

Helping the Homeless

A MODEL OF PUBLIC- AND PRIVATE-SECTOR PARTNERSHIP IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Tess Scherkenback

Nearly 10 percent of the United States' homeless population resides in Los Angeles, with an estimated 46,874 homeless according to the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's (LAHSA) 2016 census report.¹ With a total population of more than 10 million citizens, LA County's homeless population makes up a little less than 0.5 percent of the city's overall population.² With its relatively large homeless population, LA has been fixated on how to best reduce homelessness, exploring numerous policy options and devoting an annual \$1 billion in assistance to those on the street.³ Despite massive spending, the number of people struggling with homelessness in LA continues to grow each year, with an increase of 5.7 percent from 2015 to 2016, while 74 percent of LA County's homeless remain unsheltered.⁴ LA County is composed of a network of 88 cities, encompassing an intricate and extensive web of federal and statewide assistance for the homeless, including city, community, and private-sector involvement. While the city of LA proper does maintain a concentrated population of homeless, the vast number of cities comprising LA County makes homelessness widespread from city to city, requiring a variety of shelter options, support services, and innovative solutions to house this vulnerable population.

As the primary agency serving the homeless in the Los Angeles Continuum of Care, LAHSA is well-endowed with county and city funds. These funds are put to good use with innovative solutions that harness the power of the private sector through nonprofit partnership. This is demonstrated in their annual

Winter Shelter Program, which operates during the cold winter months and distributes grants county-wide to nonprofits. These organizations “administer the day-to-day operations of each program site which provides temporary overnight shelter, meals and access to a range of supportive services.”⁵ One of the most unique nonprofits LAHSA contracts for the Winter Shelter Program is the East San Gabriel Valley Coalition for the Homeless (ESGVCH), a charitable organization that partners with local churches in the San Gabriel Valley to provide temporary shelter for the homeless. This association has created a rotational Winter Shelter Program for the local homeless population, running annually from December through March and serving 1,041 people in the winter of 2015–16.⁶ Through private contributions and church donations, six local church communities provide housing, meals, utilities, and volunteers. The ESGVCH provides bus transportation, several professional staff, security, support services, and cots with an annual \$300,000 grant from LAHSA. Every two weeks the location rotates to a different church, allowing for this group of faith-based communities to assist in the rehabilitation and support of their neighbors in need.

Two of the six churches partnering with the ESGVCH to house the homeless—St. Dorothy Catholic Church and Glenkirk Presbyterian Church—are located in the city of Glendora.⁷ This paper explores the shelters these two churches provide as a case study of the unique partnership that exists between religious organizations and the publicly funded ESGVCH. It

specifically examines the research question: What are the benefits gained from the city of Glendora's model of partnership between the private and public sector in assisting the local homeless population? Hypothesis 1 is that the localization of homeless shelters and community-based support is more cost-effective than other mainly publicly funded shelters. Hypothesis 2 is that the church-run shelter allows for greater care for the individual and is more successful in meeting the needs of the local homeless population.

These findings affirm the benefits of this particular public-private partnership shelter as both cost-effective and successful in meeting the needs of the local homeless population.

This element of the research is demonstrated through the personal testimonies of homeless individuals visiting Glendora's church shelters. Findings of this case study support both Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2. The public-private partnership shelter proves to be more cost-effective than two other popular shelters in LA County that were analyzed. Additionally, personal interviews with homeless clients at the ESGVCH shelter prove that the majority of clients interviewed who had visited a shelter not operated by the ESGVCH preferred the church-run shelter. Clients indicated this preference was due primarily to the church-run shelter's exceptional staff, volunteers, and environment. These findings affirm the benefits of this particular public-private partnership shelter as both cost-effective and successful in meeting the needs of the local homeless population.

