Minutes 11/17/17

Documents:

[DSAC 171117.PDF](#)

3. SDS Joint Council 11/17/17

Documents:

[SDS JT CNCL 171117.PDF](#)

4. SSAC Agenda 1/19/18

Documents:

[1-19-18 SSAC AGENDA.PDF](#)



MEETING NOTICE

MEETING: Disability Services Advisory Council

DATE: Friday, January 19, 2018

TIME: 10:30AM –11:45AM

LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments
5th Floor, Buford Meeting Room
859 Willamette Street
Eugene, OR 97401

CONTACT: Kate Scott, 541-682-4137; kscott2@lcog.org

AGENDA

10:30 a.m.	1. Call to Order, introductions	Lana J.
10:31 a.m.	2. Consideration of Meeting Agenda	Lana J.
10:33 a.m.	3. Consideration of last DSAC minutes	Lana J.
10:35 a.m.	4. DanceAbility Guest Presentation	
11:00 a.m.	5. Action Items	
	a. Livable Communities	Andy F.
	b. Action items from the floor	All
11:15 a.m.	6. Announcements, Updates, Discussions	
	a. Lane Equity Event Debrief	Lucy Z.
	b. Items from the floor	

-OVER-

**MINUTES
DISABILITY SERVICES ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Friday, November 17, 2017
10:30 – 11:45 a.m.
Buford Room — Park Place Building
859 Willamette Street – Eugene, Oregon**

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Ahlen, Joe Basey, Melanie Carlone, Hoover Chambliss, Andy Fernandez, Marianne Malott, Ed Necker, Tina Powell, Peggy Thomas, Sheila Thomas, Dennis Weirich, Roxanne Franklin Wilson, Lucy Zammarelli.

EXCUSED: Lana Junger

GUESTS: Jordan Crowder, Michelle Slayter

STAFF: Kate Scott, Jody Cline, Sondra Marks

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Mr. Necker called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Those present introduced themselves.

2. Consideration of Meeting Agenda

Ms. Powell announced that the council's request to remove names from Homecare Worker vouchers finally had been met.

The agenda was accepted by consensus without changes.

3. Consideration of September 15 DSAC meeting minutes

MOTION: Ms. Powell moved, seconded by Mr. Weirich to approve the September minutes as presented. The motion carried, 11:0:1, with Sheila Thomas abstaining because she had been absent.

4. Action Items

a. Livable Communities

Ms. Scott handed out the "Advocacy Committee Livable Communities Recommendation." Mr. Fernandez explained the AARP presentation at a previous meeting about age-friendly communities whose accessibility benefited both older people and people with disabilities had triggered the committee's consideration of this matter. The Advocacy Committee had prepared a recommendation that it asked the advisory councils to forward to the Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors. Mr. Fernandez clarified that DSAC and SSAC were being asked separately to endorse the recommendation. He noted that the recommendation to LCOG member agencies was to strive toward a goal of meeting the Livable Communities criteria but it did not mandate they do so and did not include punitive measures if they did not.

Ms. Zammarelli and Mr. Basey arrived at 10:36 a.m.

Mr. Fernandez reported that after discussion with staff the committee had decided the recommendation should go to the full LCOG Board and not to subgroups because committee members viewed making livability a reality as being a joint effort that required all agencies to work together. He added that AARP served as a vehicle for promoting the concept but it really was rooted in World Health Organization (WHO) standards.

After discussion of possible language changes, council members agreed they wanted reference to accessibility added to the third "Whereas" statement and the inclusion of "benefit to people of all physical and mental abilities" added to the fifth "Whereas" statement.

DSAC members also agreed with Mr. Ahlen's suggestion that the recommendation be accompanied by supporting documentation such as a WHO checklist and a description of the subsections of the 8 domains. Ms. Scott asked Mr. Ahlen to send her the list to be included. Ms. Cline commented the LCOG Board would appreciate that additional information.

