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PREFACE

This guidebook is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information concerning two surplus federal property programs, Title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and the Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994, which are directed toward serving homeless people. In distributing the guidebook, the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty (NLCHP) is not rendering legal or other professional services. If you are not an attorney and need legal advice concerning a particular problem or question related to something in the report, you should contact an attorney who can advise you on the matter. If you are unable to secure help from an attorney, NLCHP staff may be able to refer you to an attorney.

NLCHP monitors the federal government’s implementation of the surplus property programs. If you are aware of federal property that should be considered surplus but has not been so designated, please e-mail us at nlchp@nlchp.org. You also should notify us if you are aware of properties that HUD has mistakenly designated as “not suitable” to assist the homeless population.
I. INTRODUCTION

This nation continues to struggle with the ever-growing problem of homelessness. Between 2.5 and 3.5 million men, women, and children experience homelessness over the course of a year.1 On any given night, more than 800,000 Americans are homeless.2 While there are no recent statistics on the total number of homeless veterans, the Veterans Administration estimates that almost 300,000 veterans are homeless on any given night, and more than half a million veterans experience homelessness over the course of a year.3

According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors’ 2004 report, requests for emergency shelter in the 25 cities studied rose by an average of 6 percent over 2004.4 On average, 23 percent of requests for emergency shelter went unmet during the same period.5 Forty six percent of the cities surveyed said that the length of time people were homeless increased in the last year.6 While this Administration has set a goal of ending chronic homelessness in ten years, the Administration and Congress are cutting funding for housing and other aid to low-income Americans in the face of increasing budget deficits.

As hundreds of thousands of persons across the nation cope with homelessness, an underused national resource -- unused federal property -- is available to help alleviate the problem. The federal government owns thousands of pieces of real property, including 29.6% of all of the land in the United States. According to an April 2004 Republican Study Committee fact sheet, 5.1 million acres of federal land are classified as “vacant with no definable purpose.” While we know of no current estimates of the total number of federal buildings that are vacant or unused, the Government Accountability Office estimated in June 2003 that the federal government spends billions of dollars to maintain properties that are not needed.7

There are two federal programs governing transfer of federal real property to provide services to homeless people, including homeless veterans. In 1987, Congress enacted the surplus federal property program known as Title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.8 Title V makes unused federal properties available, at no cost, to serve as facilities to assist homeless persons. Seven years later, Congress enacted the Base

---

1 Martha Burt et al., Helping America’s Homeless: Emergency Shelter or Affordable Housing? 49-50 (2001).
2 Id.
3 See www.nchv.org/background.cfm. HUD statistics reported in 1999 remain the most-cited numbers on national homelessness. In its report, Homelessness: Programs and the People They Serve, HUD reported that 23% of homeless people are veterans, compared to 13% in the general population. See www.huduser.org/publications/homeless/homelessness/ch_2b.html.
5 Id.
6 Id.
Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994 (1994 Base Closure Act). The 1994 Base Closure Act removed military base property from Title V’s requirements, but requires that the needs of homeless persons be considered in determining how to use the property. A wide variety of property becomes available as a result of base closure, and some, such as former base housing, is particularly well suited to the needs of homeless veterans.

NLCHP’s Founder and Executive Director, Maria Foscarinis, was one of the architects of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and NLCHP has been integrally involved in the surplus property programs from the beginning. NLCHP monitors enforcement of the Acts, offers technical advice on the programs to service providers around the country, and has, on occasion, brought suit to force compliance with the statutes. After Title V’s enactment, Maria Foscarinis, on behalf of the National Coalition for the Homeless, sued the Veterans Administration, the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Health and Human Services for failing to implement Title V. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia granted an injunction, ordering the departments, among other things, to screen federal property properly and make it available for use to assist homeless persons. After NLCHP was formed in 1989, it became the plaintiff in the litigation. The federal agencies that implement Title V remain under the court’s injunction.

As part of its continuing effort to ensure effective implementation of the surplus federal property programs, NLCHP has produced this guidebook to educate homeless veteran service providers about the programs and their problems and benefits. This guidebook has two sections. The first part outlines the requirements of Title V and the 1994 Base Closure Act and summarizes the results of the programs, showing how they have benefited homeless Americans by supplying surplus federal property to homeless service providers and local governments across the country. The first part also discusses problems that applicants for surplus federal property have faced in acquiring and using the property, and general barriers to effectiveness of the programs. Finally, the first section offers recommendations for removing those barriers and ensuring that homeless service providers are able to use the property for the purposes Congress intended.

Part two of the guidebook describes a large sample (64) of the programs that have acquired surplus federal property. NLCHP surveyed providers that applied successfully for surplus federal property and asked them a number of questions, including how they are using the property, what their costs have been, their capacity, and the number of people they serve. We also asked the providers to describe any problems they encountered in applying for and using the property. The variety of programs, the

---

creativity and dedication they reflect, and the number of people they have served testify to the need to broaden the impact of the programs.

II. TITLE V OF THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT

A. Overview

In the early 1980s, as homelessness and poverty reached emergency proportions, the federal government initially viewed homelessness as a problem not requiring federal intervention. Advocates around the country began to demand that the federal government acknowledge homelessness as a national problem requiring a national response. In late 1986, legislation providing emergency shelter, food, mobile health care, and transitional housing for homeless Americans was introduced as the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act. Both houses of Congress passed the legislation by large bipartisan majorities in 1987. After the death of its chief Republican sponsor, Representative Stewart B. McKinney of Connecticut, the bill was named the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act became law on July 22, 1987. It was renamed the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in 2000, after the death of a key Democratic champion, Congressman Bruce Vento of Minnesota.

In passing the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, Congress found that the country faced “an immediate and unprecedented [homelessness] crisis” and that “the problem of homelessness has become more severe and . . . is expected to become dramatically worse.” Congress recognized for the first time that “the Federal Government has a clear responsibility” to address the needs of homeless Americans. Congress’s purpose was, in part, “to use public resources and programs in a more coordinated manner to meet the critically urgent needs of the homeless of the Nation.” The statute as originally enacted authorized fifteen new programs providing a range of (mostly emergency) services to homeless people, and amended existing programs to include, improve, or expedite access for homeless people.

Title V of the McKinney Act, entitled “Identification and Use of Surplus Federal Property,” required all federal agencies to identify and make available surplus federal real property for use by states, local governments, and nonprofit agencies “to assist the homeless.” Those entities receive the federal property at no cost, either by long-term lease or deed. As this guidebook shows, homeless service providers and local government agencies have used surplus federal property to provide meals, shelter, job training, counseling, administration of programs for homeless individuals, childcare,

---

13 42 U.S.C. 11301(a)(1), (2).
14 42 U.S.C. 11301(a)(6).
15 42 U.S.C. 11301(b)(2).
16 42 U.S.C. 11411(a).
17 42 U.S.C. 11411(f); 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(e)(2).
medical care, case management, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and food banks.

In enacting Title V, Congress used as its basis the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (FPASA),\(^{18}\) a comprehensive scheme for the disposal of federal real property administered by the General Services Administration. Since 1987, GSA has conveyed over $3 billion worth of federal property.\(^{19}\) Normally, under FPASA, GSA conveys the property to other government entities or to private parties at its fair market price, but GSA has conveyed about one-third of the property to state or local government agencies as a “public benefit conveyance” at a substantially discounted price.\(^{20}\)

Under FPASA and GSA’s implementing regulations, federal landholding agencies must conduct a survey to determine whether they have properties that are excess, surplus, unutilized, or underutilized. “Excess property” under FPASA is “property under the control of any Federal executive agency that is not required for the agency’s needs or the discharge of its responsibilities.”\(^{21}\) The statute defines “surplus property” as any “excess real property not required by any Federal landholding agency for its needs or the discharge of its responsibilities, as determined by the Administrator of GSA.”\(^{22}\) “Underutilized” under the statute “means an entire property or portion thereof, with or without improvements which is used only at irregular periods or intermittently by the accountable landholding agency for current program purposes of that agency.”\(^{23}\) “Unutilized property” is “an entire property or portion thereof . . . not occupied for current program purposes for the accountable executive agency or occupied in caretaker status only.”\(^{24}\)

While “surplus property” under the GSA regulations technically means only that excess property that is not required by any federal agency, the phrase “surplus federal property” has taken on a broader meaning, as reflected in the language of Title V, and covers all four types of federal real property that must be made available to assist homeless persons under Title V. For purposes of this guidebook, we also will use this broader definition of “surplus property” to include all types of federal property that may be available for homeless assistance.

---

\(^{18}\) Now codified at 40 U.S.C. 101, \textit{et seq.}

\(^{19}\) Found at GSA’s website, http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/channelView.do?pageTypeId=8195&channelPage=%2Fep%2Fchannel%2FGsaoverview.jsp&channelId=-12952

\(^{20}\) Id.

\(^{21}\) 40 U.S.C. 102(3).

\(^{22}\) 40 U.S.C. 102(10).

\(^{23}\) 45 C.F.R. 12a.1

\(^{24}\) Id.
B. How Title V Works

1. Suitability Determination

Administration of Title V is complex and involves three separate federal departments (in addition to the property-holding agency): the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the General Services Administration (GSA). The Interagency Council on Homelessness, which was created by the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, also has the general responsibility of coordinating federal homelessness efforts.

Congress charged HUD with the task of screening all properties that potentially could be used to provide homeless services. Each quarter, all federal agencies must submit descriptions of underutilized, unutilized, excess, and surplus real properties to HUD for a suitability determination. HUD then determines, based on the property survey form that the landholding agency must complete, whether the properties are “suitable for use to assist the homeless.”

Title V itself does not define “suitable for use to assist the homeless.” HUD considers properties suitable for the purposes of Title V unless they fall under one of the following categories:

- **National security:** Properties to which the public is denied access, including properties where a security clearance is necessary for entrance, are unsuitable unless alternative access can be provided without compromising national security.

- **Flammable or explosive materials:** A property is considered unsuitable if it is within 2000 feet of any facility handling flammable or explosive material.

- **Runways and Military airfield clear zones:** Properties within airport or airbase runway clear zones are unsuitable.

- **Floodway:** Properties within a floodway of a 100-year floodzone are unsuitable unless the floodway has been corrected or only a small section of the property that will not affect the use of the remainder is in the floodzone.

- **Documented Deficiencies:** Properties containing hazards to personal safety are not suitable. These could include: contamination, structural damage, deterioration, asbestos, PCBs, radon, flooding, sinkholes or earthslides.

---

26 42 U.S.C. 11411(c)(1)(C).
27 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(1).
28 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(2).
29 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(3).
30 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(4).
31 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(5).
Within 45 days of receiving HUD’s suitability determination, the landholding agency must explain to HUD whether there is a compelling federal need for the property or whether it intends to make the property available for homeless assistance. If the landholding agency contends that there is a compelling federal need for the property or that it should otherwise not be made available to assist homeless persons, it must fully justify its conclusion to HUD.

2. Publication of Available Property

Under the statute, HUD must publish a list of the properties within 15 days of the end of the 45-day period for the landholding agency to respond to the suitability determinations (or 30 days after the date of the suitability determination.) As a result of one of the court’s orders in NLCHP’s lawsuit against the federal agencies, the lists of property are published weekly in the Federal Register and in general, appear on Fridays. This publication must include all properties that are suitable and available, as well as all properties that have been determined unsuitable and/or unavailable. Information published about each property includes a description of the property, its address and its classification. In addition to this specific requirement, “the Secretary [of HUD], the Administrator [of GSA] and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make such efforts as are necessary to ensure the widest possible dissemination of the information on such list.”

The Interagency Council on Homelessness must also distribute the list to all State and regional homeless coordinators.

If HUD announces that certain property is not suitable for homeless use and a provider questions that determination, the provider can challenge HUD’s determination, but it must do so quickly. To appeal HUD’s determination of unsuitability, the homeless provider must contact HUD either by calling a toll-free number (1-800-927-7588) or in writing within 20 days of its publication in the Federal Register. Upon receiving the request for review, HUD will notify the landholding agency of the request and ask for all available information on the property to review the determination. HUD must act on the request for review within 30 days of receiving the requested information from the landholding agency. It will then notify both the potential applicant and the landholding agency of its decision.

---

32 24 C.F.R. 581.6 (a)(6).
33 24 C.F.R. 581.7.
37 24 C.F.R. 581.4 (e), (f).
3. Applying for the Property

Once HUD announces that a property is “suitable” and “available” in the Federal Register, the government must hold it for 60 days to allow potential applicants, called “representatives of the homeless,” to submit a notice of interest in applying for the property. “Representatives of the homeless,” which means nonprofit organizations or state or local government agencies, must submit a brief letter of interest to HHS identifying the property in which they are interested, describing the proposed use, giving the name of the organization or agency and whether it is a public body or a private nonprofit, stating the provider’s intent to apply formally for the property, and requesting an application packet. Potential applicants may be individual organizations or government agencies, or a collaboration of nonprofits and/or government agencies, that intend to use the property for services for the homeless population such as meals, shelter, job training, and counseling. Letters of interest for Title V property must be sent to:

Director  
Division of Health Facilities Planning  
Public Health Service, Room 17A-10  
Parklawn Building  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockville, MD 20857

During the 60-day period in which potential applicants may submit a letter of interest, the landholding agency may not dispose of the property for any use other than to assist homeless persons. If the 60 days pass and HHS receives no letter of interest, the landholding agency may dispose of the property, but it still must give priority consideration to homeless uses if a letter of interest is submitted after the 60-day period.

HHS will send an application packet in response to the letter of interest, which the applicant must return to HHS within 90 days of HHS’ receipt of the original letter of interest. The application form for properties under Title V (HHS Form 696) is long and complex, and is not tailored to surplus property to serve homeless populations. It is the same application that HHS uses for disposing of federal property for all other uses, including hospitals, sewage disposal systems, animal control facilities, and forensic laboratories and morgues. The landholding agency possesses much of the information required in the application, so applicants should contact the landholding agencies for help when needed (and the landholding agencies are supposed to respond).

According to the regulations, applicants for Title V property must provide:

1) A description of the applicant organization, including documentation that the organization is a “representative of the homeless,” that the applicant is allowed to

40 45 C.F.R. 12a.9.  
41 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(e)(2)(ii).  
42 45 C.F.R. 12a.9 (a)(4).
hold real property, and in the case of those private non-profit organizations applying for deeds, documentation of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status.\textsuperscript{43}

2) A description of the property and whether any proposed modifications conform to local use restrictions, except for local zoning regulations.\textsuperscript{44}

3) An outline of the proposed program, explaining the population it will serve and “how the program will address the needs of the homeless population to be assisted.”\textsuperscript{45} The application, in contrast to the Title V-specific regulations, requires an applicant for property to “[l]ist other facilities in the community that currently offer the same type of service you propose to offer, including the number of clients and/or beds. Provide information to support the need for additional services in the community. \textbf{Include any surveys, reports, or other documentation to support your analysis.}”\textsuperscript{46}

4) The ability to finance and operate the proposed program, describing all costs and sources of funding, including the cost of maintaining the property. The application requires the applicant to provide more detailed information than the regulations seem to suggest, including a capital outlay budget and separate identification of funding sources for operations.\textsuperscript{47}

5) A certification that the applicant complies with various non-discrimination requirements.\textsuperscript{48}

6) Proof of ability to insure the property against loss, damage or destruction.\textsuperscript{49}

7) Information relevant to historic preservation concerns, where applicable.\textsuperscript{50}

8) Environmental information, including sufficient information about environmental issues to allow HHS to analyze the environmental impact of the proposed project on the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{51} Again, the application’s requirements are more detailed than the regulations, requiring the applicant to complete a ten-page environmental questionnaire.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{43} 45 C.F.R. 12a. 9(b)(1).
\textsuperscript{44} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(b)(2).
\textsuperscript{45} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(b)(3).
\textsuperscript{46} HHS Form 696 at 5 (emphasis in original).
\textsuperscript{47} HHS Form 696 at 6.
\textsuperscript{48} 45 C.F.R. 12a (b)(5) (these include the Fair Housing Act, Equal Opportunity in Housing, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).
\textsuperscript{49} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(b)(6).
\textsuperscript{50} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(b)(7).
\textsuperscript{51} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9 (b)(8).
\textsuperscript{52} HHS Form 696, attachment C.
9) The applicant must inform local government service providers of the proposed program.\textsuperscript{53}

10) Those applicants applying to lease the property are not required to comply with local zoning requirements (because HUD’s regulations preempt state and local zoning laws),\textsuperscript{54} but applicants for either a lease or a deed must comply with local use requirements and building codes.\textsuperscript{55} The application form is therefore somewhat confusing because it requires the applicant to “[i]ndicate the zoning restrictions, if any, that are applicable to the subject property, and assure that the proposed program will conform to such restrictions.”\textsuperscript{56} If you intend to lease the property, make that clear on the application form, and local zoning laws will be irrelevant.