Statement of the Problem

With nearly three-quarters of LA County's homeless population unsheltered, the question of housing options for low-income, homeless, and transient people in the city is of the utmost importance. Recent trends in social policy favor permanent supportive housing in place of emergency shelters and transitional housing. However, in LA County's expensive housing market, small cities such as Glendora face challenges instituting policy changes in favor of permanent supportive housing. Progress instituting permanent supportive housing is slow moving and expensive and must overcome the internal biases of communities that are hesitant to accept a population typically afflicted with mental illness, addiction, and criminal records. Because of these challenges, a wide network of shelters has proved necessary to help contain the issue of unsheltered homelessness because of the lack of permanent housing and Housing First options.

Housing First is a theoretical framework of homeless assistance that has been adopted as an integral component of governmental approaches to homeless policy.⁸ It ensures that those experiencing even the most severe cases of homelessness because of mental illness or addiction are immediately connected to permanent housing before meeting treatment requirements. It would be impractical to decrease emergency shelters and transitional housing options in LA County until adequate permanent housing options are available. This would only further increase the already exponential percentage of unsheltered homeless in the city. Although permanent housing models of homeless assistance offer a legitimate cure for chronic homelessness, they take time to establish. Political and public support also need to be obtained, which only further prolongs help for the unsheltered homeless. In the meantime, diverse temporary shelter options such as those the ESGVCH provides present a potentially more cost-effective interim-shelter network. They can provide housing in the winter for those left on the streets or on waiting lists for the limited permanent housing that does exist.

This study also addresses the largely ignored issue of individualized care for the homeless and what

programs best provide for their needs. A common critique of LA shelters, especially those based in downtown areas and larger cities in the county, is that they are overcrowded and less accommodating and that they turn people away after meeting their occupancy limits. There is a significant lack of research relating the experience of homeless people in more localized shelters operated in suburban communities through churches and nonprofits and how their experiences in localized shelters compare to urban shelters. This study contributes to this untapped area of research and examines the opinions of homeless people and their shelter experience in two church-run, public-private partnership shelters. These personal testimonies from homeless clients help fill this void in policy research on homelessness and emergency shelters.

The city of Glendora is used as a case study, specifically examining the public-private partnership of the ESGVCH and two local churches in Glendora—St. Dorothy Catholic Church and Glenkirk Presbyterian Church—which temporarily host the shelter. Through an interview-based survey of board members, shelter coordinators, and homeless clients visiting the shelter, this model’s efficiencies are examined. Administrators of this shelter explained the successes and challenges this model faces, along with its funding streams and cost breakdown. Personal interviews with the local homeless population participating in the Winter Shelter Program indicate their shelter experiences, views on the ESGVCH’s model, and what shelter models are most effective in meeting their needs. These data allow for an assessment of how the public-private partnership positively and negatively contributes to homeless assistance in the city of Glendora. Suggestions for how the existing model might improve its services to better meet the needs of its clients are also explored.

Literature Review

Numerous theories address homeless assistance methods. In the wake of the 2009 reforms to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, US homeless assistance policy and the philosophy behind

these programs shifted in favor of rapid housing and away from treatment and sobriety-first models. Existing literature addressing the role of shelters in the larger framework of homeless assistance policy can be grouped into two primary schools of thought.

The dominant theory of Housing First is the inspiration behind US social policy’s new approach to homeless assistance. It proposes increasing funding for permanent housing and expanding these programs while streamlining the existing shelter system, emergency shelters, and temporary housing options. Housing First also prioritizes housing before mental health and addiction treatment, or sobriety.⁹ This new approach rejects the necessity of having a substantial framework of shelters and emergency housing for the homeless. Instead, it prioritizes funding for permanent housing while critiquing the patchwork nature of the nation’s existing shelter system.

In contrast, the second major school of thought in homeless assistance policy explores the larger network of both public- and private-sector homeless assistance programs, including federal, state, local, nonprofit, and community efforts. While acknowledging the proven benefits of the Housing First model, the second school focuses on a multisector approach to homeless assistance that values the role of emergency shelters and transitional housing, along with permanent housing options. This is a holistic theory, which places less focus on reforming and streamlining the current shelter system and instead advocating for an adequate shelter safety net via multisector programs. The holistic theory recognizes the benefits of the Housing First approach but also supports the need for shelters to temporarily house the homeless while adequate long-term solutions are being developed throughout the nation.