MOTION: Peggy Thomas moved, seconded by Joe Basey, to forward the recommendation as amended to the LCOG Board. The motion carried unanimously, 13:0.

b. Committee Membership

Before moving to this item Ms. Cline expressed her gratitude for everyone's work that had resulted in a strong advisory council.

Copies of the "Committee Member Recommendations" drafted by staff were passed out. Ms. Cline observed there was good representation on all committees by members of both DSAC and SSAC.

Peggy Thomas expressed some concern that the Advocacy Committee only had 3 SSAC members listed and a proposal for that group specified 11 members with 5 representing SSAC. Ms. Scott responded that as the committee developed its bylaws it could adjust membership and representation numbers.

Ms. Cline asked members who wanted changes or additional assignments to contact Ms. Scott.

Ms. Wilson wanted to join the Long Term Care Committee.

Ms. Malott wondered about her eligibility to serve on SSAC now that she was 65. Ms. Scott clarified that in her role as the liaison from DSAC to SSAC she was officially a voting member of both groups.

Responding to a request from Peggy Thomas, Ms. Scott said some council members were not comfortable sharing their phone numbers or addresses but she would provide current rosters and e-mail addresses after she updated them.

Ms. Wilson asked for more information about the role of Procurement and Monitoring. Ms. Scott said the committee provided advice and input on discretionary funding contracts, monitored how contracted services were being provided, and participated with staff in site visits. For example, recently committee members had been invited to visit the kitchen where Meals on Wheels food was prepared.

Mr. Ahlen commented on the importance of coordinating council members' communication through LCOG in order to ensure that quorum rules were followed and decision-making was transparent.

c. Review of Draft S&DS Brochure

The draft brochure was distributed. Michelle Slayter explained that when doing S&DS outreach events she had realized the agency lacked a brochure so she had worked to correct that. She asked for feedback on what she had drafted and Ms. Scott said she would forward to Ms. Slayter any suggestions people thought of and sent to her after the meeting.

Mr. Ahlen suggested adding a statement that materials were available in alternative formats upon request.

Mr. Necker commented that while more information about some of the programs would be useful, it was more important to have a reasonably readable font size. He suggested adding a phone number to call for more information about programs. Ms. Wilson recommended that wherever help for people with disabilities was mentioned it should specify physical disabilities so people would not request services that were not available to them.

Ms. Slayter pointed out that the middle section of the brochure listed programs available to people over 60 regardless of disability. She could add the ADRC phone number beneath the program listings.

Ms. Cline proposed that Ms. Slayter make the changes mentioned and that Ms. Scott then send out the revised brochure with a deadline for providing additional suggestions.

d. Action Items from the Floor

Sheila Thomas asked whether the accessibility issues along the EmX line on West 11th that were discussed at the last meeting were being addressed. Mr. Ahlen answered that they were.

5. Overview of Adult Foster Homes

Jordan Crowder provided and reviewed in detail a document titled "Adult Foster Home Program Overview." specific only to those adult foster homes (AFHs) licensed by S&DS. These foster homes had age and physical disability eligibility requirements. Other types of foster homes were available through the mental health system.

In AFHs a caregiver lived in the home with residents and the goal was to create a more homelike environment than other placement types such as residential care facilities, assisted living facilities, or nursing facilities. Caregivers received the week-long "Ensuring Quality Care" training as well as S&DS orientations and additional classes. Their references were

checked and local certification was required.

There were three classifications of foster homes with progressively more direct care experience and additional licensing required for the higher classifications. Frequently foster home caregivers entering the system gained experience and then were able to elevate the classification of their homes to take in individuals with higher care needs and to meet those needs. Homes might have several types of staff and care givers and staffing levels and requirements differed for the different classifications. Currently S&DS worked with 89 commercial foster homes.