4. HHS’ Consideration of the Application

HHS, in theory, has 25 days in which to approve or deny an application.\textsuperscript{57} HHS’ regulations provide under “scope of evaluation” that “[d]ue to the short time frame imposed for evaluating applications, HHS’ evaluation will, generally, be limited to the information contained in the application.”\textsuperscript{58} HHS often avoids this 25-day time limit by requesting additional information from the applicant. Of the seventeen applications HHS received in 2003, it acted within the twenty-five day period in only five cases.\textsuperscript{59}

5. Transferring the Property

The statute requires that once an application is approved, the property must be made “promptly” available.\textsuperscript{60} Generally, the property may be made available in one of two ways: The controlling agency may declare the property excess and transfer it to GSA, which may then deed or lease the property to an applicant. Or, the agency may grant an “interim use” permit directly to the applicant. Successful applicants can secure transfer of the property either by lease or deed. As noted above, any applicant that takes possession of the property under a permit or lease is not subject to local zoning requirements, although it still must comply with local use restrictions.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{53} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9 (b)(9).
\textsuperscript{54} See also United States v. Village of New Hempstead, 832 F. Supp. 76 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (upholding regulation exempting leased Title V property from local zoning requirements).
\textsuperscript{55} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9 (b)(10).
\textsuperscript{56} Form HHS 696 at 5.
\textsuperscript{57} 42 U.S.C. 11411(e)(3).
\textsuperscript{58} 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(c).
\textsuperscript{59} HHS Monthly Homeless Reports for 2003 (on file with NLCHP).
\textsuperscript{60} 42 U.S.C. 11411(f)(1).
\textsuperscript{61} 24 C.F.R. 581.9(b)(10).
III. BASE CLOSURE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AND HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1994

A. Overview

Originally, surplus military base property also fell under Title V of the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. The Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994 (1994 Base Closure Act)\(^{62}\) revised Section 2905(b)(7) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA)\(^{63}\) and amended Title V to remove military base property from Title V’s requirement, substituting a new community-based redevelopment process. The 1994 Base Closure Act was designed to reconcile the affected communities’ multiple interests in base property reuse and the national priority of assisting homeless persons. The 1994 Base Closure Act, in effect, replaces the priority of consideration for entire base properties with a different kind of safeguard -- inclusion in the reuse process and plan, and protection by mandatory federal review. In contrast to Title V, under which HHS will transfer the property to a provider or government agency only for homeless uses,\(^{64}\) the 1994 Base Closure Act is more flexible and the base property can be used in any number of ways to provide homeless assistance. Some plans have provided, for example, for job set-asides for homeless people on the former base property, and under other plans, the property was sold for commercial use and the money from the sales was to be put in a housing trust to assist homeless people.\(^{65}\)

B. How the 1994 Base Closure Act Works

The base redevelopment process begins with the selection of the nine-member Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and the Department of Defense’s (DoD’s) recommendations to the Commission as to what bases should be closed or realigned. The Commission then selects the recommendations with which it agrees. Under the process, the Commission may remove certain bases from the list by a majority vote, but it cannot add any bases to DOD’s list of recommended closures and realignments unless seven of the nine members vote to do so. The Commission then sends its recommendations to the President. If he approves the recommendations, he sends them to Congress. The list is binding unless both Houses of Congress pass a joint resolution of disapproval within 45 legislative days.

Once this last hurdle is cleared, the Secretary of Defense must evaluate the property and determine whether DoD or another federal agency needs the property.\(^{66}\) After this

\(^{63}\) Codified as amended at 10 U.S.C. 2687 note.
\(^{64}\) Of course, in practice under Title V, homeless service providers have, on occasion, acquired other property or money from a city in exchange for a promise to withdraw an application for Title V property.
\(^{65}\) See Maria Foscarinis, Converting Military Bases and Other Vacant Federal Property to Aid Homeless People, 28 CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW 1365, 1369 (April 1995).
\(^{66}\) § 2905(b)(7)(B)(i)(I). For ease of reference, all citations to the 1994 Base Closure Act are to the DBCRA as it appears in the note following 10 U.S.C. 2687.
screening phase, DoD must publish a list of all surplus buildings and properties in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation.67

While this federal screening process occurs, the affected communities must form a Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA). HUD defines an LRA as any authority or instrumentality established by State or local government that the Secretary of Defense recognizes as the entity responsible for the reuse plan. After DoD recognizes this LRA, the Secretary of Defense notifies the community by publishing the name, address, and point of contact for the LRA in both the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the communities affected.68

At this point, the burden switches to the LRA to publish a time period during which it will receive “notices of interest” for the property as it begins the redevelopment process.69 The statute directs the LRA to consult with representatives of the homeless and take into account the needs of homeless people in preparing a reuse plan.70 “A notice of interest under this clause shall describe the need of the government, representative, or party concerned for the buildings or property covered by the notice.”71 Depending on the nature of the property, the process can be highly competitive and you can assume that many well-financed interested parties will express interest in the former base property.

The notice of interest that a homeless service provider submits to the LRA is different from the notice of interest a provider files under Title V. Under Title V, the notice of interest is just a letter that precedes the application, while under the 1994 Base Closure Act, the notice of interest is the application. The provider must therefore submit:

(I) A description of the homeless assistance program that the representative proposes to carry out at the installation.
(II) An assessment of the need for the program.
(III) A description of the extent to which the program is or will be coordinated with other homeless assistance programs in the communities in the vicinity of the installation.
(IV) A description of the buildings and property at the installation that are necessary to carry out the program.
(V) A description of the financial plan, the organization, and the organization’s capacity to carry out the program.
(VI) An assessment of the time required to commence carrying out the program.72

After all interested parties submit their notices of interest, the LRA then determines which notices of interest to support and submits a formal plan, incorporating all of the

---

67 § 2905(b)(7)(B)(i)(IV).
68 § 2905(b)(7)(B)(ii).
69 § 2905(b)(7)(C)(i); (D)(i).
70 § 2905(b)(7)(C).
71 Id.
72 § 2905(b)(7)(E)(i).
uses for the property, to the Secretary of Defense and HUD for review. The LRA and homeless service providers, if they agree on a plan to serve homeless people, prepare legally binding agreements implementing that understanding. The redevelopment plan essentially is a strategic plan for the reuse of the installation. It must explain the proposed reuses of the military installation and how this reuse will balance economic redevelopment, other community concerns, and homeless assistance.

After the LRA submits its reuse plan to HUD and DoD, HUD has sixty days to review it to determine whether the LRA has complied with the homelessness requirements of the 1994 Base Closure Act. In making this determination, HUD considers: (1) the size, nature, and need of the homeless population in the vicinity of the installation; (2) whether the LRA can document that it consulted with representatives of the homeless community and the extent of such consultation; (3) if the plan specifies how buildings and property will become available for homeless assistance; and (4) the economic impact of the proposed homeless assistance on the communities in the vicinity of the installation. HUD can negotiate and consult with the LRA during the review process and will notify the LRA of its determination or, when necessary, of any further steps the LRA needs to take to comply with the 1994 Base Closure Act. Upon acceptance of the plan, the military disposes of the property for the approved uses. It is then the LRA’s responsibility to implement the reuse plan.

C. 2005 Base Closure Process

In 2001, Congress approved a round of base closures to be conducted in 2005 to achieve cost savings for DoD. The President nominated the nine members of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission in early April 2005. The Commission’s chair is Anthony J. Principi, former Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

On May 13, 2005, the Secretary of Defense transmitted to Congress and the Commission the list of 33 major bases (in 22 states) that DoD recommends for closure. Homeless service providers in areas where there is a base recommended for closure should begin to plan their applications. As noted above, it is unlikely that the Commission will add bases to the list that DoD did not recommend, so if DoD did not recommend closing or realigning a base in your area, you should assume you will not be able to acquire any property during this round.

By September 8, 2005, the Base Closure and Realignment Commission will transmit its recommendations to the President. The President has until September 23, 2005, to approve or disapprove the recommendations. If he approves, he transmits it to Congress. The list is binding unless both Houses of Congress pass a joint resolution of disapproval.

---

73 § 2905(b)(7)(G).
74 § 2905(b)(7)(F)(ii)(I).
75 § 2905(b)(7)(G)(V).
76 § 2905(b)(7)(h)(i).
77 § 2905(b)(7)(H)(i)(I).
78 § 2905(b)(7)(I)(i)-(v).
within 45 legislative days. The list will then become final some time later this year (depending on when Congress is in session).

If the President returns the report to the Commission, the Commission has until October 20, 2005, to resubmit its report to the President. If the report is returned to the Commission and then re-submitted to the President, the President must transmit his approval and certification of resubmitted report to Congress by November 7, 2005.

Again, Congress has 45 legislative days from the day it receives the report from the President to enact a joint resolution to reject the report in full, or the report becomes law. Should the President fail to approve or transmit either the initial or revised Commission recommendations by the above dates, the BRAC process will be terminated.

IV. IMPACT OF THE SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY PROGRAMS

Between 1988 and 2003, according to GSA, 91 properties worth a total of $105.4 million were transferred under Title V of the McKinney Act to be used to assist homeless Americans, including the base closure properties that were transferred before Congress enacted the Base Closure Act in 1994.79 Most of these properties were transferred in the early years of the statute’s implementation as a result of NLCHP’s lawsuit against the federal agencies that implement the Act. In each of the last three fiscal years, an average of less than five properties were transferred under Title V, even though a total of 945 properties were publicized as suitable and available in 2003 and 886 were announced as suitable and available in 2002. In 2003, there were seventeen Title V applications.80 HHS approved seven and disapproved six, and four withdrew or failed to pursue the application after HHS requested more information.81 Of the seven applications HHS approved in 2003, one withdrew after HHS approved the application because of a real or perceived inability to operate the program. Of the other six that applied successfully in 2003, only two had actually received the property as of September 2004.82

Since the 1994 Base Closure Act became effective, HUD has approved ninety base closure plans, and fifty-three included accommodations for homeless services.83 With respect to the other thirty-seven plans, the LRA received no notices of interest from homeless service providers.84 While neither DoD nor HUD keeps statistics on the amount or value of property that ultimately is devoted to homeless services under the 1994 Base Closure Act, it is safe to assume that both numbers are significant, and that base closure property represents an important resource for homeless service providers.

---

79 August 5, 2004, e-mail from GSA to NLCHP (on file with NLCHP).
80 HHS Monthly Homeless Reports for 2003 (on file with NLCHP).
81 Id.
82 HHS Title V Activity Reports for January through September 2004 (on file with NLCHP).
83 September 22, 2004, e-mail from HUD to NLCHP (on file with NLCHP).
84 Id.
Part Two of this guidebook describes sixty-four programs that acquired surplus federal property or directly benefited from the property. All of the properties were transferred before January 1, 2004. Four of the programs are no longer operating, two never began operations, and two will begin operations by 2006. These numbers include some properties that originally were covered by Title V but were not transferred before the 1994 Base Closure law went into effect. In that instance, LRAs could choose to proceed under the 1994 Base Closure provisions, or continue to operate under Title V. Because some LRAs opted to remain under Title V, many base closure properties actually were transferred under Title V (such as those at the former Fort Ord in California).

While NLCHP included as many properties as possible, in many instances (especially with properties transferred before the agencies complied with the court’s order requiring the agencies to report on the program to NLCHP), information about the programs was unavailable. In other cases, program officials did not respond to requests for information.

Of the sixty-four properties described here, local governments acquired six properties, and non-profit organizations acquired the rest. Three of the local government applicants (in Redmond, Washington, Miami Dade County, Florida, and King County, Washington) formed public/non-profit collaborations to develop the property.

Service providers have used the properties for a wide variety of programs, and many offer multiple services. Ten programs offered emergency shelter, serving almost 11,900 homeless people a year. Nine of the programs are still operating, providing emergency shelter to 11,788 persons a year.

Forty-two programs that received property offered transitional housing, although only thirty-seven of those programs are currently using surplus federal property. Two more transitional housing programs will operate by 2006. Those thirty-nine programs will serve more than 5000 homeless people annually.

There are few permanent housing programs (in part because HHS no longer allows Title V property to be used for permanent housing of any kind). Two of the four permanent housing programs use base closure property, one was approved before HHS decided not to approve permanent housing, and one is a program that gave up the Title V property (after significant community opposition) in exchange for property the city offered at another site. Two of the four programs that offer permanent housing include supportive services for residents with disabilities.

Although only a small number of properties were used for food pantries or food banks, the seven programs provide meals to almost 1,900,000 people a year. The Emergency Foodlink, which operates on a former army depot in California, has become the largest single food program in the nation, serving more than 1.5 million people a month.

Five programs offer mental health services to individuals with mental disabilities, serving more than 4,000 people annually, while seven properties provide substance abuse services to about 6,200 people each year. Most of the programs (forty out of sixty-four)
provide case management and counseling, serving more than 132,000 clients a year. Only four of the programs operate adult day centers, but they serve 5,500 homeless people annually. Eleven programs offer childcare to more than 3,300 homeless children a year. Finally, twenty-one programs offer education and/or job training, serving more than 20,000 homeless individuals annually.

The programs experienced a variety of reactions from the communities in which they applied to operate. Eleven of the programs NLCHP surveyed reported significant community opposition. One program, the Tri-County Community Action Committee, Inc. in Hughesville, Maryland, had not opened as of late 2004, at least in part because of significant opposition from the community as well as zoning problems. In Denver, the community opposition forced the providers to give up their claim to the Lowry Air Force Base property in exchange for other property or, in some instances, revenue from the sale of the property. The negotiations that resulted in the exchanges were long and drawn out, and it took years for the programs to begin operations.

At least six programs, including Aftercare Ministries in Alexandria, Louisiana, have reported good community relations, fostered in part by their early efforts to generate community support. In Bangor, Maine, local organizations and residents have provided the Park Woods transitional housing community with multiple in-kind donations. The Salvation Army Family Shelter in Benton, Arkansas, which operates in a former federal building, has broad community support and receives clothing donations from area business people.

V. BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING MAXIMUM EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAMS AND HOW TO OVERCOME THEM

While a significant amount of federal property has been transferred under Title V and the 1994 Base Closure Act to assist homeless Americans since the McKinney Act became effective, a variety of factors have prevented the programs from having the maximum impact possible. A number of these problems are reflected in the record of the ongoing litigation between NLCHP and the federal agencies responsible for implementing Title V, which began in 1988. Since first entering a permanent injunction, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has issued additional orders enforcing its injunction on four occasions.85 These orders relate generally to the agencies’ refusal to identify all property to which Title V applies, HUD’s failure properly to determine which property is suitable to serve homeless persons, and the agencies’ failure to conduct meaningful outreach for the program. As part of the extensive relief in the lawsuit, the district court ordered HHS to include the name and phone number of NLCHP in the application packet, explaining that NLCHP can help applicants complete the forms.

While the district court’s injunction improved the administration of Title V of the McKinney Act in several respects, other factors continue to impede the effectiveness of both surplus property programs. This guidebook will address many of these barriers, and offer suggestions for overcoming the obstacles.

A. Ineffective Outreach

1. Title V

The McKinney Act requires the three federal agencies responsible for administering Title V to “make such efforts as are necessary to ensure the widest possible dissemination of the information on [the list of available and suitable properties].”\(^{86}\) Congress thus recognized that the program would not be effective if those serving homeless people did not know about the program and the property available under it. The agencies responsible for administering the program, however, have failed to do sufficient outreach to let providers know about the programs and the properties available thereunder. Agency efforts, however, are improving (largely because of NLCHP advocacy), and all of the agencies responsible for Title V now have at least some information about the program on their web sites.

What is missing from all of the agency sites is a comprehensive list of all of the property that is currently available. The HUD site does explain Title V and refers you to the Federal Register notice for that particular Friday, but that is an incomplete list because it does not include the properties announced the previous seven weeks. See http://www.hud.gov/homeless/index.cfm. NLCHP is working with the agencies, including the Interagency Council on Homelessness, to ensure that a complete list will be available on agency web sites. In the mean time, you can contact NLCHP to determine if there is Title V property in your area, or you can call HUD’s “Hotline,” which is supposed to provide you that information. The number is 1-800-927-7588. If you do not receive the information from HUD, let us know and we will help.

GSA also plans to introduce a system that is supposed to send out electronic notices of property available in your area once you sign up. Watch GSA’s website, http://rc.gsa.gov/ResourceCenter, for information on how to sign up for that service. GSA also has a limited number of properties listed on its McKinney Act site, which represent the properties for which it has disposal authority. See http://rc.gsa.gov/ResourceCenter/PublicPages/default.asp for Title V property notices.

2. Base Closure

The Department of Defense has information about the base closure process on its website, but at this time, there is nothing on its website that deals with the LRA’s duty to take into account the needs of the homeless population. HUD just developed a web site about the base closure process, and the web address is: http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/library/milbase/index.cfm.

\(^{86}\) 42 U.S.C. 11411(c)(2)(B).
The best way to keep abreast of the base closure process from the perspective of homeless service providers is to check NLCHP’s web site for updates.

B. Difficulties Obtaining Desirable Property

1. Title V

Properties that would be desirable and usable as facilities to assist homeless people are likely to be desirable for other purposes. Because of the desirability of suitable properties for non-homeless uses, the landholding agencies or GSA may be motivated to withhold the properties from the McKinney process. Agencies also may thwart the McKinney process by interpreting suitability standards very narrowly. Although HUD determines the suitability of surplus property, HUD does not confirm or audit the results of the property surveys it receives from the landholding agencies. The agencies therefore have much latitude in defining subjective criteria, and there is little HUD can do to ensure accurate application of the criteria, absent an objection from someone in the community who knows the property. Many properties are listed, for example, as “excessively deteriorated,” a subjective phrase that agencies could use to avoid McKinney requirements.

Homeless service providers who learn about unused or vacant federal property should check with HUD and NLCHP to determine whether it is properly listed as available under Title V. Providers should direct any concerns that the federal government may not be complying with Title V’s requirements to NLCHP, and NLCHP will help determine the status of the property. And remember, to appeal HUD’s determination of unsuitability, the homeless provider must contact HUD either by calling a toll-free number (1-800-927-7588) or in writing within 20 days of its publication in the Federal Register.

2. Base Closure

During the base closure process, depending on the area and type of property, there typically is significant competition for the more desirable property. Homeless service providers thus may be forced to compete with large developers or government entities with significant resources. Homeless services providers, unless they are able to find a law firm or other sophisticated representative to press their case, may be at a disadvantage when it comes to claims to the former base property. Homeless service providers may also be at a disadvantage when trying to negotiate agreements that maximize the benefit to the homeless population.

C. Potentially Unsuitable Property

The standards for determining what is “suitable” to serve homeless people under Title V are vague. HUD thus lists property that may contain asbestos or other contamination (even though its guidelines suggest such property would not be considered suitable). 401 of the 945 listings for properties in 2003 mention the possibility of asbestos or lead
Homeless service providers with limited resources must thus apply for property without knowing what expense they will incur to make the property useable.

Similarly, with respect to base closure, some of the property may have deteriorated as base operations have wound down. In other cases, the property may deteriorate if the redevelopment process drags on. Other property, because it was under federal jurisdiction and did not have to meet local occupancy or building codes, may not pass inspection by local authorities.

Under either program, before committing resources to acquiring any property, do your homework to ensure that the property is suitable for its intended use, or can be made suitable within your budget for the project. For example, where there may be contamination or structural problems that will have to be remedied before your program can use the property, having an environmental or structural engineer examine the property in the beginning stages may save you from investing in property that will never be usable, or will be usable only after paying huge remediation or restoration costs.

C. Difficult Application and Acquisition Process

1. Title V

In response to NLCHP’s survey, many service providers mentioned difficulties in navigating the Title V application process. As noted above, the application form that HHS requires applicants to complete under Title V is a standard form (HHS Form 696) that HHS uses for all property disposals as “public benefit conveyances.” HHS thus uses the same form to transfer a small house that will be used as a homeless service provider’s administrative offices under Title V as it does property that will be transferred under FPASA for sewage disposal systems, hospitals, and animal control facilities. The application, for example, suggests that the provider may not use the property without complying with local zoning laws. That, however, is not true if it is Title V property that is leased from the federal government, rather than property deeded to the provider.

Use of this complicated form, not tailored to Title V, guarantees a complicated process that makes it unlikely that HHS will be able to rule on an application within the time frame the statute requires. Thus, in 2003, HHS completed evaluating only five out of seventeen applications in the 25-day statutory period. Such delay also can make it difficult for homeless service providers who need to line up funding and staffing for a project, and cannot determine when they will have the property in hand.

Several providers described the difficult application process, which often includes repeated HHS requests for supplemental information. HHS asked for various types of information that was not listed specifically in the application or in HHS regulations, especially environmental impact information. The Economic Security Corporation of the
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87 Id.
88 24 C.F.R. 581.9(b)(10).
89 HHS Monthly Homeless Reports for 2003 (on file with NLCHP).
Southwest Area in Joplin, Missouri, reported multiple problems with its application for a former federal building, including being required to answer difficult environmental questions, even though the building was going to be used for administrative offices. The Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee made multiple submissions to HHS, which asked it on several different occasions for environmental information.

2. Base Closure

The application for the base closure property must give a detailed description of the service provider’s proposed program, the need for the program, the provider’s ability to carry out the program, and how that program fits into the services the community already provides. Applications that are incomplete or suggest an unsophisticated approach to redeveloping the property may lose out, given that for-profit organizations with resources to engage in sophisticated and well-financed campaigns may be seeking the property as well.

D. Limits on the Use of the Property

1. Title V

Under Title V, the only statutory limitation on the use of the surplus federal property is that it must be “use[d] to assist the homeless.” HHS regulations require the agency to review the services the applicant proposes to provide, “such as meals, shelter, job training, and counseling.” Although nothing in the Act or the regulations prohibits using surplus property for permanent housing, including permanent supportive housing, HHS has taken the position that it will not approve applications that envision any type of housing other than transitional housing -- housing in which people cannot live for more than two years.

While it is impossible to determine how many housing providers would have applied to use surplus federal property for permanent housing had HHS’ policy not precluded that use, sixteen national organizations concerned about housing and homelessness, including the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, the Corporation for Supportive Housing, Habitat for Humanity International, the National Alliance to End Homelessness, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National League of Cities, and Volunteers of America, all signed a letter in July 2004 to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, urging the Department to allow Title V property to be used for permanent housing. HHS continues to consider the issue and may announce a change at any time, so be aware of this possibility and contact NLCHP if you are interested in using Title V property for permanent housing.

90 42 U.S.C. 11411(e)(1).
91 45 C.F.R. 12a.9(e)(2)(i).
Another limitation on the use of Title V property is that it cannot be used to serve people who are not homeless. While we are not aware of HHS prohibiting service providers from serving a nominal number of people who are not homeless, the service provider’s application must show its intent to serve homeless individuals. Some service providers therefore have decided against applying for some Title V property when they intended to serve both homeless individuals and individuals who were extremely poor but not homeless.

2. Base Closure

The 1994 Base Closure Act allows greater flexibility in using the property to meet the needs of the homeless community than Title V. Base closure property can thus be used for permanent housing, and there is no requirement, as there is under Title V, that the property be used only to serve homeless people. Service providers and state and local agencies may determine that what is most needed is a mix of housing to serve homeless people and otherwise low income individuals, and the LRA may agree to use the property so serve a number of different populations, as long as the plan reasonably meets the needs of those people in the community who are homeless.

While there is greater flexibility in using the base closure property to serve homeless people under the 1994 Base Closure Act than under Title V, HUD has not made clear how far that flexibility extends. In the 1995 round of base closures, HUD approved a variety of creative plans to serve the homeless population (such as selling the property commercially and dedicating some of the proceeds to a housing trust fund). Indications NLCHP received recently from HUD suggest that HUD may be more restrictive as it reviews the LRA plans and the legally binding agreements for the 2005 round of closures.

E. NIMBY Opposition and Zoning Issues

Of the sixty-four providers in our survey, eleven mentioned Not-in-My-Backyard (NIMBY) opposition to their programs, which in some cases resulted in programs being unable to use the property for which they applied. Some reported not just a lack of support for their efforts, but genuine opposition to serving homeless people in their communities. Community opposition often comes in the form of zoning regulations. Under Title V, programs that lease property are not subject to local zoning actions, although they must comply with local building codes, such as those that address fire safety issues. At least some providers who applied for Title V property were not aware that they had the option of leasing the property so they could avoid NIMBY-ism in the form of hostile zoning actions. The Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Act Committee, for example, reported that after it obtained its deed in July 2002, the town undertook a comprehensive rezoning effort that rendered the program’s proposed use of the property nonconforming. Those providers who acquire the property by deed thus are vulnerable to zoning efforts to derail their programs, while providers who lease the
property under long-term leases are protected from local zoning efforts under HUD regulations.

Because the base closure process involves deeding property over from the federal government to local government entities (the LRA), homeless service providers that use base closure properties have no option to lease from the federal government and are subject to local zoning regulations, as well as occupancy and building codes. And because base closure property is often very desirable, there may be reluctance, as there was with Lowrey Air Force Base in Colorado, for example, to allow the property to be used to serve homeless people. Local jurisdictions may therefore try to zone the property for uses other than low-income housing. Providers applying for base closure property should monitor the zoning process and ensure that their agreement with the LRA protects them from any local zoning or other laws that may otherwise impede their ability to provide services.

VI. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING PROVIDERS’ ACCESS TO SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY

A. Collaborate

When applying for property under either Title V or the 1994 Base Closure Act, there are significant benefits to collaborating with other nonprofit organizations or with state or local agencies. All of the barriers addressed above become less daunting when homeless services providers are able to partner with other organizations and agencies. For example, HHS, when reviewing Title V applications, has expressed concern over the years that certain providers do not have the resources to maintain the properties and manage the programs they propose. To the extent providers can join forces and draw on each others’ resources, the application normally will be much stronger. It also is an advantage, from HHS’ perspective, if applicants can demonstrate that they are involved in the efforts of the community as a whole to address homelessness issues. Community support in the form of other community partners helps demonstrate a more integrated, comprehensive approach to the needs of the homeless community.

In the base closure context, the LRA must consider the needs of the homeless community in planning for the redevelopment of the property. It is not obligated to award the property to any particular organization. Rather, it is supposed to consider the extent to which the organization coordinates with other homeless assistance programs in the community and how the proposed programs fit into the community’s continuum of care. Collaborating with other homeless organizations or agencies in the initial stages of the base closure process means that the organizations can work together rather than submit competing applications. This allows the organizations to assess jointly the extent of homelessness in the community and determine the programs that are most needed. The result is a stronger, more comprehensive approach to the problem and hence, a more compelling application.
Engaging the community and local government officials as early as possible in either the Title V or the base closure process also can help applicants for surplus property avoid NIMBY issues. Providers have reported significant success dampening community concerns when they include city and neighbors at all planning stages and approach the application process as a collaborative effort. Engaging a government agency as part of the collaborative increases the chances of allaying community concerns.

Providers who apply for property under both Title V and the 1994 Base Closure Act also should be aware that some NIMBY actions, such as hostile zoning laws, may violate fair housing laws. While people who are homeless, like people who are poor, are not a protected class under current law, homeless people and programs that serve them may be protected by civil rights laws. The Fair Housing Act, for example, protects people from discrimination on the basis of race, physical or mental disability, or familial status. In addition, facilities operated by religious organizations that serve homeless people may be protected under the First Amendment, which allows religious organizations to fulfill their religious mission by helping the poor.

If you have reason to believe that NIMBY efforts reflect discriminatory animus against the part of the community against the potential residents of your program, you should consult a lawyer familiar with Fair Housing Act issues. You also can contact NLCHP and we will try to help.

There are at least two very good examples of collaboration in the base property redevelopment context (although both actually got the property under Title V because the closure preceded enactment of the 1994 Base Closure Act). More than ten homeless service organizations, as well as the Monterey Housing Authority, collaborated in northern California to use Fort Ord property to provide a variety of services to homeless individuals, including homeless veterans. Services provided include transitional housing, job training, substance abuse treatment, childcare, family advocacy, and health care services.

In Miami, Florida, the Miami Dade County Homeless Trust, a quasi-governmental agency, acquired 84 acres on what was the Homestead Air Force Base. Nonprofit organizations now provide an array of services to the homeless population, including emergency housing, transitional housing, health care, substance abuse treatment, job training, and day care. Both examples demonstrate the advantages of a collaborative, comprehensive approach to using surplus federal property.

**B. Get Expert Help When You Can**

In addition to collaborating with other homeless organizations and agencies, as mentioned above, you should try to collaborate as much as possible with experts in various fields, including lawyers, accountants, and engineers. While we know budgets

---

92 Similarly, a right to housing under the U.S. Constitution has not yet been recognized, although such a right is a common precept in international law.
are a big constraint, sometimes it is possible to get experts to donate their time or offer a
discount to homeless groups. When you cannot find an expert to help on a pro bono
basis, there are occasions when it makes sense to pay for assistance. Getting expert help
early on may save money in the long run.

Homeless service providers should know that there are resources available to help
navigate this process. NLCHP will provide technical assistance during the base closure
process. NLCHP also is recruiting national law firms to help homeless assistance
providers in the base closure process on a pro bono basis. While we do not yet know
how many lawyers will be needed or available to help in the process, we are trying to
locate attorneys with expertise in zoning, real estate law, corporate transactions, and other
areas relevant to base closure. Pro bono assistance should help “level the playing field”
and help you anticipate the issues that need to be addressed in the negotiation process.