Housing First

The Housing First theory of homeless assistance is affirmed by Sam Tsemberis, founder of the nonprofit Pathways to Housing, which was the incubator of the Housing First model. Based on the philosophical presumption that housing is a human right and consumer

choice plays an invaluable role in solving chronic homelessness, Tsemberis' approach inverts the old process of homeless assistance. The old model began in emergency shelters and, only after a client demonstrated readiness, led to permanent housing.¹⁰ The new process removes barriers to immediate housing for the homeless by eliminating sobriety requirements and other thresholds that must be met before a client is deemed eligible for permanent housing. Additionally, clients are given an active role in choosing their housing options, allowing for a consumer-driven approach.

An abundance of research into the practicality of the Housing First model has reaped significant evidence that supports this program's approach. Housing First has been proven to decrease homelessness at better rates than older approaches, result in "longer tenure in stable housing arrangements," and allow for greater consumer engagement in the housing process. Furthermore, evidence suggests Housing First contributes to decreases in "time spent in institutions such as psychiatric hospitals" and is more cost-effective.¹¹

By emphasizing a rapid and fluid transition from the streets into permanent housing, the Housing First model de-emphasizes the role of emergency shelters and support services. It eliminates their previously instrumental role in transitioning the homeless from the streets into housing under the old model of assistance. Ultimately, Tsemberis' Housing First model "greatly reduces the need for shelters or other transitional housing programs," and in its ideal form eliminates the need for a wide web of costly emergency shelters and services.¹²

The Pathways to Housing model of Housing First policy has grown in popularity and become an integral component of homeless assistance policy throughout the nation. Replications of the Pathways model are becoming more prevalent throughout California as well and have consistently proved effective in assisting even the most severe cases of homelessness. A study by Tsemberis et al. of Housing First programs in California demonstrates further proof that this model of assistance can be beneficial, especially when it adheres to similar program structures and goals as the Pathways model.¹³

The key principles that structure a Pathways' model of Housing First prioritize "immediate access to housing and access to both a treatment team and community supports that provide flexible, client-driven services."¹⁴ These support services are available but not mandatory for participants to enroll in. Additionally, Pathways aims to provide "scatter-site apartments in areas of the community apart from where services are provided as a means of honoring consumer choice."¹⁵ Great emphasis is placed on including clients in the rehousing process, allowing them to have a personal say in their placement and living quarters. This helps individualize their experience, encouraging them to have a personal stake in the rehousing process. Traditional emergency shelters often lack the capacity to offer such individualized choice in rehousing because of scarcer resources and extensive waiting lists for available housing.

Traditional emergency shelters often lack the capacity to offer such individualized choice in rehousing because of scarcer resources and extensive waiting lists for available housing.

The study of California's varying Housing First programs discovered that "programs with greater fidelity to the Housing First model enrolled clients with longer histories of homelessness and placed most of them in apartments."¹⁶ Compared to low-fidelity programs, clients at high-fidelity programs resembling the Pathways model averaged longer stays in their permanent housing placements. This research demonstrates the

efficiency of the Pathways model as a replicable system. It is a viable program even in states such as California that have a large homeless population and a complex system of homeless assistance programs.

A recent study by Todd Gilmer et al. into the fidelity rates of a diverse network of California's Full Service Partnerships (FSPs) discovered a general need for improvement in modeling a Housing First program structure. This study included Los Angeles County and 23 other major counties throughout the state and interviewed 93 FSPs, which are "supported housing programs that do 'whatever it takes' to improve outcomes among persons with serious mental illness who are homeless."¹⁷ Results of this research indicated a lack of fidelity among FSPs studied to the Housing First model. These primarily included a failure to prioritize housing before treatment requirements and integrate consumer choice into housing placement for the homeless.¹⁸

Despite the proven success of these components of the Housing First model, multiple housing programs throughout California continue to lack fidelity to these approaches. Gilmer et al. critique these shortcomings and provide valuable data that demonstrate the continued need for improvement of housing programs for the homeless throughout major counties in California. The Pathways model of Housing First has demonstrated positive results, but these results are failing to be completely realized in the California network of housing programs.