Specialized contracts involved homes where the intent was to serve targeted populations, such as individuals with heavy physical care needs, complex medical needs, or challenging behaviors that limited placement options. These homes received enhanced rates and had higher staffing requirements. Currently S&DS had one each of three specialized types of contracts, one Advanced type, one Basic, and one Complex ADL

Answering questions, Mr. Crowder said no homes had beds specifically set aside for emergency placements, and that homes averaged between three and five beds each. He estimated there were a total of about 250 Medicaid beds and said he could provide more specific information.

Ms. Wilson reported she had called Lane County Behavioral Health after the last meeting and was told that office did not license foster homes for mental health patients. Mr. Crowder clarified that the local office did not license such homes and that the Oregon Health Authority was the licensing agency.

Ms. Carlone was curious about a budget for recruiting providers and educating the community about them. Mr. Crowder explained that applications to become providers were received regularly but over the past few years more homes had closed than opened. There were no S&DS funds budgeted specifically for recruitment of providers but specialized contracts was one way the State was trying to attract more providers, especially on the Medicaid side.

Ms. Carlone responded that long-term planning might indicate the need to create a budget for foster home provider recruitment in order to be ready for the large spike in the population needing care.

Ms. Wilson suggested that volunteers might help with recruitment. Mr. Crowder agreed to look into this idea and to see whether the State did anything for recruitment.

Mr. Chambliss asked about the kinds of problems associated with the foster home system in Lane County. Mr. Crowder responded that the system regularly generated some complaints that either Licensing and Monitoring or Adult Protective Services (APS) investigated. Many of them were around issues like the quality of food but did not rise to the level of neglect.

Responding to questions from Mr. Necker, Mr. Crowder continued by saying the state's focus was primarily on safety-related complaints and if an APS investigation found violations of

foster home rules it could result in formal citations, fines, mandatory trainings, restrictions on admissions, and occasionally homes were closed because they failed to comply with the rules and meet the conditions. Most homes in violation closed voluntarily. There was a process for correcting problems but some homes did not address the concerns and opted to close instead.

Private pay homes had to follow the same rules and were required to respond to concerns the same way. S&DS monitored foster homes annually and once or twice a year did unannounced visits. In private pay homes S&DS had less of a presence than in the homes it licensed but still responded to and investigated complaints. Private pay homes did not have case managers visiting to provide individual assessments.

Ms. Powell recalled when she had been involved in relicensing activity in the past there had been no checking on residents and paperwork only had to be in order. Mr. Crowder observed that S&DS staff was doing more now than previously and with one case manager assigned to each foster home there was a better connection with residents and awareness of what was going on. Inspectors also had more interaction with clients now. He said Medicaid residents had one assessment with a case manager each year and case managers also stopped by if they were in the neighborhood and checked on residents. Mr. Crowder noted that licensors tried to let providers know that S&DS wanted to act more as a partner rather than opponent.

Ms. Carlone spoke about the benefits of a good foster home situation and said many larger facilities were unable to meet clients' needs. She saw value in having a foster home support group for providers to come together to brainstorm and share resources. Mr. Crowder agreed and said in other parts of the state there were strong networks organized by providers. He was aware of an informal association in Lane County but did not know whether meetings were held and if they were S&DS had not been invited to participate.

Ms. Malott commented that Lane County had no long-term care facilities that could accommodate clients weighing more than 350 pounds and she wondered if people had to go to Portland for their care. Mr. Crowder answered that the State was aware of the need for bariatric placements but he did not know of plans to build such facilities. Ms. Cline said she also had not heard of any plans for addressing this need.

6. Announcements, Updates, Discussions

a. BluePath & LILA Updates

Sheila Thomas handed out a document titled "Myths and Truths About the 'ADA Education and Reform Act' (H.R. 620)" and asked council members to take it home, read it, and consider writing letters in opposition to the bill which she said would diminish the ADA. Due to the lack of time at this meeting, her presentation was postponed to the next meeting.

b. Community Accessibility Assessment Webinar

Mr. Weirich reported the webinar had been good and that lots of local accessibility assessment already was underway. APD envisioned local DSACs performing "macro assessments" of local communities and making recommendations. This would require finding more volunteers to look at ADA problems within a given area.