C. Contact NLCHP with Questions

Applicants under Title V or the 1994 Base Closure Act who have questions or encounter
problems in the application process should contact NLCHP for assistance. NLCHP is in
the process of reviewing the legally binding agreements into which homeless service
providers entered with LRAs during the 1995 round of base closures, and anticipates
drafting a “best practices” document that will provide more specific guidance as the 2005
base closures and realignments proceed. Please check our web site (www.nlchp.org) for
more information.

VII. CONCLUSION

Homelessness continues to be a crisis in this country and there is much we can and
should do to address the needs of poor and homeless Americans. Ensuring that the
surplus federal property programs work as Congress intended can be part of the solution,
and we are here to help you navigate the surplus federal property process.
PART TWO

PROGRAMS BY STATE
Alaskan AIDS Assistance Association (AAAA) provides transitional housing with case management for homeless persons who are diagnosed with HIV/AIDS. Other services provided by AAAA are a food bank, transportation, substance abuse counseling, and mental health counseling. AAAA also advocates for clients’ medical treatment and pays for medication for clients who are waiting for their insurance and/or Medicaid benefits to take effect.

There are 14 beds within the facility and the program serves approximately 15 persons annually. Although it is open to both men and women, the program serves mostly men.

Rehabilitation of the property cost approximately $400,000 and annual operating costs are approximately $58,000. AAAA uses a variety of funding sources to provide transitional housing and supportive services to their clients.
The Tundra Women’s Coalition provides transitional housing to domestic violence victims, many of whom have already benefited from services provided by the shelter that TWC operates. Most inhabitants are on waiting lists for permanent housing and have found employment. They are still part of ongoing support groups and one-on-one counseling programs while in the facility. The transitional housing facility serves, on average, eight people daily and approximately 15 individuals per year.

Rehabilitation costs were $3,000-$4,000, and annual operating costs are approximately $35,000. Funding comes from the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault and the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation. The organization also plans to apply for funding from HUD.
House of Refuge, Inc. and Community Housing Partnership completed a joint application in 1992 to provide transitional housing on a collaborative basis. The program’s goals are to provide assistance to those individuals who meet the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) definition of homelessness and earn less than 80% of area median income. The goal is to assist with social service intervention, begin resolving situations that caused their state of homelessness, and move individuals into permanent housing within less than 24 months. Seventy percent of all clients achieve this goal.

Program participants are required to work or attend school if they have not yet received their GED. Participants must combine work and school for a combination of 32 hours weekly. In addition, program participants pay 30 percent of their adjusted gross income for rent. The services provided to participants include outreach, case management, transportation, counseling, financial management, parenting skills, employment, education assistance, and life skills.

As of 2003, House of Refuge East served 225 adults and children annually in the facility’s 88 two-bedroom homes. Each housing unit accommodates up to 5 people, resulting in a maximum of 425 beds for the facility. Rehabilitation costs were $100,000. Annual operating costs for this program are approximately $1,200,000. Funding for the program comes from HUD, state and county funds, rental fees, and private donations.
PHOENIX RESCUE MISSION  
1801 S. 35th Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona  85009  

Contact:  
Jerry Sandvig

Phone:  
(602) 233-0300  
Fax:  
(602) 233-1329  

Applicant: Phoenix Rescue Mission  
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit  

Property: Gila Bend Air Force Auxiliary Field, Building #1895100A3  
Property Description: 32 single room occupancy (SRO) units, about 10 feet by 20 feet in size  
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)  

Program Type: Emergency shelter and transitional housing  
Client Base: Homeless women and families  

Start Date: Was planned for June 1999 — property could not be used  

HHS approved Phoenix Rescue Mission’s application in November 1996 to provide both emergency shelter and transitional housing in a vacant Air Force building. A faith-based organization, Phoenix Rescue Mission (PRM) provides a number of support services to over 100 homeless residents daily, and an estimated 1,200 residents annually. Support services provided include case management, employment counseling, transportation, shower facilities, and family living skills. PRM also supplies a total of 700 meals to clients each day.

PRM ultimately was not able to use the federal property because the buildings did not conform to local building codes. PRM thus incurred $60,000 in transportation costs to move buildings it could not use.
ESPERANZA EN ESCALANTE
3700 S. Calle Polar
Tucson, Arizona  85730

Contact:
Betty Slaybaugh

Phone:  
(520) 571-8294
Fax:  
(520) 748-0398

Applicant: Esperanza En Escalante
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Davis Monthan Air Force Base
Property Description: 1 double-wide trailer and 19.6 acres of land
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Transitional Housing
Client Base: Homeless veterans and their families

Start Date: March 1993

Approved to use part of Davis Monthan Air Force Base in 1990 and 1992, Esperanza En Escalante (EEE) currently reaches 42 individuals and eight families of the estimated 900 veterans who are homeless each day in Tucson. EEE is constantly expanding and improving its facilities. Clients come to EEE through referrals from the VA’s Medical Center, social service agencies, hospitals, and homeless programs in the community. Several of the current residents have been placed by EEE into job training programs. Recognizing the need for a specialized program for disabled homeless veterans, EEE constructed a three-building complex in March 1999 that serves 15 disabled homeless veterans.

Services provided to residents include: life skills and vocational training; case management; individual and small group counseling; and health education. Over 95 percent of previous residents have graduated to self-sufficiency or, in the case of disabled clients, to income and housing assistance programs. The program served approximately 70 homeless persons during 2003.

Full rehabilitation costs are indeterminate because of ongoing construction, but have reached $1,145,579 to date. Annual operating costs are approximately $490,000. Funding comes from the Department of Veterans Affairs; city, county and state funds; and private contributions.

This typical desert home has four bedrooms and serves four homeless veterans. Family units have two bedrooms and each serves one family.
Volunteers completing construction on one of the 50 housing units

Children of a family that lives at EEE.
In March 1997, HHS approved the Salvation Army’s application to use the Benton federal building, a former post office turned federal office building. The program experienced initial NIMBY opposition. However, maintaining the same ambiance that the Benton building had in the 1940s, the Salvation Army has been able to turn its program into a source of community pride. The original goal was to create the first family shelter, crisis center, and transient drop-in center in Saline County. Eight months later, the Salvation Army was operating the only shelter within 25 miles that allowed families to remain intact.

By contracting with several outside organizations to operate in the building, the Salvation Army has been able to provide its 150 clients per month with a wide spectrum of services including child advocacy, adult education, and special literacy programs for dyslexic children. Also available to clients is a program that helps them prepare for job interviews by providing them a haircut, beauty products, and business attire. The program has gained wide support within the community and receives many clothing donations from area business men and women.

The most recent addition to the Salvation Army operation is a drop-in day center where clients can receive meals, bathe, and launder their clothes, thus aiding them in finding and keeping jobs. The Salvation Army also operates a family crisis shelter that provides services to homeless families. Shelter staff work with clients during a fourteen-day program to create an individual plan of action tailored to each family’s needs. This plan may include counseling, providing groceries, or paying the first month’s rent for the client’s new home. During 2003, the Benton Shelter provided services to 236 families, with 819 members. During that same period, the Center provided services to 103 individuals. Renovation costs were a little less than $100,000 and annual operating costs are $45,000.
Quapaw House, Inc. applied for the former Social Security Administration Building in Hot Springs in August 2002 and after asking for additional information, HHS approved the application in September 2003. Assignment of the property was conditioned upon it becoming completely vacant. The property was eventually deeded to Quapaw House, Inc. on September 30, 2003.

Quapaw House began operations in the building in March 2004 and serves eight men with substance abuse problems each day, providing transitional housing and job training. It estimates it will serve almost 96 men annually.

Rehabilitation costs for the building were $18,500. Annual operating costs are estimated to be $36,000.
Our House II officials first sought to obtain the Little Rock Veterans Affairs (VA) property in 1988, but were initially unsuccessful. In 1989, following the court’s injunction in NLHCP v. VA, HHS approved Our House II’s application to use the former VA buildings, making it one of the first programs to operate under the Title V program.

Our House, Inc. spent $274,000 to rehabilitate this property. Annual operating costs are approximately $500,000. Funding for Our House, Inc. comes from grants (including a transitional housing grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development), donations, and in-kind contributions. Many of the computers for the computer job training program were donated by a computer company and the local community donates several broken appliances for the appliance repair program.

Since opening in 1991, Our House II has supplied over 50,000 nights of shelter and nearly 120,000 meals through the transitional housing program. In 2003, Our House II
served 58 adults and 47 children, supplying not only housing, but literacy training, day care, parental counseling and job training. Our House II requires that all residents obtain their GED if they are not working.

Clients are referred to the transitional housing program from Our House’s emergency shelter. Clients may stay in transitional housing for up to two years. In 2003, 34 individuals and families found unsubsidized housing after moving on from Our House’s program. Clients also have the option of enrolling in Our House II’s job training program. Those who complete Our House II’s intensive eleven-week computer training course have an eighty-seven percent success rate in finding full-time positions. In 2003, twelve of Our House II’s clients were able to find full-time jobs and work at locations ranging from the post office to the railroads.

Our House, Inc. runs an award-winning program that has received national media attention, including a front page article in The New York Times. Our House, Inc. was the recipient of the “Community Service Excellence Award” given by the Interagency Council On The Homeless as well as Goodwill Industries of Arkansas winner of the 1995 Outstanding Achievement Award.

The day care facilities at Our House provide meals and recreational facilities for the children, while the parents (and other individuals) attend classes at the job training center.
Community Social Model Advocates, Inc. (CSMA), founded by David Riordan, was approved in 1994 to acquire three buildings to operate an alcohol and drug recovery program for homeless women and women accompanied by their children (age 6 and under). The Rose Julia Riordan Tranquility Village began full operation in January 1999 and was formally dedicated on June 11, 1999. Approximately 100 residents are served annually by this program, and there are 56 beds within the total facility.

When the Rose Julia Riordan Tranquility Village began operations, it became the first transitional housing program in Merced County to offer substance abuse treatment/recovery to women and mothers accompanied by their children. Because of the high demand for the program, which is licensed and certified by the State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, there is a continual waiting list, which usually contains ten applicants. All women at the Rose Julia Riordan Tranquility Village Transitional Housing Program, who are often referred through Alcoholics/Narcotics Anonymous, receive alcohol or other drug recovery services. Some additional services offered by CSMA include alcohol education, parenting classes, and HIV education.

Rehabilitation costs have been more than $100,000 to date and annual operating costs are approximately $375,000. The majority of funding comes through a county contract and donations.
After a seven year wait to occupy a historic building on this property that had been vacant for over 20 years, the Regional Opportunity Center (the Center) opened its doors to the largest homeless veterans population in the country. New Directions, Inc. operates 156 beds, including a 24 bed facility for substance abuse detoxification, and 24 beds for homeless persons with multiple disabilities. Services include money management, legal assistance, health education, substance abuse counseling, and a range of vocational training classes.

Annually, more than 250 veterans enter the program and 120 residents are prepared to move into permanent housing after 9-12 months. Additionally, 700-800 veterans access the detoxification program annually.

New Directions (ND) operates three businesses out of the Center; these businesses employ residents of the program. A fifties diner opened a year ago, and a catering business employs residents who have completed on-site culinary arts courses taught by the Los Angeles Trade Technical College. The Los Angeles Trade Technical College trains residents for an on-site handy-worker business. ND also collaborates with the Los Angeles Unified School District, which provides on-site remedial education. Along with the State Department of Rehabilitation, ND provides on-site job search and
job placement assistance. Residents assisted in the rehabilitation of the site and graduates have and will continue to be hired as case managers and administrative staff.

Rehabilitation costs reached $5.4 million and were funded by the Cities of Los Angeles, Santa Monica, Culver City, and Beverly Hills; the County of Los Angeles; the Los Angeles Housing Authority, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and private donations. The annual operating budget is $4 million and is supported through funding from various local, state, and federal grants.
VETERANS TRANSITION CENTER OF MONTEREY COUNTY (VTC)
Martinez Hall,
220 12th Street
Marina, California  93933

Contact:
Ronald M. Holland

Phone:  
(831) 883-8387
Fax:  
(831) 883-3024

Applicant: Vietnam Veterans of Monterey County (VVMC)
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Fort Ord
Property Description: 20 duplexes with 2-4 bedrooms; 38,000 square foot administrative building; 3,700 square foot warehouse; and a 3,200 square foot warehouse
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Transitional housing, supportive services, and case management
Client Base: Homeless veterans and families

Start Date: Case management—February 1998;
Transitional housing and Self-Help Center—2002

In 1996, the VVMC created the Veterans Transition Center of Monterey County (VTC) to operate a supportive service program for homeless veterans and their families and to provide property management for these facilities. A major obstacle, that caused more than a two-year delay, was amending the application to make VTC (a 501(c)(3) corporation) the applicant rather than VVMC (a 501(c)(19) corporation).

By October 1998, all properties of the former Fort Ord, except for ten duplexes, had been transferred to various nonprofit organizations working to help homeless persons in that community. VTC acquired the ten duplexes and, prior to rehabilitation, it estimated it would need to spend nearly $30,000 per building for rehabilitation. Initially, it seemed unlikely that VTC would be able to proceed because of its limited financial resources. In 1998, however, VTC received a Continuum of Care grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and was able to begin the rehabilitation process. Actual costs for rehabilitation were $75,000 per unit, or $3 million for all twenty units. Additional funds for rehabilitation were obtained from the Federal Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program, the Community Development Block Grant through the City of Marina, and local foundations. Renovation began in September 2001 and was completed in May 2002.

In addition to providing transitional housing, the program supports homeless veterans and their families. Services VTC provides to program participants include case management, permanent housing placement, and life skills courses. Annual operating costs are $575,000 and they are provided through funds from HUD, the Department of Veterans Affairs, local foundations, and individual donations. There are 58 beds in the facility, and an estimated 56 people are served daily, including 40 veterans. The VTC serves an estimated 198 homeless persons annually.
A Woman’s Place of Merced County (AWP) has operated an emergency shelter program targeted toward the victims of domestic violence and sexual assault since 1996. In addition, AWP continues to be the only agency in Merced County that provides comprehensive services to survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault.

AWP facilitates shelter residents’ goals by providing transportation when needed and connecting clients with organizations that can aid them in obtaining permanent housing. Referral services also include those for legal assistance and social services. Bilingual and bicultural staff are “on call” 24 hours a day to assist with emergency domestic violence incidents.

AWP’s vertical advocacy program is available to all shelter residents. Under this program, advocates accompany local law enforcement to ensure the proper execution of court orders for the immediate removal of batterers from the family home and for the return of abducted children. Advocacy then continues through both the counseling process, which includes group and individual counseling, and future court proceedings. AWP serves approximately 3000 individuals per year.

Staff at AWP also perform outreach to inform the community about domestic violence and sexual assault. This entails presentations or training for the following: professional associations, law enforcement personnel, social services staff, volunteers, and teenage students. Funding for this program comes primarily from the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the State of California, and Merced County. Annual operating costs for the shelter are $60,000.
Approved in 1994, Interim Inc. provides transitional housing for homeless persons with a severe psychiatric disability. Interim’s program, Shelter Cove, provides its residents with a wide range of services, including case management, crisis intervention, food, and transportation. Residents at Shelter Cove are encouraged to learn daily living skills that foster the self-sufficiency needed to move into permanent housing.