Carol McNaughton Nicholls and Iain Atherton have demonstrated additional proof of the effectiveness of Housing First in several studies. They recognize that this approach to homeless assistance is not a direct cure for the major factors contributing to homelessness, such as poverty and serious addiction. They find it has proved effective in aiding even the most severe cases of chronic homelessness. Through examining case studies of existing Housing First approaches and the program attributes that make them effective, Nicholls and Atherton conclude that several program attributes make Housing First a success.¹⁹ These include "making available mainstream housing to people for whom such opportunities would not otherwise exist and the integration of

services in a holistic and flexible manner rather than viewing housing and social support separately."²⁰ Ultimately, they affirm the benefits of the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.

Seema Clifasefi et al. further support the Housing First theory. In a study of alcoholic homeless individuals with criminal histories placed in Housing First programs, results indicated that "participants' number of jail bookings and days decreased significantly over a two-year follow-up as a function of greater time spent in project-based HF [Housing First]."²¹ Housing First has also proved effective in reducing mortality rates among the homeless according to a study Benjamin Henwood et al. conducted. Through a comparison of previously homeless individuals enrolled in Housing First programs and the general homeless population, this study discovered that Housing First participants maintained a higher average age of death. Additionally, Henwood et al. found that those enrolled in Housing First were much more likely to die of natural causes than the general homeless population, were much less likely to die from an accident, and had lower rates of death by infectious diseases.²² Overall, significant evidence links Housing First with providing longer life expectancy and better quality of life for the homeless who are fortunate enough to be placed in programs that follow the Pathways model.

Shelter Reform

A second theory in the Housing First school of thought explores not only the primacy of rapid housing to aid the homeless but also the faults of the existing emergency assistance network and the need for shelter reform. Championed by Dennis Culhane, this approach to homeless assistance recognizes that immediate, permanent housing ought to be the end of US homeless assistance policy. It rejects the emergency shelter network as a legitimate means to that end. To financially offset the costs of permanent housing models, Culhane proposes reducing the emergency shelter systems and services to divert funds from such programs to support Housing First services. For the subset of the homeless population

that is not chronically homeless, Culhane argues for “transitional residential programming and relocation assistance,” which would be geared toward serving deinstitutionalized individuals who might temporarily fall into homelessness. He contends that these alternate support services would be more beneficial than emergency shelters, which often lack focus on reintegration for the deinstitutionalized, generally failing to offer anything more than nighttime shelter.²³

Those staying in emergency shelters were more isolated from friends and family and perceived that they had less social support than permanently housed mothers.

While Culhane does critique the existing emergency shelter network, he does not advocate for dismantling the entire system. He suggests that reform of some emergency shelters into more focused service centers might be beneficial. He explains that the current model of emergency shelter assistance exposes homeless populations to “victimization and dehumanization,” which reform might correct through reordering the priorities and programs of existing shelters.²⁴ Ultimately, he argues that shelters and transitional housing programs ought to be “reserved for those needing short-term shelter and services, like specific populations of single adults leaving institutions.”²⁵ This limiting of the current emergency shelter system’s serviceable clientele would substantially reduce the emergency shelter network and therefore result in homeless assistance programs that support the well-being of homeless individuals.