Mr. Weirich preferred seeing people with disabilities talk with businesses about their needs for accessibility improvements with a non-aggressive, customer-service approach rather than in an ADA compliance and punitive manner. He suggested the Advocacy Committee could take on as a project building tools for consumer advocacy or connecting with APD if it wanted to participate in the OHSU/DHS project as described in the webinar. He also recommended working with LILA and Trillium.

Sheila Thomas indicated that LILA had a team of people with vast ADA experience and sad they could present an overview of ADA issues at a future meeting.

- c. Items from the Floor - none

7. LCOG, Councils and Committee Reports

- a. Long-Term Care Committee Update

Mr. Weirich said in an effort to ensure that needs were being met the committee was reviewing the intake process for long-term care.

- b. Advocacy Committee

Committee chair Peggy Thomas reported the committee had worked on the Livable Communities recommendation at its last meeting. She announced the next meeting would be November 27.

- c. Procurement & Monitoring

Peggy Thomas shared that committee members had toured the meal site facilities at the Willamalane Adult Activity Center, received information about the program from Sandy Karsten and Heather Demsky, and had lunch at Cafe 60.

- d. Senior Services Advisory Council

Mr. Fernandez reported at the last meeting Carmel Snyder from AARP had spoken about current legislation that affected older adults and seniors and how AARP was addressing it. He had presented an update of the Parks and Recreation Systems Plan that represented a 30-year long-term vision. The council also heard about Area Agencies on Aging applications for federal grants.

8. Call for Next Meeting Agenda Items & Reminder of Next Meeting January 19, 2018, 10:30 AM – 11:45 AM 859 Willamette Street, 5th Floor Buford Meeting Room Eugene, OR 97401

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

(recorded by Mary Feldman)

MINUTES
SENIOR & DISABILITY SERVICES JOINT COUNCIL

Friday, November 17, 2017
noon – 1:30 p.m.
Buford Room — Park Place Building
859 Willamette Street – Eugene, Oregon

MEMBERS PRESENT: Marianne Malott, Chair; John Ahlen, Joe Basey, Rosemary Beachy, Ruth Beardsley, Amy Bresler, Melanie Carlone, Hoover Chambliss, Andy Fernandez, Rod Holst, Karen Locke, Sue Maddron, Kay McDonald, Tom Mulhern, Ed Necker, Tina Powell, Diane Rogers, Barbara Susman, Peggy Thomas, Ken Viegas, Dennis Weirich, Roxanne Wilson, Lucy Zammarelli

GUESTS: Tom Mulhern, Catholic Community Services of Lane County Exec Director; Erik de Buhr, Community Supported Shelters Executive Director; Denise Jubber, Eugene Mission Director of Supportive Services; Mira Gattis, HACSA Resident Services Director; Dan Bryant, Opportunity Village/Square One Executive Director; Anne Williams, St. Vincent de Paul Housing Programs Manager

STAFF: Jody Cline, Kate Scott, Sondra Marks

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Ms. Malott called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

2. Housing Panel

Ms. Gattis used a handout and slides in her presentation about the Housing Authority's services to more than 5,000 families in Lane County. She shared photos of sites of public and multifamily housing owned by HACSA that provided 1-4 bedroom units with eligibility determined by family size. She noted that previously units had turned over more quickly but people tended to remain longer now. Income-eligible people who received Section 8 vouchers for certain bedroom-sized units could use the vouchers anywhere in Lane County. The wait list had been closed with 3,000 people on it and now 2,200 people remained on it. Ms. Gattis stressed the importance of those on the wait list maintaining a current mailing address to avoid being removed from the list. Special preference for Section 8 vouchers was given for Title 9, homeless veteran families, families transitioning from homelessness or displaced by fire or familial domestic violence, and homeless people with disabilities.