The inspiration for Shelter Cove came when administrators at Interim Inc. were unable to find homes for clients who were ready to move out from their crisis center for mentally ill homeless persons. To fill this gap in the continuum of care, Shelter Cove was created to allow clients to explore independence while remaining in a supportive environment. Residents work with peers and case managers to gain valuable life skills through independent living experience and active participation in their own treatment. The Shelter Cove community maintains social support networks by hosting resident dinners nightly and holding community council meetings.

Interim provides a job placement program and there are some paid positions available for residents on site as well as on-site day treatment for residents who require more intensive support. Case managers also assist clients in applying for government benefits for which they are eligible as well as work with clients to develop a plan to ensure a stable source of income. Approximately 74 percent of Shelter Cove’s residents were able to move into permanent housing in the 1999-2000 program year. Of those moving into permanent housing, 91 percent remained in permanent housing as of July 2000.
The program serves approximately 36 persons daily and 60 persons annually and has been filled to capacity since it first opened in May 1997.

Approximately $600,000 was spent for rehabilitation of the original property, constructing a new community room, and in bringing the units in line with current property regulations. Combined annual operating costs for the housing project and day program are approximately $980,000. Funding for Interim Inc.’s program is provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Supportive Housing Program grant; rental and dining fees paid are by residents and local government funds.

Interim, Inc. Properties
California Foodlink (Foodlink) was approved in 1993 to operate a charitable food distribution program at the Sacramento Army Depot. Foodlink obtained several buildings it uses for warehouse space, office space, classrooms and a cafeteria. Since 1993, Foodlink has become the largest single food program in the nation, distributing millions of pounds of food throughout California. In addition to charitable food distribution programs, Foodlink has expanded its services to include a job training program which won the 1999 Peter F. Drucker Award for Nonprofit Innovation.

Operating in conjunction with the California Department of Social Services, Foodlink distributes millions of pounds of food through The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), to a network of agencies that serves the homeless and hungry in all 58 counties in California. Approximately 1.5 million people access the TEFAP network every month. Moving to this property has given Foodlink the capacity to distribute this volume of food as well as give Foodlink the cold storage space necessary to accept and store donations of fresh produce and vegetables from the agricultural industry in California.

Foodlink’s job training programs work with the homeless, jobless, and other persons transitioning to self-sufficiency, including parolees. The program includes training in commercial truck driving, warehousing, forklift operation, packaging, food service and child care. All Foodlink training programs are tuition-free and include support services for the students. The commercial truck driver training program is particularly successful, providing Foodlink with a steady supply of skilled drivers to work its charitable food distributions, while providing graduates skills and on-the-job experience in a high growth field. Over 90 percent of graduates find related employment in the field, earning between $10 and $18 an hour. Annually, the entire job training program serves over 350 persons.
Rehabilitation costs were negligible and approximately $5.2 million was spent for operating costs for federal Fiscal Year 2000. Foodlink receives support from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the California State Department of Social Services, the California State Employment Development Department, the Sacramento County Office of Education, the Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance, and numerous individuals, businesses, and foundations. In addition, Foodlink generates funds by contracting with businesses to provide various warehouse services.
Applicant: Vietnam Veterans of California  
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit  
Property: Sacramento Army Depot  
Property Description: 2 buildings (1 for housing, 1 for administration) and a cafeteria  
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)  
Program Type: Transitional housing and job training  
Client Base: Homeless/low-income single male veterans  
Start Date: May 1998  
Website: http://www.vietvets.org

In May 1998, the Vietnam Veterans of California (VVC) completed the Sacramento Veterans Resource Center (SVRC). VVC originally planned to use a portion of the Sacramento Army Depot property for this project, but VVC sold its rights to the property back to the City of Sacramento in order for Packard Bell to occupy the property. The alternate site, which VVC purchased, consists of a 4,000 square foot facility for office and classroom space, and a 5,000 square foot transitional housing facility for homeless veterans. The program serves about 500 homeless and low income persons annually.

In addition to a 34-bed transitional living program, SVRC operates several job training and reintegration services. The Veterans Workforce Investment Program and the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project specifically target veterans who have significant barriers to employment, such as substance abuse disorders and mental illnesses. Services include case management and alcohol/drug counseling and education.

Initial funding in the amount of $1.5 million for the SVRC program came from the Sacramento Army Depot payment, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency. Annual operating costs are $475,000 and are met through grants from HUD and the VA. SVRC is building an alcohol and drug treatment wing with 19 beds that will open in late 2005.
The first program to open in 1996 at Fort Ord, Children’s Services International (CSI), obtained the deed to its 24,000 square foot Family Services and Child Development Center in 1997. Its goal is to provide multiple services for homeless children and their families, ranging from child care to adult education. CSI first assesses clients’ needs and refers them to appropriate social service organizations. CSI is able to offer a wealth of supportive services through partnering with eleven other social service organizations, many of which are also located at the Fort Ord facility and possess transitional housing units.

CSI’s case management and family advocacy services include making the initial contact for the client and following up to ensure that needed services are provided to clients. Health services are provided daily on site. Adults are assisted in their search for housing, provided transportation assistance, and may enroll in parenting classes or continuing adult education. Job training is available to those interested in becoming child care providers. CSI helps to meet the childrens’ needs by providing up to ten hours of child care per day for children, from birth to twelve years of age.

A typical school age client is picked up and transported to the Center by CSI. During the first part of the afternoon at CSI, children eat a snack and complete their homework with the guidance of an adult tutor. When their homework is completed, the children participate in other activities. At the conclusion of these activities, parents pick up their children. Clients are referred to CSI through local shelters, Coalition members’ transitional housing programs, children’s protective services, emergency rooms, schools, and word of mouth. CSI serves 100 people daily, and 315 annually. Approximately half of the enrolled families now come from the Coalition’s transitional housing programs. Almost all families are employed, seeking employment, or enrolled in an educational or vocational program. CSI's program has been replicated at a new $3 million family and

| Applicant: Children’s Services International |
| Applicant Type: Private nonprofit |
| Property: Fort Ord |
| Property Description: 6 acres of land and a 24,000 square foot building constructed in 1990 |
| Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V) |
| Program Type: Child care, job training, family advocacy, and health care services |
| Client Base: Homeless families with children |
| Start Date: February 1996 |
child development center in East Salinas that has been funded through a multitude of private and public sources.

Rehabilitation costs were approximately $200,000. Annual operating costs for the year 2000 were approximately $750,000. Funding for this program comes from federal, state, county, and city grants as well as service contracts, private foundations, and corporations.
Approved in 1993 to use a portion of the former Fort Ord, the Housing Authority of Monterey County (HAMC) acquired the property for transitional housing for homeless families in which the adults are recovering from substance abuse disorders. The Housing Authority’s program, Pueblo Del Mar, began operations in December 1998 after completing rehabilitation efforts.

Pueblo Del Mar’s primary goal is to promote self sufficiency among its clients. Clients are primarily referred through CalWORKS or substance abuse recovery programs and are offered a variety of services such as Alcoholics/Narcotics Anonymous meetings, community council membership, and life skills training modules. Pueblo Del Mar’s community council, which consists of all residents, governs the community and organizes special events. Residents pay 30 percent of their income as rent and are encouraged to participate actively in the community. There are 75 adults and 150 children served by the program. The facilities contain 224 beds and include 56 two-bedroom units that accommodate four people.

Pueblo Del Mar creates additional opportunities for its clients through partnerships with more than ten other service providers. The Monterey County Department of Health, Division of Behavioral Health, Alcohol and Drug Program conducts case management and after care case management. CalWORKS job training and cooperative day care also are available. Clients also may use programs offered by other nonprofit agencies housed in nearby surplus federal properties, including a job training workshop offered by Interim, Inc. and child care and parent support offered by Children’s Services International.
In November 1998, four years after receiving initial approval, Shelter Outreach Plus, a merger of Shelter Plus and Peninsula Outreach, opened its transitional housing program “Homeward Bound.” Shelter Outreach Plus used the land it received, including 16 duplexes, to provide a safe and confidential location where women and their children may receive housing and supportive services. Services provided include case management, food and clothing pantries, peer counseling, and child care. Homeward Bound currently uses 27 dwelling units and has an approximate capacity of 108 residents, dependent upon family size. The two-year program serves approximately 100 people annually.

Homeward Bound provides counseling, educational and recreational programs, and referral to job training programs to help clients move toward self-sufficiency. Homeward Bound fosters social ties by matching clients with peer counselors who are often graduates of transitional housing programs. The program also promotes a community atmosphere by hosting holiday events and social gatherings for residents at its community center. In addition to its transitional housing program, Shelter Outreach Plus also provides emergency shelter and toll-free phone referrals to anyone in Monterey County requiring information on available social services, including emergency shelters, food distribution, primary health care, including dental care, alcohol and drug treatment programs, children’s services, and prenatal care.

Rehabilitation costs were approximately $575,000. Annual operating costs for 2003 were approximately $176,674. Funding comes from Monterey County, a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Supportive Housing Program grant, private foundations, the United Way, and individuals.
HHS approved Grace Chapel’s application in 1993 to operate an intake center that would assist homeless persons in locating transitional housing at the Grace Apostolic Church Transitional Housing Program or other off-site housing programs. To supplement the intake program, Grace Apostolic Church provides a number of supportive services, including case management, food and clothing distribution, transportation, job search assistance, and budget counseling. Grace Chapel also operates a recreational center for youths in a 9,000 square foot facility, which includes a basketball court.

In 2003, 862 homeless persons received services at Grace Chapel; recipients of services included people ranging from infancy to 60 years of age. Twenty percent of the persons served received transitional housing. Staff at Grace Chapel have noted a significant rise in the number of homeless families, most notably in families with two or three children. Rehabilitation costs for the Grace Chapel Program were $63,000 and annual operating costs are $356,000. Funding comes from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development grant programs and private donations.
| **CATHOLIC CHARITIES** |  |
|------------------------|  |
| P.O. Box 19020         |  |
| Denver, Colorado 80219 |  |
| **Contact:**           |  |
| Mary Boland            |  |
| **Phone:**             |  |
| (303) 830-0215 ext. 313|  |
| **Fax:**               |  |
| (303) 830-2885         |  |

**Applicant:** Catholic Charities  
**Applicant Type:** Private nonprofit

**Property:** Lowry Air Force Base  
**Property Description:** 40 housing units  
**Property Type:** Base Closure (under Title V)

**Program Type:** Transitional housing  
**Client Base:** Homeless families

**Start Date:** January 31, 2003

In 1994, Catholic Charities was awarded 40 units of family housing on this property to create a transitional housing program for homeless families. Originally Catholic Charities and other partner organizations, such as the Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (Coalition), were told that the family apartment units on this property (a total of 868 units) would be sold to private developers for use as affordable rental apartments. Catholic Charities and its partners agreed with this plan because it meant that homeless families would be integrated into a mixed income rental neighborhood.

Later, however, the local redevelopment authority (LRA) changed its plan. Apartment units were instead demolished and land was sold to private homebuilders for the development of single family homes. The starting prices for these homes ranged from $225,000 to $1 million. Over time, the units occupied by Catholic Charities and the Coalition’s families were set apart because these families were in the original Air Force housing. It became evident that the two types of housing units could not coexist in the same neighborhood. Neighborhood associations objected to relocating the homeless families to another part of the base.

After 18 months of unfruitful negotiations, Catholic Charities and the Coalition filed suit, claiming breach of contract and damages for depriving their organizations of the legitimate use of property under Title V of the McKinney-Vento Act. The case was settled out of court. Part of the settlement included a cash payment to develop affordable housing units off base in lieu of the units originally awarded in 1994. As of January 2003, the families remaining in 35 units on base were placed in housing off base, pursuant to the settlement agreement.
HHS granted the application of the Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (the Coalition) in 1993 to use 100 housing units on this property for transitional housing for homeless families. Because of major NIMBY opposition to the program, the Coalition entered into an agreement with the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA). This agreement required the Coalition to give up its rights to 54 of the housing units in exchange for funds that would be collected by the LRA from the sale of the returned units. The Coalition used these funds and additional funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the City of Denver, and State of Colorado to develop over 250 housing units, including single room occupancy (SROs), transitional housing for homeless families, and permanent housing for low income families. These units were completed by September 1997.

The Coalition leased the remaining 46 units on the base from the LRA for $1. Between December 1994 and October 2000, the Coalition provided transitional housing for more than 225 homeless families using these units. Services included case management, vocational counseling, substance abuse counseling, and mental health services. Seventy-five percent of these families successfully transitioned to permanent housing.

In 1999, the Coalition filed a lawsuit in state court to force the LRA to abide by its agreement, and transfer fee title to the Coalition. In October 2000, a settlement agreement was reached under which the Coalition received $1.6 million (which was used to construct single room occupancy housing units throughout the city of Denver), and took title to 92 apartments on the base. Thirty of these units are used for homeless families, while the remaining units are reserved for affordable housing.

In December 2002, the Coalition completed renovation on the ninety-two 2-4 bedroom housing units and built a community center for its residents on the base. The funding
for the new construction came from low income tax credits, the City of Denver and State of Colorado HOME funds, and bank financing. Funding for transitional housing and services comes from a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Supportive Housing Program (SHP) and community support.

In addition, the Coalition received title to a 9 acre vacant parcel on the base, once environmental remediation was completed. The Coalition completed construction of 120 housing units on the site, including 40 transitional housing units for homeless families, in December 2003. Currently, the program serves 300 individuals annually, an estimate that is expected to more than double with the addition of these new units.
The Del Norte Neighborhood Development Corporation (Del Norte) initially got approval in 1993 to use this property as an assisted living program for homeless persons with HIV and AIDS. However, because of significant NIMBY problems, Del Norte made an agreement with the City of Denver to give up its rights to the property in exchange for funds from the City.

Del Norte is using the funds it received from the City of Denver to operate a permanent housing program with case management services for homeless persons with HIV or AIDS at an alternate site. This new site contains 14 housing units and one manager’s unit. Residents may remain at the new program permanently; the program serves 15 to 17 persons annually.
Approved in 1994 to create a transitional housing program for homeless single adults, the Denver Indian Center, Inc. planned to serve approximately 50 persons daily at its facility, named Crooked Tree. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), however, requested that the organization change its program from transitional housing to permanent Section 8 housing. For this purpose, Crooked Tree received one dormitory-style building with 44 single room occupancy (SRO) housing units on two acres of land. The Northeast Denver Development Corporation acquired the property in November 2002 and changed the name of the residences to Golfer’s Way. It continues to be Section 8 housing.

Rehabilitation costs were $600,000; annual operating costs are $201,000. Financial support for this program comes from HUD and rent payments from clients.
The Empowerment Program proposed to provide transitional housing to formerly incarcerated homeless single women on this property. However, due to NIMBY opposition from the City of Denver, the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA), and the neighboring community, Empowerment entered into an agreement with the City to give up its rights to the property in exchange for funds to develop housing off site.

The Empowerment Program used the funds to operate a program at an alternate site in North Capitol Hill, 1904 Logan, beginning in February 1996. The property consists of 28 1-bedroom apartments. Because of continued NIMBY opposition, Empowerment was not able to provide housing to its initial target population—exclusively previously incarcerated homeless women. Instead, the organization provides transitional housing to homeless and low-income persons, many of whom have been incarcerated. To be eligible for the program, persons are required to earn less than 40% of the median income for the Denver area. All residents may receive supportive services off site. Empowerment estimates that one third of program participants are homeless.