In a study comparing the experiences of homeless mothers in emergency shelters and permanent housing, Bethany Letiecq et al. found evidence that supports Culhane’s theory of shelter reform. From a sample of homeless and low-income mothers in Baltimore and Washington, DC, the authors compared the experiences of these women in permanent housing versus emergency shelters. They found that those staying in emergency shelters were more isolated from friends and family and perceived that they had less social support than permanently housed mothers.²⁶ To improve the experiences of such women, they suggest that emergency shelters and transitional housing programs should restructure or reform services to be more focused on familial and communal support.²⁷

Culhane and Randall Kuhn offered further critique of the emergency shelter network in a study that examined length of stays of homeless clients in public shelters in New York City and Philadelphia. They discovered a significant portion of the cities’ homeless are long-term shelter dwellers, typically elderly, and suffer from mental health problems, addictions, and medical conditions.²⁸ This population heavily relies on the emergency shelter network, which is burdening the system because it is not designed to accommodate their needs. Culhane and Kuhn argue that this population would be better assisted by long-term care facilities that existing emergency shelters could transition to, which would result in better care and “significant savings in shelter resources.”²⁹ This evidence supports the theory of shelter reform. It is particularly relevant to public shelters in large urban cities such as LA, where emergency shelter systems are burdened with long-term shelter dwellers who require more specialized services than the existing system provides.

Holistic Theory

The second primary school of thought in homeless assistance policy looks at the macrolevel of the nation’s homeless services, addressing the role of secular nonprofit and religious organizations. This holistic theory values both permanent supportive housing

and private-sector assistance programs, while the Housing First theory prioritizes immediate housing and reducing emergency shelter services. The leading scholarship exploring this field comes from Laudan Aron and Patrick Sharkey of the Urban Institute, who have released illuminating and innovative research into the practicality and contributions of secular non-profits and religious organizations in homeless assistance. Their research comparing these private-sector efforts to assist the homeless reveal that “faith-based non-profits run about a third of all programs, including the majority of all food programs and one-quarter of all shelters and drop-in centers.” Additionally, they found that “secular non-profits run almost half of all homeless assistance programs administering the majority of housing programs.”³⁰ Although they provide a substantial portion of the nation’s homeless assistance programs, Aron and Sharkey discovered that 62 percent of them receive no public funding from the government, and 90 percent receive less than half of their operating funds from the government.³¹ Less than 25 percent of secular nonprofits rely on government support for their program operations, while 40 percent rely on government funding for less than half their operational costs.³²

By providing such a large percentage of homeless assistance services, and a substantial percentage without any government funding, secular nonprofits and religious organizations serve as integral providers of care for the nation’s homeless. Aron and Sharkey conclude that although Housing First is viable and practical as a dominant model of homeless assistance, the services provided by religious organizations remain a necessary component of a national framework to assist the homeless.³³ These private-sector operations are valued under the holistic theory, which acknowledges the importance of Housing First but promotes the private sector’s network of assistance as an equally important realm of social services.

In addition to valuing the role of the private sector in homeless assistance, Aron and Martha Burt of the Urban Institute explore Santa Monica’s Continuum of Care and discovered a continued need for emergency shelter services alongside Housing First programs.³⁴ They concluded that “emergency

shelter capacity remains the single most glaring service gap. . . . Los Angeles County has less emergency shelter capacity than most major and many minor U.S. cities.”³⁵ Support for the emergency shelter network in unique regional locations does not place Aron and Burt’s scholarship at odds with the Housing First theory, for they affirm its benefits and promote its growth as a long-term solution for severe cases of homelessness.³⁶ However, their holistic approach to examining homeless assistance policy includes a wide range of both public- and private-sector support services, with a network of programs tailored to meet regional, city, and communal needs.

Thomas Fodor and Lois Grossman provide further support for the holistic theory from a study of temporary housing options and private-sector alternatives. They contend that rising housing costs and the growing homeless population require an increase in localized efforts and private-sector assistance programs for the homeless. Community-level homeless assistance programs are advocated, along with an increase in temporary housing options, as immediate steps that can help mitigate the crisis of unsheltered homelessness that continues to grow.³⁷ Burt and Barbara Cohen propose a similar but slightly modified system to best support the homeless. In a study exploring the significant growth of private-sector services, along with existing state and federal services for the homeless, they suggest a partnership model of service. This model includes a large role for the private sector working in conjunction with public services and funding.³⁸