Once someone reached the top of the Section 8 wait list they completed paperwork, received a briefing and a packet of information, and then looked for a landlord. Landlords did their own background and reference checks. Having a bad criminal history record made it more challenging to find housing but those declared ineligible for HACSA's public units due to the results of their background check, criminal, or rental history could request a hearing to explain what had changed since their offense had happened. Lifetime registered sex offenders were never eligible. Tenants were required to report all changes in income and households.

The Section 8 homeownership program allowed using the voucher for mortgage payment after being in the program at least one year and meeting the requirements of the complicated self-sufficient program. Answering Ms. Wilson's question Ms. Gattis said it was possible for someone with a

temporary address outside Lane County who reached the top of the wait list still to be eligible for the home ownership program if they were completing the self-sufficiency program and met certain requirements.

HACSA's non-subsidized housing rents did not fall within the 30 percent income qualification. There were about 700 of those units and about 1,100 of public and assisted housing.

Ms. Beardsley asked about referring people and Ms. Gattis responded that applications were available at HACSA's front desk or could be downloaded from the website.

Ms. Gattis agreed to provide copies of her PowerPoint presentation. She then reviewed services provided by some of the sites: New Winds in Florence provided supported living for people with chronic mental illness who were referred by Peace Health or Options Counseling. Roosevelt Crossing in Eugene had been built cooperatively with Sponsors and it provided transitional housing for people coming out of prison who lived in Lane County before prison.

Ms. Malott commented that her Section 8 housing facility allowed felons to live there, some of whom were noncompliant.

Ms. Gattis spoke about HACSA's commitment to increasing opportunities by assisting residents to access services which entailed a lot of partnerships with community agencies. She cited the Shelter Plus Care continuum of care program that used HUD grants to help with housing for formerly chronically homeless individuals and allowed them to be pulled off the Centralized Wait List. Other grants with community partners were used to promote housing stability and self-sufficiency for residents in public housing units or holding Section 8 vouchers.

Ms. Wilson commented it was important to let Family Self Sufficiency program clients know that a certain amount of increased income was matched but once it was exceeded the voucher was canceled and participation in the program ended.

Ms. Gattis concluded her presentation by emphasizing the importance of advocacy for more affordable housing. She viewed housing as a right and something that should be considered the basis for all health issues. She announced that the local Intergovernmental Housing Policy Board met on the first Monday of the month at noon to review issues and policies around affordable housing. She noted that Portland, Salem, Corvallis, and Bend had enacted a new construction fee that benefited affordable housing.

Mr. de Buhr shared a slide show presenting information about Community Supported Shelters (CSS), the organization that managed Eugene's four rest stop sites or Safe Spots which provided legal places for the homeless to camp in a basic but livable environment. Each of the sites served different populations, with one serving people with physical and mental disabilities, one serving vets, and two for the general homeless population between the ages of 18 and 72 (children were not being served at this time). Every location was fenced and had gate duty shacks that monitored egress and entry. Residents were required to leave between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., 20 people were allowed per site and after a one month trial period they could stay for six months and then apply for a three-month extension if they needed more time. A 2-1/2 month wait list moved quickly.

Sheltering at one of the low-barrier sites discouraged antisocial behavior but admission to the

program was not restricted by felony or drinking history. Monthly checks-ins were required and each community had general and communication meetings, work parties, and provided special mediation if someone was not succeeding in the social situation. Five volunteer staff positions were filled by residents. Personal shelters consisted of a platform and tent cover or Conestoga huts with a locking door and a 6'x10' interior at the veteran's camp. Each site had two porta-potties; a solar system for charging cell phones and small devices; trash service; a wood-heated community space where people could gather; and a camp kitchen with running water, propane stove, and food storage. Work parties worked with the City on maintaining camp infrastructure, paths, replacing tent covers, and building kitchens. Safe Spots were all about hope and empowerment through fostering a culture of cooperation, healing, and self-improvement. In 2016 they had served 171 people.