In 1999, the City of Denver Department of Human Services asked Empowerment to take over an existing Shelter Plus Care contract that would involve owning and rehabilitating the property that the Lowry redevelopment authority awarded to Empowerment originally. Those buildings, however, were eventually sold and relocated, and other base property (1090 Quebec Street) was given to Empowerment and rehabilitated through a $2.1 million grant from Denver. Yearly operating costs for that property are about $130,000. The property consists of 17 one-bedroom apartments and the residents are women who had been on the street and were seriously mentally ill. In addition to housing services for 17 women on the site, Empowerment provides health, housing, education, and employment opportunities to a larger group of homeless women. 500 women annually receive this sort of assistance, while an additional 60 women receive rental assistance through the shelter plus care program.
By September 2005, Third Way Center expects to open its doors to homeless individuals and mentally-ill youth to provide housing and treatment. It will support about 32 people daily and about 75 individuals annually.

Three years elapsed between the application and the transfer of the deed. Since that time, the program had to apply for zoning approval, which has been a lengthy process, and it cannot begin demolition of the existing structure until it receives approval.

Rehabilitation costs for the demolition of the current standing building are estimated to be approximately $200,000 and annual operating costs are estimated to be $2,000,000. Remaining asbestos in the building also must be removed during the demolition. Reaction from the community has been positive, and funding will come from foundations, HomeAid Colorado, and the Department of Human Services.
In 1989, the Community for Creative Non-Violence (CCNV), the largest shelter in the District of Columbia, began using this property adjacent to CCNV’s existing main shelter building. Because CCNV did not have 501(c)(3) nonprofit status when Square 571 became available, the National Coalition for the Homeless initially acquired this property and turned the title over to CCNV after CCNV obtained its nonprofit status. Acquiring the property allowed CCNV to expand services that were in high demand at its main facility. On the new property, now called the Mitch Snyder Arts and Education Center (the Center), CCNV offers a variety of services including Jobs for the Homeless program, alcohol and other drug counseling, arts and educational courses, a GED program, and computer classes. These services are available to all its residents. Participants in CCNV’s program had an 85 percent success rate in finding employment after graduation. The Center reaches some 24 persons daily six days a week and an estimated 4,992 persons annually.

Costs for the rehabilitation of the property were approximately $25,000. Annual operating costs are $50,000. Funding for the program comes from individual donations and fundraising events such as car washes, open houses, and graduation ceremonies for the residents; 50 percent of funding comes from in-kind goods and services.
**SOUTH MIAMI-DADE HOMELESS HOUSING PROJECT**
111 NW 1st Street,  
Suite 310, 27th Floor  
Miami, Florida 33128

**Contacts:**  
Karen Mahar (Camillus House),  
Al Brown (CPHI),  
David Raymond (Dade County Homeless Trust)

**Phone:**  
(305) 374-1065  
(305) 329-3013  
(305) 375-1490

**Fax:**  
(305) 372-1402 (Camillus House)  
(305) 375-2722

The Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust was approved to acquire this property in 1995 to provide a wide range of housing services in coordination with other area agencies. It obtained 84 acres of unimproved vacant land in a suburban area. Community Partnership for the Homeless, Inc. (CPHI) began operating its emergency shelter in October 1998, following completion of its eleven-structure Homeless Assistance Center (HAC) and installation of the essential infrastructure (including water and sewer facilities, sidewalks, and roads).

The HAC has a nightly capacity of 300 people and serves approximately 2,000 clients annually. The HAC provides a variety of services to its clients, including adult education, day care, head start, outreach, case management, and job training. HAC job training includes vocational classes that are taught at a local vocational high school. Students from these classes are often later hired by the HAC as cooks, receptionists, and security guards. Also available through the vocational school are certification programs for nurse’s and physician’s assistants. Currently, the HAC refers many of its clients to Job Corps, which is located adjacent to the property. By helping their clients find livable wage jobs and coordinating with transitional housing
programs, 61 percent of HAC’s clients are able to obtain permanent housing. HAC’s current operating budget is $3,057,846.

Transitional housing programs for families and singles now operated by Camillus House, Inc. began in July and October 2000, respectively. The facility consists of 37 family units (152 beds) and 15 units for individuals (30 beds). The annual operating budget for the family units is $548,167 and $150,727 for the individual units. During the last year, the program served a total of 431 participants, including 67 single adults and 80 families (113 adults and 251 children). Fourteen on-site staff members provide an array of supportive services, including case management, life skills training, parenting skills, child care, legal services, transportsations, and referrals for other services.

The Miami Dade County Department of Human Services awarded funds to Camillus House to operate the outpatient substance abuse program, which uses space in HAC’s building. The program began in Autumn 2004.
In 1992, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless applied for and was awarded a parcel of federal surplus land in Chicago to begin an urban agriculture training program for homeless people. In 1996, Growing Home was formed as an independent non-profit organization in order to operate the program. In 1996, Growing Home acquired 10 additional acres of federal surplus land in LaSalle County and in April 2002 started its transitional job and organic agriculture social enterprise. This program was developed in response to the overwhelming need for job training and job creation as well as an anticipated growth in the demand for persons experienced in horticulture. The program is devoted to teaching homeless persons horticulture and business through the operation of an outdoor garden and greenhouses operated throughout the year. Since Growing Home began operations in 2002, the number of individuals completing the program has increased annually. It is expected that 15-16 individuals will complete the program in 2004. Growing Home has trained over twenty people since it began its training program. After completing the training, 71% of program graduates have found full-time employment or have continued training or studying in other programs.

The Chicago Moorings site was part of The Navy Pier, a tourist center, which was slated for redevelopment by the City of Chicago. The Coalition negotiated with the City to give up its rights to the property in exchange for the following: an alternate site; $50,000; the right of first refusal of all day laborers in the area; a stall that is used to sell produce grown through the program; and free access to all farmers markets. The cash portion of the settlement was used to rehabilitate the alternate property, one acre of land.
The Community and Economic Development Associates, Inc. (CEDA) Northwest Self-Help Center was approved in 1994 to provide a range of services to homeless persons on this property. However, Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) opposition from the surrounding cities of Highland Park and Highwood, who were serving as the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA), was strong. Unable to reach an agreement to share the property, CEDA gave up its rights to the property in exchange for $850,000 in funds.

Following an evaluation of the gaps in the local area’s Continuum of Care, CEDA used the funds to open a new homeless shelter for homeless families and individuals at an alternate location and to expand one of CEDA’s existing buildings to provide space for an employment resource center. The agency operates 32 units for homeless individuals and families. The Resource Training Center serves hard-to-employ, immigrant, and homeless individuals. The Center opened in February 2001. Services provided include family counseling and instruction in financial management. The money was also used as matching funds to apply for grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. CEDA estimates that 100 homeless persons are served annually by the programs funded through revenues generated by CEDA. Annual operating costs are $1.7 million.
Horizon House had proposed expanding services it provides at other facilities by developing a day center on this property. Because of Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) opposition from the Mayor's office and the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA), Horizon House returned its rights to the property in exchange for funds.

The funds were used to purchase an alternate facility. Horizon House received a grant from the Veterans Administration to assist with the purchase, rehabilitation, and development of the alternate property, a former tire service center. The Fort Benjamin Harrison property was later developed into a state park, residential area, and a commercial development area.

Since it reopened and began operations in the summer of 2001, Horizon House offers a wide variety of services to homeless individuals in the Indianapolis community. These services include emergency shelter, food and clothing supplies with access to laundry, an outpatient medical suite, mental health services, legal services, job readiness training, and job placement. In addition, volunteers perform “street outreach” on a weekly basis to find individuals to take part in Horizon House programs.

As of 2003, Horizon House served 3,811 clients annually, with more than 76,000 duplicate visits.
In 1997, HHS approved the application of the North Central-Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging, Inc. (NC-FH AAA). Services for homeless people were expanded through co-locating local service agencies in office space on this property. The large building was rehabilitated to remove lead paint, make the building accessible, and implement other improvements. NC-FH AAA currently sponsors programs operating on site. Services include a nutrition program, local food bank services, and programs providing job training, job search services, and assistance in obtaining housing, and Section 8 housing vouchers. The Flint Hills Breadbasket intake services are also located in the facility. The Breadbasket provides local food bank services. NC-FH AAA is partnered with cooperating organizations to serve a large portion of the 6,000 to 7,000 homeless persons that are estimated to live in Manhattan and the surrounding area.

Rehabilitation costs exceeded $600,000. Funding for the program comes from grants and private donations.
Aftercare Ministries Inc. provides services in a positive environment to help veterans and ex-felons stay off the streets and out of prisons. The organization serves about 24-30 individuals daily and is located in a commercial area of the city. Aftercare Ministries has worked with the community to generate support for the program, and the community has reacted positively. Aftercare Ministries wants to continue to build relationships with the community by participating in cleanups and being a citizen of the community.

Rehabilitation costs were about $112,000 and annual operating costs are about $300,000 (the liability insurance expense was higher than anticipated). Funding comes from Rapides Foundation and private sources, and AMI is working on a grant from HUD.
Vernon Community Action Council (VCAC) was approved in 1993 to use this property for a transitional supportive housing program for the homeless. In 2002, 226 persons were served through the program at A.C. Dowden Memorial Shelter with an average of eight persons served daily.

The Dowden Memorial Shelter is one of the few shelters in Louisiana that serves all segments of the homeless population including men, women, and families. Each client at the shelter receives case management. Clients begin case management by setting both short and long term goals for themselves which, when achieved, will lead to self-sufficiency. Other supportive services provided to clients include: job search assistance, transportation, food and clothing distribution, education referrals, legal advocacy, relocation assistance, and advocacy and supportive services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Graduates of the VCAC program have an 86 percent success rate in finding employment and 75 percent are able to obtain permanent housing.

Rehabilitation costs for the Dowden Memorial Shelter reached $22,500. Annual operating costs are $130,000. Funding for the program comes from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Emergency Shelter Grants Program, rent payments, private foundation grants, and local donations. The surrounding community has given "tremendous support" to the program and has volunteered time and given in-kind donations to the shelter.
HARMONY HOUSE
1900 Garrett Road
Monroe, Louisiana  71202

Contact:
Haynes Harkey, Chair

Phone:
(318) 343-9200
Fax:
(318) 343-9222

Applicant: Monroe Area Guidance Center
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Naval Reserve Center
Property Description: A 12,000 square foot building, a 8,000 square foot gymnasium, and 16 acres of land
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Emergency shelter, job training, day care, health clinic, and drop-in center
Client Base: Homeless mentally ill and multiply-diagnosed persons, and homeless veterans

Start Date: August 1996

In 1994, the Monroe Area Guidance Center (MAGC) was approved to acquire this property for the operation of Harmony House and Fairhaven Homeless Shelter, the only emergency shelters in Louisiana that target the mentally ill. The use of this property saves the MAGC program $18,000 in rent per year, which is now put toward the development and funding of new programs to assist homeless persons.

By using the new and more spacious Navy property, MAGC was able expand its emergency shelter program for mentally ill and otherwise homeless persons to include 50 percent more clients. Harmony House has landscaped and improved the original site, including the addition of three storage buildings and a gazebo, as well as expansion of the gym facilities, in order to make it a suitable extreme weather shelter. An average of 60 persons are served daily at Harmony House and an estimated 500-600 persons are served annually.
Harmony House focuses on supporting clients in meeting their personal goals. Clients may stay at Fairhaven Homeless Shelter for up to six months. During this time, Harmony House provides supportive living, employment services, and a nutrition program for clients. Harmony House has its own psychiatric rehabilitation center for clients with mental illnesses. The rehabilitation center is partially staffed through a partnership with a local university in which nursing, counseling, and occupational therapy students work at the rehabilitation center to gain experience in their field. Upon graduation, 85 percent of the program’s clients move into permanent housing.

Future plans for MAGC include creating a Section 8 permanent housing program on six acres of land bordering Harmony House. MAGC already obtained funding to build 19 apartments for Section 8 use. Rehabilitation costs for the property were approximately $50,000, and annual operating costs for the program are $800,000. Funding comes from a contract with the Office of Mental Health, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Medicaid reimbursement, the United Way, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Emergency Shelter Grant Program, a Community Development Block Grant, Vocational Rehabilitation funds, and private donations.
In 1993, HHS approved the application of the City of Bangor to use this property to create a transitional community for homeless individuals and families. Residents may receive assistance from a range of on site services: case management; housing subsidies; education/training/planning; child care assistance; transportation assistance; and counseling. Residents may also benefit from off-site services provided through the City of Bangor, including maternal and child health services, immunizations, HIV and STD testing, children's dental services, lead screening, and participation in the WIC program. Persons may reside in Park Woods for up to 2 years and must make a commitment to work toward self sufficiency prior to entering the program. One hundred and fifty persons are served daily, and 600 persons are served annually.

Rehabilitation costs exceeded $490,000 and annual operating costs are $260,000. Funding for the Park Woods program comes primarily from multiple grants administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition, a range of local organizations provide in-kind donations, including churches, the Bangor Daily News Foundation, local salons, and members of the residential community around Park Woods.
VICKERS HOPE
P.O. Box 687
Caribou, Maine 04736

Contact:
Steve Ulman

Phone:
(207) 498-3709
Fax:
(207) 498-3743

Applicant: AMHC Facilities, Inc.
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Loring Air Force Base
Property Description: 16 buildings, each approximately 1,100-square feet
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Emergency shelter, transitional housing, and adult day care
Client Base: Homeless teenagers, victims of domestic violence, and chronically ill homeless persons

Start Date: June 1997

HHS approved the application of AMHC Facilities Inc. in 1995 to use these sixteen 2-3 bedroom housing units to provide housing and a range of supportive services to homeless individuals and families. The housing and services are offered through a collaborative of local agencies including Aroostook Mental Health and Battered Women’s Project. The services that the organizations provide include: case management, a children’s crisis center, a pre-school program, transitional housing for victims of domestic violence, and supportive housing for the chronically mentally ill. There are approximately 32 beds in the facility. The program serves an average of 32 persons daily and 30-35 persons annually.

Ten buildings are used as supportive housing for chronically mentally ill homeless persons. Two buildings are for the battered women’s project. The remaining four buildings are used for office space, the children’s crisis center, supportive housing for the elderly, and a pre-school.

Rehabilitation costs have been approximately $130,000 to date. Annual operating costs, excepting each agency’s individual program costs, are approximately $86,000. Funding for this collaborative program comes from the Maine State Housing Authority and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
Approved in 1991 to open the only emergency shelter in Ellsworth, H.O.M.E., Inc. houses residents for up to 45 days and assists them in locating housing. Twenty-two persons at one time may stay at Emmaus Center. In 2002, 450 homeless persons, including 54 families, received shelter.

In addition to providing the shelter’s residents with three meals a day, H.O.M.E. also provides services to non-residents to help them obtain stable and adequate housing. H.O.M.E. assists clients in obtaining food, clothing, transportation, furniture, and day care, as well as providing short term loans for security deposits on housing, and emergency needs such as utility or repair bills. Furthermore, H.O.M.E. helps clients with paperwork and finding jobs. In 1999, HOME provided 11,710 clients with food boxes or furniture.

Rehabilitation costs were $35,907. The operating budget for 1999 was $198,000. Funding for Emmaus Center comes from the Main State Housing Authority, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and private donations.
Crossroads Community, Inc. applied for properties in Chestertown, Maryland, and Queen Anne’s County, Maryland in May 2002. The properties consist of 4 single-family dwellings, 2 split-level and 2 ranch style. All of the homes are between 1000-1100 square feet, sit on land between 15,000-190,000 square feet, and have 3 bedrooms. The property provides transitional housing for homeless individuals with mental illness, and serves 12 individuals daily, and 16-20 individuals annually.