Both the Housing First and holistic theories of homeless assistance recognize the efficiency and benefits of programs that prioritize immediate housing and critique factors of the old model of emergency shelters. The two theories diverge in their understanding of how the emergency shelter network coincides with the Housing First approach. The Housing First theory advocates for redistributing funds from emergency shelters to permanent housing programs and reducing the emergency shelter network. In contrast, the holistic theory acknowledges the continuing importance of emergency shelter systems while simultaneously promoting Housing First models,

recognizing that certain communities might require an expanded shelter network given their population's needs and available services.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 of this case study is that the privatized, locally operated shelter is more cost-effective than other predominantly government-funded, large urban shelters. The portion of services offered through the Glendora winter shelter that are funded by private contributions and religious congregations covers the cost of food, utilities, housing, and clothing. This significantly reduces operational costs, and the partnering nonprofit covers the remaining expenditures of transportation, cots, case managers, security, and staff with public grant funds. The shelter is also run almost entirely by volunteers, which saves enormous expenses on staffing, personnel, and employee benefits. This unique partnership offsets the costs associated with operating a shelter by equally distributing the expenditures between the community and public grant money.

Therefore, this research hypothesizes that this partnership provides a more cost-effective approach. Additionally, the shelter's location in the expensive southern Californian housing environment also plays a factor in reducing cost. The rental and housing space, combined with the maintenance and utilities costs associated with operating a large shelter, are diverted by employing church property. This innovation, combined with the community's provision of a substantial portion of necessary services, indicates that this shelter model is predictably less expensive than other shelters.

Hypothesis 2 of this case study is that the ESGVCH's localized shelter offers a unique opportunity for more individualized service. Most large urban shelters that receive a significant amount of their funding from government sources handle large case-loads, servicing a significant number of clients each day. Contrary to this model, the Glendora winter shelter is operated by several paid staff at the ESGVCH, along with a constantly changing cohort of volunteers from the religious congregations of those churches

that host the shelter. These workers and volunteers bring a unique perspective to their job, for they are singularly focused on serving the clients, attending to the winter shelter, and providing the most effective service possible. Because the church provides a different volunteer force every night, workers with fresh attitudes and desires to serve keep the workplace positive and provide a welcoming atmosphere for shelter visitors. Additionally, the involvement of religious organizations in providing the winter shelter allows for the inclusion of an optional spiritual reflection time, prayer, Bible study, and services to connect members of different faiths to their respective congregations. The combination of these innovative services is hypothesized to provide greater care for the individual and specialized focus on meeting the emotional and spiritual needs of the local homeless population, along with their physical needs.

Hypothesis 1: The ESGVCH shelter is more cost-effective than other predominantly government-funded, large urban shelters. The operational costs of the winter shelter hosted by Glenkirk Presbyterian Church and St. Dorothy Catholic Church were gathered through a series of interviews with program directors at these local churches. The expenditures reported include the cost of operating a nighttime shelter program in partnership with the ESGVCH, servicing an average of 200 homeless clients per night. The churches cover the cost of housing, utilities, breakfast, lunch, and dinner and provide clothing and basic toiletries to clients. The ESGVCH funds transportation with several contracted buses that pick up clients at bus stops throughout the city in the evening and return them to their desired locations in the morning. Additionally, the ESGVCH provides cots, security workers, and several case managers, all of which are funded through a \$300,000 annual LAHSA grant.

Glenkirk Presbyterian Church's shelter expenditures average between \$1,500 and \$2,000 per night, providing services to an average of 200 homeless clients. This cost includes housing, breakfast, lunch, dinner, and utilities, with an average volunteer force of 35 people from the church community working the

Table 1. ESGVCH Cost Breakdown

LAHSA Grant for Four Months of Operating the Winter Shelter	\$300,000
Average Church Expenditures per Night	\$2,000 (x120 Days/Four Months) = \$240,000
Average Number of Homeless Clients Served by Emergency Shelter per Night	150 (x120 Days/Four Months) = 18,000 People in Four Months
Total Operating Cost of ESGVCH Funds and Church Funds	\$540,000
Average Cost per Homeless Client for Four Months Shelter and Services	\$540,000/\$18,000 = \$30