Ms. Rogers commended Mr. de Buhr's accomplishments since she had met him seven years previously when he was working to build Conestoga huts one at a time. She thanked all the panelists for their hard work to meet the needs of vulnerable people.

Ms. Thomas recognized that the priorities of CSS were people with mental and physical disabilities, vets, and young adults but she was concerned about accessibility at the Safe Spots. Mr. de Buhr responded there were wheelchair accessible huts at two sites and another was coming at the vet's camp. He said there were few wheelchair-using applicants but the first two participants in the program had used wheelchairs. The camps' proximity to a bus line was especially valuable.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that the requirement to be off-site during the day could be physically overwhelming for some people with disabilities. Mr. de Buhr stated that with a doctor's note exceptions to this requirement were made.

Responding to Mr. Necker's question about children, Mr. de Buhr said that because sex offenders were not ineligible, children could not be accommodated.

Mr. Bryant reported that after Opportunity Village was built it had become clear that the lack of affordable housing meant people could not move on from temporary shelter so the people responsible for Opportunity Village decided to build affordable housing. Emerald Village Eugene now was under construction on a one-acre parcel in the Whitaker area. It would consist of 22 tiny structures of 160-340 square feet at a cost of \$25,000 each. Each would have plumbing, heat, water, a small kitchenette, and there would be a common space with a full kitchen. There would be no on-site property manager and the community was expected to deal with its own issues.

The simplicity of the design allowed for maximizing the use of volunteers in building. Mr. Bryant had presented the concept to AARP at a conference in Dallas recently. The project included two fully ADA-accessible units but there were no applicants for those yet. The project involved working closely with the City to ensure everything was code compliant. The structures were intended as permanent housing for residents whose only income was Social Security or SSI so they could only afford the rent of \$250-350 per month. The first 14-15 residents had been selected over a year ago and they were working with final design agreements and how to live together in a community. Each had been required to put in 50 hours of sweat equity in building their own homes. The \$1.7 million project had received \$0.5 million in in-kind donations. The structures' small size allowed for a high degree of energy efficiency. One was a clay/straw construction with foot-thick walls. Located at 25 N. Polk Street, tours were given regularly. One home was nearly finished and may be occupied in December. The homes would be populated as they came on line.

Responding to Ms. Thomas's request for clarification Mr. Bryant said this was a limited equity co-op in which residents rented their homes until after 30 months \$50 of the monthly rent went toward paying off the balance of the cost.

Opportunity Village/SquareOne had purchased an acre in Cottage Grove with Meyer Memorial Trust grant funds and a donation and wanted to replicate the Emerald Village model with a community of 13 tiny homes. He said one of the lessons learned during the current process was the importance of selecting a site that was a level property and close to services, including a bus line. The Whitaker property provided those features. They also had learned that using cluster parking emphasized the community feel and promoted interaction. One of the issues in tiny housing was storage and at Emerald Village it was designed to be high within the structures so was not entirely accessible. He added that seniors or anyone unable to contribute their 50 hours of sweat equity could contribute in other ways such as through PR efforts.

Answering an inquiry from Ms. Thomas, Mr. Bryant said applicants were not drug-tested but the community nature of the project involved a selective process that vetted applicants and a serious felon or predator sex offender may encounter issues in the case-by-case selection process. Because a 16-year old already had been accepted as a resident, careful consideration would be required if a registered sex offender applied. Ms. Thomas commented that someone 18 who was in a relationship with a younger person would be considered a sex offender and she was concerned about how to distinguish that person from a predatory sex offender.

Council members thanked Mr. Bryant for his work and his presentation. Ms. Rogers asked about a site visit for the advisory councils and Mr. Bryant said to call him and he would schedule it.