Before the property could begin housing individuals, renovations were completed, a license to operate was obtained, and final corrections and improvements had to be made. Lead paint abatements were required in 1 unit.

The biggest problem facing the project was NIMBY opposition from the community. The project received negative press from local papers through articles as well as letters to the editor. Articles featuring the project were juxtaposed with articles and pictures about policemen who had been shot and killed by a person with a long history of mental illness, which caused a great outcry from the community that public safety was being threatened by the transitional housing. To overcome NIMBY opposition, Crossroads Community, Inc. held multiple community meetings, met with local elected officials, met with local neighborhood associations, sent letters to every house in the neighborhood, and co-sponsored a defeating stigma workshop at the local college.

All four dwellings began operations in the Summer of 2003. The Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development provided funding for renovation of the property, while the Mental Hygiene Administration is providing ongoing funding. The total rehabilitation cost for the property was $119,174. The FY03 operating expense for the four homes was $405,136.
Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee, Inc. (SMTCCAC) was approved for use of 16 former Navy townhouses on 4.13 acres of land in La Plata, Maryland, in August 2001 and plans to use the property as transitional housing for homeless families.

This approval came after multiple attempts. The first time HHS told SMTCCAC its application was incomplete and HHS needed more information on agencies that it was collaborating with on the property. SMTCCAC also had to provide more information on current programs, on plans for vacant land, and environmental information.

However, despite its approval, it is estimated that SMTCCAC will not be able to operate the facility until the summer of 2006 due to a host of difficulties. While SMTCCAC obtained its deed in July 2002, it still faces problems concerning the property. The biggest problem is that the town in which the property is located underwent comprehensive rezoning between the award and receipt of the deed. The property is now non-conforming and not able to be developed further without an amendment to either the zoning code or the deed.

Furthermore, SMTCCAC has experienced problems visiting the property, which is imperative to make the necessary renovations. To view the property, which was boarded up, persons from SMTCCAC had to force entry onto the site. This occurred during the application process as well as after approval. As of the fall of 2002, these problems were resolved and SMTCCAC currently has full access to the property.
Additionally, the property has lead paint and asbestos problems, which SMTCCAC plans to abate at construction commencement.

Finally, SMTCCAC has dealt with NIMBY opposition from members of the community, including town leadership, and is dealing with these problems by securing services through Maryland volunteer lawyers service. Difficulties that SMTCCAC is facing with lead paint and asbestos on the property as well as opposition from NIMBY are moot until the town rezoning issues are resolved and construction may commence.

SMTCCAC is working in conjunction with the Charles County Homelessness Committee in developing the property. The estimated total rehabilitation costs of the property are $1,000,000 to $3,000,000. They estimate that annual operating costs of the facility will be $100,000.
Grace Centers of Hope, formerly known as Pontiac Rescue Mission, was approved in 1989 to use this property in downtown Pontiac to provide a wide range of services to homeless men, women, and children. These services include transitional housing with case management, emergency shelter, and health care. A long term care program, including substance abuse counseling, is available to adults with addictions and a day care program is available for their children.

The shelter provides 43,000 nights of stay and 106,000 meals annually with 150 dormitory-style rooms and a kitchen/dining area that seats 200 persons. GCH serves approximately 116,000 clients annually.

Rehabilitation costs were approximately $800,000. Total annual operating costs are $1.8 million. Funding comes strictly from private donations.
In July 2001, the Economic Security Corporation of Southwest Area applied for property in Joplin, Missouri. The property, Durward G. Hall Federal Building and Courthouse, is a 150 ft. by 120 ft. lot comprised of a basement and three upper levels with 65 rooms. Economic Security Corp. of Southwest Area uses the property to provide administrative services for transitional housing for homeless individuals. Additionally, the property is used as a drop-in facility for homeless individuals who are seeking shelter and protection from extreme weather conditions. The program serves approximately 100 people annually.

The program encountered several problems in obtaining and moving into the property. The program was told that it had an incomplete application and needed to expand on the roles of the Jasper County Public Housing Agency. In addition, the program had to explain why its other buildings were not suitable for its proposed purpose. Finally, it had to list the persons who determined the answers to questions regarding environmental concerns. After HHS approved its application, the program encountered other problems. The IRS and Social Security Disabilities Hearing Offices were in the building and delayed moving out for approximately five months after Economic Security Corp. of Southwest Area moved in. The program also had to wait a year before signing the deed to the property, which caused problems. This delayed renovation and forced the program to physically move offices on multiple occasions.

GSA spent approximately $1,000,000 renovating the building before it was declared surplus under Title V. Remodeling costs of the property, after the property was assigned to the Economic Security Corporation, were approximately $300,000. The program receives funding from Agency Reserves, various programs the agency operates and private resources.
The application of the Human Resource Development Council Inc. was approved in 1996 to provide a range of services to homeless individuals and persons needing home health care. This space has been renovated to make room for 41 staff members to provide supportive services to homeless and displaced community residents and offices for home health care services. These services include: Head Start, case management, employment and training, food bank, and both temporary and permanent housing assistance. Also on the site are two transitional living units for homeless persons. Currently, the Bozeman Reserve Center serves approximately 50 unduplicated clients per day and offers direct services to nearly 2145 unduplicated clients annually. In addition, in 2003 the program issued over 12,000 referrals to other agencies and service providers.

Rehabilitation costs for the site were $1.4 million. Annual operating costs are approximately $600,000. Funding for the Bozeman Reserve Center comes from a variety of sources, including federal and state grants, contract revenues, contributions, and fundraising.
AMANDLA CROSSING
100 Mitch Snyder Drive
Edison, New Jersey
08837-3653

Contact:
Cari Tarica

Phone:
(732) 549-5559
Fax:
(732) 549-2105

Applicant: Middlesex Interfaith Partners with the Homeless
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Raritan Depot
Property Description: 30 housing units and 3.2 acres of land
Property Type: Title V Surplus Property

Program Type: Transitional housing, children’s day care, and case management
Client Base: Homeless single-parent families on welfare

Start Date: July 1991

In 1989, Middlesex Interfaith Partners for the Homeless (MIPH) became one of the first organizations in the country to acquire surplus federal property. It improved the vacant land that it received with 29 apartment-style housing units which are used for transitional housing and services, including case management, daily living skills instruction, and educational classes for homeless single-parent families on welfare. The maximum occupancy of these units are 78-82 adults and children; an estimated 28 adults and 45-50 children reside in these housing units at any given time. Since it began operations, Amandla Crossing has been filled to capacity and has approximately 45 applications for the program on file at any given time. The program serves 86 homeless persons in single parent families annually.

Amandla Crossing educates residents with classes on building self-esteem, health issues and nutrition, parenting, home management, the GED, and tenancy. Residents pay a percentage of their annual income as rent. Formerly, this level was set at 30%, however, after a change in state law, MIPH was required to change this to 65%. Amandla Crossing succeeds in placing 100% of their clients in permanent, Section 8 housing and after one year, 98% of graduates are still living in safe and affordable housing.

Rehabilitation and construction costs for this property were $1.7 million. Annual operating costs are $1,000,000. Funding comes from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, emergency assistance payments, foundations, the United Way, and individual donations.
Middlesex Interfaith Partners obtained this property in 1996. The property now consists of a single, newly-constructed 21,000 square foot facility containing 16 apartments, a classroom, and several offices. The facility contains 4 one-bedroom, 8 two-bedroom, and 4 three-bedroom apartments. At any given time, the Imani Park may be expected to house 35-45 individuals, depending on family size. The program serves as a transitional housing facility for homeless individuals living with HIV or AIDS and their families, and began operations in June 2004.

The costs of building construction were approximately $2,800,000. Annual operating costs are expected to be between $600,000-$700,000. Funding for the program comes from a variety of sources, including Supportive Housing Grants from HUD, Middlesex County Home, the United Way of Central New Jersey, Housing and Mortgage Finance Association (HMFA), and the Department of Community Affairs (DCA).
In March 2001, Urban Renewal Corporation applied for property in Kearny, New Jersey. The property, two acres of land and one building, is used by the program to provide job training to homeless individuals. Annually, the program serves 600-850 clients per year.

Urban Renewal Corp. encountered problems in starting its program. It was unable to obtain the property’s utility records, maintenance information, environmental information, etc. Additionally, the facility had environmental problems -- lead paint on the property made it unsafe for future use as a residence and had to be addressed.

Furthermore, Urban Renewal Corp. also has been faced with Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) opposition to its program. Community members were reluctant to have homeless individuals in the area.

Rehabilitation of the property has cost $116,753.39 as of late 2004. Annual operating costs are approximately $950,000-$1,100,000. Funding for the property comes from the Department of Labor.
| **CATHERINE A. ROWE COMMONS**  
262 Main Street, 6th Floor  
Paterson, New Jersey 07505  
| **Applicant:** Paterson Coalition for Housing, Inc.  
**Applicant Type:** Private nonprofit  
| **Contact:** Terese Tolomeo  
| **Property:** Naval Reserve Center (Clifton)  
**Property Description:** 1 and 1/2 acres of land  
**Property Type:** Base Closure (under Title V)  
| **Program Type:** Transitional housing and children’s day care  
**Client Base:** Homeless families  
| **Start Date:** February 1995  

The Paterson Coalition for Housing was approved in 1992 to use land at a Naval Reserve Center to create a transitional living community. The Catherine A. Rowe Commons Transitional Housing Program (The Commons), operating in 20 housing units and a day care center, is a comprehensive program for homeless families that includes case management, on-site therapy, and drug and alcohol counseling, and targets chronically homeless families and young parents with a history of child abuse and neglect. All applicants are given an initial interview and are sent for a drug screening and psychological evaluation. If appropriate, they are interviewed a second time and the screening committee considers their case. If approved, a move-in date is set.

The day care program, which includes after school and summer programs, is available to all children of families residing at the facility and is closely linked with the local school district. In 2003, the Commons added a summer day camp for children ages 5-12 that complements the Head Start program that also is on site. The Commons also expanded its services recently to include a Division of Youth and Family Services Aging-out Youth program for 18-21-year-old homeless individuals.

The Commons serves 60 persons daily and 100 annually. Rehabilitation costs were $1.8 million. Annual operating costs are $350,000. Construction funding came from the Federal Home Loan Bank of New Jersey, the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, and the Stewart B. McKinney Transitional Housing Demonstration Program. Operating and services are funded through Stewart B. McKinney, the Division of Youth & Family Services, and Emergency Assistance.
A residential facility for mentally ill homeless persons, Liberty House opened its doors late in 1996, after Community Mental Health Services, Inc. (CMHS) was approved to use the property in 1989. Full-time case management, including on-site counseling and social services, in addition to a 24-hour crisis intervention program, are all part of the services available to residents. Liberty House also provides three meals a day in its cafeteria (although residents may prepare meals in lounges that contain kitchenettes). There also is an outdoor eating area with a canopy and picnic tables, laundry facilities, and an enclosed area for children to play. The facility has a total of forty-eight beds, and the same number of people are served annually at the site. Residents pay 30 percent of their monthly income.

Rehabilitation costs were $4.7 million and annual operating costs are $296,000. Funding for Liberty House comes from the Department of Housing and Urban Development through a Single Room Occupancy grant, the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency, a Community Development Block Grant from Chester County; the Chester County Housing Trust, the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs, and the Federal Home Loan Bank.
HHS approved the application of the Travelers Aid Society (TAS) in 1993 to provide transitional housing to homeless families with at least two children. Program participants must be able to attend school or work and are required to develop short-term and long-term goals with assistance from a case manager. TAS works with other agencies to provide a variety of services on-site. Programs for parents include computer training, GED preparation, parenting classes, and nutrition classes. In addition to day care, programs for children include Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and Big Brother/Big Sister. The Crossroads Program provides housing for 58 families or 215 persons each year.

Rehabilitation costs were $920,000 and the program operates on an annual budget of $550,000. Funding is provided by a Community Development Block Grant, private foundations, individual donations, and the Rhode Island Housing and Mortgage Finance Corporation.
CAROLINA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTER
5055 Lackawanna Boulevard
Charleston, SC 29151

Contact:
Christine Dean

Phone:
(843) 744-5358
Fax:
(843) 529-3202

Applicant: Carolina Youth Development Center
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Charleston Naval Base
Property Description: 4 housing units and 1/2 acre of land
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Transitional housing
Client Base: Single children from foster care, ages 18 to 21

Start Date: January 1998; closed 2000

Approved in 1994 to operate a transitional housing program for children ages 18 to 21 that are referred from the Department of Social Services, Carolina Youth Development Center (CYDC) served up to 9 children daily and up to 20 children annually. CYDC’s services included case management, food, and health education. The Lowcountry Food Bank provided food for residents and some children were able to assist with meal preparation.

There were no rehabilitation costs for the property; the annual operating budget was $100,000. Funding came from the South Carolina Department of Social Services, foundation grants, Medicaid reimbursement, and private donations.

The program was closed in 2000 because of a lack of state funding.
**DISABILITIES BOARD**
**CHARLESTON COUNTY**
995 Morrison Drive
Charleston, SC 29403

**Contact:**
Sue Sherrod

**Phone:**
(843) 805-5800

**Fax:**
(843) 805-5825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Disabilities Board of Charleston County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Type:</td>
<td>Private nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property:</td>
<td>Charleston Naval Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Description:</td>
<td>4 duplex housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Type:</td>
<td>Base Closure (under Title V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type:</td>
<td>Permanent housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Base:</td>
<td>Homeless people with developmental disabilities and social needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date:</td>
<td>April 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved in 1994 to use a portion of the former Charleston Naval Base, the Disabilities Board of Charleston County (DBCC) has created a supportive housing program for people with developmental disabilities. All residents are referred through the South Carolina State Department of Disabilities and Special Needs and receive a Medicaid Community Home-Based Waiver, which allows them to access a range of Medicaid-funded supportive services with the assistance of the staff. The program, which consistently runs at full capacity, serves 27 persons annually with a total number of 27 beds for residents.

Residents in DBCC’s program participate in a day program that includes prevocational training, supported employment, and sheltered workshops. In the sheltered workshops, workers do contract work under the supervision of a vocational trainer. When at home, clients have constant access to the program’s staff who provide transportation, meals, and any other case management and assistance that the resident might need. Clients are also provided with daily living and community skills training. Residents pay $400 per month in rent to the Disabilities Board of Charleston County and may stay in the program permanently.

Rehabilitation costs were up to $90,000 per unit. In 2003, the annual operating costs were approximately $137,000. Funding comes from the South Carolina State Department of Disabilities and Special Needs and residents’ rent payments.
HOTLINE, Inc. was approved in 1994 to obtain offices at Charleston Naval Base to operate a 24 hour crisis and referral line. HOTLINE serves approximately 12,000 persons a year. HOTLINE provides community outreach and education through presentations and written materials on various subjects (e.g. suicide prevention, self-esteem, stress management and effective communication skills). This organization also provides the Tri-County Resource Directory, The Youth Yellow Pages, and the Community Service Directory. After five years on the former naval base property, the program merged with another nonprofit organization and moved to offices off the base.
Approved in 1995 to reuse property at Charleston Navy Base, Florence Crittenton Programs provided transitional housing for up to eight families until June 2003, when it closed. Residents were able to remain at the facility for 24 months receiving a number of on-site services from case management to presentations from local attorneys on pertinent legal issues such as child custody. In addition, linkages to off-site day care were available to all residents. One parent received an outside scholarship for college. One office unit remains open for outreach, support services, and case management.