Ms. Carlone hoped to see Federal and State cooperation that provided some funding for things like this project that actually worked. Mr. Bryant said this project had been financed nearly entirely through private charity except for some help provided by the City of Eugene. While the average cost for affordable housing was \$150,000-200,000 per unit, this project's per unit cost was \$80,000. Although residents did need to have some income, Section 8 vouchers would be accepted if the units qualified under Section 8 standards and this was something being discussed with HACSA. The income requirement for residents was a maximum below 60 percent of median income which qualified for a low income housing property tax exemption.

Ms. Jubber distributed handouts about the Eugene Mission and its services. It was the only emergency shelter in the area and served 600-700 people each day, about 400 of whom spent the night. It served as many as 1,000 meals some days but averaged around 850. Existing since 1956, the Mission's current executive director had come onboard 6 years ago and since had effected some significant changes. As a shelter housing individuals, some people had lived at the Mission over 30 years. Now it was considered a wellness center serving people experiencing homelessness. While many shelters limited stays to one month only, anyone staying longer than 90 days at the Mission was required to engage in case management to get the support needed to change their trajectory. It also had become a dry shelter with zero tolerance for drugs and alcohol. People who tested clean for everything except THC were allowed to stay and were retested in 45 days. Most people appreciated having a safe place for their recovery from substance use.

A team with three behavioral health specialists worked with the 90 percent of those served who met

the criteria for diagnosable mental health conditions, many of whom lived with psychoses. A Supportive Services team had four case managers. Registered sex offenders were served in the men's section and case managers made an effort to connect them to services before their 90 days had elapsed. Case managers helped individuals identify and then set goals to address barriers in the areas of housing, behavioral health, physical health, disabilities, employment/financial, criminal/legal, veterans, parenting, and domestic violence. Ms. Jubber's Support Services team knew the programs in all these areas and interfaced with partners working in them. The veteran's project with which Mr. de Buhr worked was on Mission property. A veteran's specialist on the team had served in the Air Force and understood the vet system so was able to help vets who did not believe help was available to them, including those with less than honorable discharges. The number of vets now served had doubled.

Ms. Wilson stated that she was starting a peer-delivered service for support and recovery and could help if clients were referred to peer support.

Ms. Beardsley wondered if the Mission used a program that helped people apply for Social Security disability programs. Ms. Jubber replied that referrals sometimes were made and that County staff recently had assisted with SSI. The Mission often partnered with community court through the City. She commented that often clients lacked trust and did not report information needed by others in order to help them. Ms. Beardsley added that Social Security often received applications from individuals that could not be located so the applications were denied.

Ms. Williams reported that St. Vincent's waiting list currently was open but likely would close in a couple of weeks and people could get an application at the office at 2890 Chad Drive. The intent was for it to be open once each quarter and when it hit 3,000 names the agency would work through those names. St. Vincent had a couple of 72-unit HUD-subsidized housing facilities in Marion County serving those 62 and older or with disabilities. There was a high turnover rate there and people paid 30 percent of their income to rent the units with HUD subsidizing the remainder.

Ms. Williams described the Rural Housing Rehabilitation Program as operating in Oakridge, Westfir, Lowell, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Florence, Veneta, Junction City and unincorporated areas of Lane County. It provided three percent interest loans to people who owned their homes and whose incomes were at or below 80 percent of the federal median income. Interest payments were not required until a change in use of the property or the owner's death. Repaid loans supported the revolving loan fund that provided for health and safety or accessibility improvements by people with low income who wanted to improve or maintain the value of their homes.

Supportive Services for Veteran Families was another St. Vincent program that provided funding for eviction prevention and rapid rehousing. Its goal was for people experiencing a housing crisis to achieve housing stability through case management and referrals to VA community resources. This was the newest stream of funding made available in many years and it had grown exponentially over the past five years. The local program had been one of the initial 86 grantees nationwide in this effort to break down silos between HUD and vet programs. The program model had reduced by 50 percent nationally homelessness among vets despite the ongoing affordable housing crisis.

Ms. Williams encouraged council members to let Congress people and local representatives know that people could not continue to be placed in housing that did not exist or that they could not afford or sustain. Eligibility for this program was determined by being a vet with any form of discharge except

dishonorable and having 50 percent or below median income. A small amount of gap funding allowed provision of services to some vet families slightly over the median income level. Staff was trained to find answers and make referrals for vets who did not qualify.

Ms. Beachy mentioned a report that the homeless tents off Highway 99 had been under-budgeted for heat. She was not sure the report was credible but hoped to find out more about the situation.

Ms. Maddron asked how a vet with a family accessed the program described by Ms. Williams. Ms. Williams responded that income eligibility varied by the number in the household and the individual should call St. Vincent's and ask for someone on the SSVF staff.

Ms. Wilson wondered if the family of a vet was eligible if the vet had passed away and Ms. Williams said that enrollment by the veteran was required and if that had happened prior to the death then the family continued to be eligible.

Mr. Mulhern spoke about Catholic Community Services' rental housing counseling program as being a unique service helping people find affordable housing. The process began with a weekly orientation group session for ten people that provided information after which there were one-on-one follow up sessions with a housing counselor. This program was available to anyone. The Emergency Rental Assistance program helped people pay rent in an emergency and this program was open when funding was available. Currently it was available and 40 names were being put on a list weekly.

Other programs included Elderly Rent Assistance for those 58 and older and it had \$50,000 available; Emergency Food and Shelter program with \$28,000 available; and the Emergency Housing Assistance program which had \$69,000 available. Eligibility criteria generally was being homeless or unstably housed and in threat of eviction. Typically the agency had only one or two pots of money available but presently it had these three. Other Catholic Community Services programs provided housing rental assistance with case management. It also had operated a homeless prevention program with ShelterCare.

Answering Ms. Beachy's question, Mr. Mulhern said each program had its own funding source with most money received through Lane County's Human Services Division that acted as the funnel for State and Federal funding.

Ms. Carlone requested a copy of the presentations.

3. Call for Agenda Items for Next meeting: January 19, 2018

Future topics for the agenda were to be submitted to Ms. Scott.

4. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:49 p.m.

(Minutes recorded by Mary Feldman)

2:30 p.m.

2:43 p.m.

MEETING NOTICE

MEETING: **Senior Services Advisory Council**

DATE: Friday January 19, 2018

TIME: 1:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

2:45 p.m.

LOCATION: Lane Council of Governments
5th Floor, Buford Meeting Room
859 Willamette Street
Eugene, OR 97401

CONTACT: Kate Scott, 541-682-4137; kscott2@lcog.org

A G E N D A

- | | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| 1:15 p.m. | 1. Call to Order, Introductions | Diane R. |
| 1:16 p.m. | 2. Consideration of Meeting Agenda | Diane R. |
| 1:18 p.m. | 3. Consideration of the last Council Meeting Minutes | Diane R. |
| 1:20 p.m. | 4. Dementia Friendly America Presentation & Discussion | N4A/Jody |
| 2:20 p.m. | 5. Action Items
a. Livable Communities
b. Other items from the floor | Andy F. |
| 2:25 p.m. | 6. Announcements, Updates, Discussions
a. Items from the floor | All |

-OVER-

7. LCOG, Council and Committee Reports

The above facility is wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation and assisted listening devices can be provided with 48 hours notice; call (541) 682-4498.\

- a. Advocacy
- b. DSAC

Jody
Marianne or Andy

- 8. Call for Next Meeting Agenda Items and
Reminder of Next Council Meeting

Diane R.

March 16th, 2018 1:15PM – 2:45PM
859 Willamette Street, 5th Floor Buford Meeting Room
Eugene, OR 97401

- 9. Adjourn

Diane R.