Rehabilitation costs for the property were $7,000; the program had an annual budget of $128,000. Funding came from the Department of Social Services, United Way, private foundations, reserve funding, and Medicaid reimbursements.
The Mental Health Association of the Lowcountry (MHA) was approved in 1994 to reuse property at Charleston Naval Base for a transitional housing and emergency shelter program. In collaboration with Elder Shelter and Elder Support Line, MHA devoted its emergency shelter to elderly abused persons from the surrounding three counties. Each room in the lodge had kitchens to facilitate independent living for each person entering the program. The emergency shelter had the capacity to serve five persons daily and 100 to 150 persons annually. Residents came to the shelter through referrals from the Department of Social Services, hospitals, and law enforcement agencies. Services provided included case management, crisis intervention, and counseling.

The transitional housing program, operated solely by MHA, was a supervised independent living program for homeless adolescent persons. This program served six to ten individuals daily and 45 individuals annually.

Rehabilitation costs approached $30,000, and annual operating costs were approximately $75,000. Funding for the programs came from public donations, grants, foundations, and some fees for services. The organization declared bankruptcy in 1999 and the property reverted back to the reuse authority.
Interfaith Hospitality Network of York County provides services as a day center to homeless families and helps adults find jobs in conjunction with other social agencies in the area. In addition, counseling and training for life skills, such as budgeting, interpersonal skills, and stress management are available. The project serves about 14 people daily and 60 people annually. Community reaction and support from local churches and individuals has been very favorable.

Rehabilitation costs were alleviated through donated labor and supplies, and the total costs, though valued at $40,000, were actually around $15,000. The budget for Interfaith is about $90,000 per year, and the majority of funding comes from local churches and private individuals, with additional funding from grants. Interfaith Hospitality Network shares its building with another private nonprofit service provider, The Hope Project. The Hope Project provides emergency assistance as a food pantry and serves about 40 people per day.
HHS approved the application of the Children’s Center (CC) to use ocean front housing at Fort Crockett in February 1998. CC staff participated in negotiations regarding whether to give up its rights to the ocean front property for an alternate property that was newer and in a residential area and, therefore, safer for children than the ocean front property. After these negotiations, CC moved to a safer, more child-friendly location.

The program includes transitional housing with a variety of support services from case management to education in home and community living. Day care is provided off site at one of The Children’s Center’s other facilities. Additional services for residents are available through linkages with other agencies in the Galveston area. The facility is equipped with 32 beds. Annually, the program serves approximately 75-100 adults and children.

Rehabilitation costs were approximately $500,000 and annual operating costs are $1.5 million. Funding comes from the Emergency Shelter Grants Program, the Moody Methodist Permanent Endowment Fund, Houston Endowment, Meadows Foundation, Diocese of Galveston, and private donations.
Applicant: Women Opting for More Affordable Housing Now, Inc. (WOMAN, Inc.)
Applicant Type: Private nonprofit

Property: Fort Crockett, Galveston, Texas
Property Description: 10 housing units, 2,700 square foot warehouse, 2 storage sheds, and 2.7 acres
Property Type: Title V Surplus Property

Program Type: Transitional housing with child care assistance
Client Base: Homeless victims of domestic violence

Start Date: November 1998

Women Opting for Affordable housing Now, Inc. (WOMAN, Inc.) was approved in January 1998 to provide transitional housing to homeless victims of domestic violence. The program provides comprehensive case management and child care assistance for 10 families or approximately 40 people annually in ten townhouse units. The warehouse was converted into a community center. Residents will be employed or obtain job training while in the program and will work toward self-sufficiency. Woman, Inc. provides the following support services: case management, counseling, child care assistance, rental assistance, parenting skills training, life skills management, nutrition and medical intervention, job skills improvement, and advocacy. The maximum stay period is 18-24 months.

Rehabilitation costs were $250,000 and funding came from the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate World. Annual operating costs are $150,000. Funding comes from foundation grants and the Supportive Housing Program.
Beginning operations in August 1990, Mental Health Mental Retardation Services for the Concho Valley (MHMRSCV) administers permanent housing for individuals with mental disabilities on a former fish hatchery. An average of 3 people daily and 15 annually are served by MHMRSCV’s program.

MHMRSCV offers life skills training, prevocational training, vocational training, and a job placement program for residents and other mentally disabled homeless persons from the area. The employment program includes job training in areas such as ceramics production, shelf stocking at a local military commissary, and highway custodial work. Residents of the housing program receive on-site case management and 24-hour supportive service staffing and are expected to pay 30 percent of their income as rent. Although there is no limit on the length of time which residents may stay with the program, the average length of stay is 24 to 30 months. When residents leave, often for less structured supportive housing, they are offered continual case management until they leave the area.

Rehabilitation costs were $10,000 for the housing units. Annual operating costs are approximately $25,000. Funding comes from state and local sources as well as residents’ rent payments.
In 1994, Carpenter’s Shelter was awarded property to provide emergency shelter in an existing facility at Cameron Station Army Base. Through a property exchange, Carpenter’s sold the Cameron Station property and purchased an existing DMV site which they renovated and expanded. In April 1999, Carpenter’s Shelter moved into its new $3.5 million, debt-free facility.

As Northern Virginia’s largest homeless shelter, servicing more than 1,000 people each year, Carpenter’s provides free, comprehensive services that include: temporary residential shelters, case management services, educational and family services, a daytime drop-in center at David’s Place, and an overnight hypothermia shelter during the winter months that Carpenter’s coordinates for the City of Alexandria. As of 2004, the yearly operating costs for the facility were approximately $1,100,000.

Eighty-bed Residential Shelter: Carpenter’s serves homeless people who are chronically mentally ill, those working to live a life of sobriety or abstinence from drugs/alcohol, individuals who are unemployed, physically ill or disabled, victims of domestic violence or abuse, parolees, refugees, and veterans. Carpenter’s provides opportunities that enable residents to overcome poverty. More than 400 homeless men, women, and children accessed the residence in 2003.

David’s Place: Besides homeless persons who use shelters, some “street people” in Alexandria do not, or cannot, use a shelter. Many of these individuals suffer from substance abuse disorders and mental illnesses. David’s Place is Carpenter’s daytime drop-in center, and serves more than 350 homeless individuals in a year. The facility includes showers, restroom facilities, laundry services, mail, and a dry storage area.

Hypothermia Shelter: From November through March, Carpenter’s provides an overnight refuge to unsheltered individuals to prevent overexposure to the winter weather. Approximately 325 homeless persons, including some children, access the winter overflow program each year.
HHS approved the application of the Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB) in 1994 to acquire a warehouse at Cameron Station, a former Army base, to conduct a food distribution program throughout the Northern Virginia area. However, at the request of the City of Alexandria and a local developer who had acquired the rights to develop the rest of the base, CAFB gave up its rights to the property in 1996 and was awarded funds to purchase another facility elsewhere.

Difficulties in finding property large enough for its intended program and in a neighborhood that would not oppose such a program proved to be a significant barrier. Nevertheless, CAFB found and purchased property formerly owned by the Frito-Lay Company in December 1997. This property consists of 2.5 acres of land, including a 12,000 square foot building, most of which is warehouse space. CAFB distributes 22 million pounds of food each year to 275,000 people. In addition, CAFB provides programs on food safety, nutrition, and organic farming and advocacy.

Renovation costs for the facility were approximately $400,000, which includes the cost of installing a refrigeration and freezer system. Annual operating costs are $700,000, and are met through funding from private sources.
HHS approved the Prince William County Government to use former military housing for a transitional housing program for homeless families in 1991. Case management, supportive services, and life skills seminars are provided to the estimated 33 persons served daily and the 47 persons served annually.

As of December 2001, 53 families had graduated to permanent housing. One former resident with two children completed her bachelor's degree, obtained full-time employment and moved into permanent housing. Another woman with two children attended business college, obtained employment with the federal government, and purchased a home through the County's Single Family Lease Purchase Program.

The initial rehabilitation costs for this property were $339,000 and an additional $100,000 was spent in 1998-1999 to renovate kitchens in all nine units. The annual cost for maintaining staff, utilities, property, and supplies is approximately $246,000. The maintenance and program fees are supported by a local community development block grant, a federal shelter grant, a state shelter support grant, and rents collected. Local churches have supported the program through volunteer efforts.
Applicant: City of Redmond, Community Planning Division  
Applicant Type: Local government  

Property: Coast Guard housing site  
Property Description: 18 housing units and 5 acres of land  
Property Type: Title V Surplus Property  

Program Type: Transitional housing and emergency shelter  
Client Base: Homeless families and homeless youth over 18 years of age  

Start Date: January 1998  

Through the City of Redmond's acquisition of the Coast Guard housing site, several levels of services are provided on this property. The City acquired a division of the property through the Title V program and leased the housing units in that division to four local agencies to provide transitional housing. The agencies were the Seattle Indian Center, Friends of Youth, Hopelink, and Catholic Community Services. The latter three agencies, now known as the East Side Housing Association, manage the properties and provide case management services. The City purchased the rest of the site for the provision of mixed income permanent housing. Funding comes from the City of Redmond, King County, the State of Washington, other east side cities, and private sources. Services include case management, housing placement assistance, living skills training, and job skills training.

The Redmond Family Housing Site closed for redevelopment and reopened in spring 2004, after a $14,480,000 capital campaign. The facility now has 50 family housing units (two are for resident managers) and eight emergency shelter units. The program also is constructing a child care center, to be opened in 2005. Estimated client service will be approximately 150 individuals annually in transitional housing, and 300 family members in the shelter. Annual operating costs are $800,000.
The Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI) had planned to use the former Federal Building for transitional housing for homeless adults. The organization encountered extreme opposition from the business association in Olympia and the City Government, which prevented LIHI from using the property by restricting funding resources for the organization and refusing to write a letter making the organization eligible for Federal funds. In addition, the area representative threatened to try to amend the McKinney Act to prevent other organizations from receiving this type of property to assist homeless persons.

As a result, in 1995, the Low Income Housing Institute reached a negotiated agreement with the City and agreed to give up its rights to the property in exchange for operating the program at another site. The City agreed that if the LIHI moved to another site, it would not prevent the organization from developing and using the alternate site. LIHI received no funds as part of this agreement.

A permanent housing program for previously homeless people, the Fleetwood Apartments, has been operating at the new site since September 18, 1997, and contains 43 studio units. Within one week, 116 homeless persons applied for housing and by October 1st there were already persons on the wait list. The facilities have 43 beds and serve an estimated 60 clients per year. Only single men and women may reside at the facility. Current operating costs are approximately $225,000, not including supportive services.
NIKE RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY
35th Place South
Tukwila, Washington  98188

Contacts:
Joan Mladineo - St. Stephen Housing Association;
Gerald Perez - High-Line West Seattle Mental Health Center

Phone:  
(206) 933-7213 (Highline)
Fax:  (206) 933-7014

 Applicant: King County Housing Authority
 Applicant Type: Public nonprofit

Property: Nike Midway Housing Site
Property Description: 31 three-bedroom single family homes on 10 acres of land
Property Type: Base Closure (under Title V)

Program Type: Transitional housing and emergency shelter
Client Base: Homeless families and chronically mentally ill seniors

Start Date: November 1990

HHS approved the application of the King County Housing Authority in 1990 to create an emergency shelter and transitional housing program for homeless families and chronically mentally ill seniors. The Nike Residential Community Program was developed through partnerships with four nonprofit agencies -- Highline-West Seattle Mental Health Center, St. Stephen Housing Association, South King County Multi-Service Center, and the King County Housing Authority -- that operate independent programs within the property owned by the Housing Authority.

Services provided in this Community include case management, employment, education, family literacy programs, and instruction in nutrition and household budgeting. There are 14 emergency shelter units and 8 transitional units in the facility, totaling 50-55 beds. Since 1992, Nike Residential Community has served an average of 830 homeless household members per year, 377 in transitional housing and 453 in emergency shelter.

Rehabilitation costs were approximately $900,000 and were funded by seven South King County Cities’ Community Development Block Grant Programs, King County, Washington State, and the Federal Home Loan Bank. Annual operating costs are $85,000, excluding services.
Multi-Community Action Against Poverty, Inc. (Multi-CAAP) applied in September 1997 to acquire the Guthrie property to rehabilitate, establish, and operate a transitional housing and support community for homeless veterans and families. The application was approved and the deed finalized in August 1998. Multi-CAAP invested about $85,000 in the project and received close to $1 million in local, state, and federal money. About half of the 14 houses were renovated when it was discovered that the director of the program had embezzled funds from the project. He was eventually convicted on criminal charges, and the program went bankrupt. HHS took possession of the houses, and Multi-CAAP’s new director is working to encourage other non-profits to pick up the project.
## PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

**Name_________________________**  
**Organization_________________________**

**Address_________________________**  
**City________________State_______Zip________**

**Phone (w/h)_________________________**  
**Fax_________________________**  
**Email_________________________**

### Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Shipping</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone Without a Home</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned to the Streets</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Delayed, Access Denied</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Foot in the Schoolhouse Door</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks to their Future</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Contract</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Credit</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Directly to Jail</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat II and U.S. Implementation</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness &amp; the Right to Housing</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungry &amp; Homeless</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal to be Homeless</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Sweeps</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Homeless People Allowed</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Room for the Inn</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Way Out</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Sight - Out of Mind?</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Remain Nowhere</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Identification Barriers</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishing Poverty</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate &amp; Unequal</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut Out</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Steps</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Programs, Foolish Cuts</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions Through Alternative Remedies</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI and SSD Benefits Termination</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuck at the Shelter</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Protect and Defend</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the HUD Conplan Process</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unused but Still Useful – Aquiring Federal Property</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration and Voting</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Shipping</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminalization</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal Amount  
$_______

### Discount  
(Non-profits, shelters and homeless assistance agencies with budgets < $100,000 may deduct 20%)  
$_______

### Sales Tax  
(5.75% for orders shipped to Washington, DC)  
$_______

### Total Amount Due  
$_______

---

**Please make checks payable to NLCHP and mail to:**

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty  
1411 K St. NW Suite 1400  
Washington, DC 20005
Join our membership network

Please join us as we press for policies to provide homeless people with the rights they need to realize self-sufficiency, and prevent their children from entering the cycle of homelessness and poverty.

As an NLCHP Member, you will receive:

- Free electronic versions of NLCHP Publications
- 45% discount on registration for monthly NLCHP audio trainings
- 10% discount on registration for NLCHP conferences, forums, & workshops
- Advance notification of NLCHP events and newly-released publications
- Information on volunteer, internship, and pro bono opportunities
- Access to NLCHP program attorneys and members through members-only list serve

Please select your membership category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Member</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Member (discounted rate)</td>
<td>□ $25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Member (Budget &lt;250K)</td>
<td>□ $75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Member (Budget 251K – 750K)</td>
<td>□ $185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Member (Budget &gt;750K)</td>
<td>□ $285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Firm/ Law School/ Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Member</td>
<td>□ $500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support the national advocacy effort to prevent and end homelessness by making a donation of:

- $1,000
- $500
- $250
- $100
- $50
- $25
- Other $ _________

The National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty is a 501(c)(3) organization. Your contribution is tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

First Name: __________________________  Last Name: __________________________

Title: __________________________  Organization/Company: __________________________

Address: __________________________

City: __________________________  State: _________  Zip/Postal Code: __________________________

Office/Home Phone: __________________________  Fax: __________________________

E-mail: __________________________

Send this form and a check made out to NLCHP to:

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty
1411 K Street, NW Suite 1400
Washington, DC 20005

Join our membership network or contribute online and pay by credit card at

www.nlchp.org/GetInvolved/MemForm.cfm