Source: Author’s calculations based on interviews.

shelter each night. Because the shelter is entirely run by volunteers, the operational cost is kept extremely low, and the cost of services per person provided by the church averages between \$7.50 and \$10. Glenkirk hosts the shelter for two weeks, and because it has an abundance of space in which homeless clients can be housed, several other local churches of various denominations partner with Glenkirk during its two weeks hosting the shelter. These partnering churches provide food and a volunteer force from their congregations for one of the evenings the shelter is hosted at Glenkirk. These partnering churches often do not have the space required to house the homeless but do their part to assist the community and other churches in providing temporary shelter. Included in these partnering churches are various evangelical Christian denominations and the local Mormon congregation.

St. Dorothy Catholic Church became involved in the Winter Shelter Program in 2003 and operates its shelter slightly differently than Glenkirk. St. Dorothy’s congregation directly provides the funds necessary to operate the program, including all food and clothing costs. The only expenditures the church administrators cover are utilities and electricity, which are covered by a surplus of donations. St. Dorothy’s shelter

is operated by a volunteer force averaging between 35 and 40 workers, and they serve an average of 130 to 150 homeless clients per night. Local churches that do not have adequate space to host the shelter also contribute one night during the two weeks that St. Dorothy hosts the shelter, and administrators at this shelter also recruit support from local restaurants to donate meals. The combination of congregation donations, local support, and volunteer workers helps keep the operational costs of the shelter low, while the ESGVCH provides the same services for St. Dorothy as it does to Glenkirk using public grant money.

When compared with other local homeless shelters, the ESGVCH model proves to be a cost-effective model. The average total cost per homeless client served by the ESGVCH winter shelter for four months of shelter and services is about \$30 per client. The financial breakdown of this cost is shown in Table 1. This is a relatively low cost compared to similar shelter models in LA County. In addition to emergency shelter, the ESGVCH provides health services and transitional programs in conjunction with its winter shelter. Overall, this model of shelter assistance provides necessary programs and services at an exceptionally low cost.

Table 2. Union Station Homeless Services (Receives 22 Percent of Funding from Government Grants)⁴¹

Annual Expenses for Program Services (Includes meals, shelter, housing navigation, care coordination, mental health services, employment assistance, rapid rehousing and prevention assistance, and emergency and permanent housing) ⁴²	\$7,870,043
Average Number of Homeless Clients Provided Emergency Shelter per Year	500 People
Average Cost per Homeless Client for Four Months of Shelter and Services	$\$7,870,043/500 = \$15,740$ per Person for a Year of Service Cost per Person for One Month = \$1,312 Cost per Person for Four Months (Equivalent of ESGVCH Winter Shelter) = \$5,247

Source: Union Station Homeless Services, "2015–2016 Annual Report," accessed February 26, 2017, <http://unionstationhs.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Annual-Report-2015-16-FINAL012317nomarks.pdf>.

The Union Station Homeless Services organization in LA provides a similar model of services as the ESGVCH and is a secular nonprofit organization that combines public grant funds with private donations to provide services. It receives 22 percent of its total finances from government grants and offers a variety of services including emergency shelter, employment training, permanent and temporary housing, and family shelter.³⁹ This program offers year-round shelter, and the average cost per homeless client for four months of shelter and services under the Union Station model is roughly \$5,247. This program is significantly more expensive than the ESGVCH model, which is due to the variety of services offered and full-time personnel. Its services include “meals, shelter, housing navigation, care coordination, mental health services, employment assistance, rapid re-housing and prevention assistance, emergency and permanent housing.”⁴⁰ The financial breakdown of this model’s cost is shown in Table 2. The Union Station model provides fewer individuals with emergency shelter than the ESGVCH does but provides a greater variety of services. It is another model of public-private-sector partnership to service the

homeless but is significantly more expensive than the ESGVCH model.

Another lead organization providing services to the homeless in LA County is the Los Angeles Mission, a religious nonprofit organization that is entirely funded by the private sector.⁴³ Like the ESGVCH winter shelter, it primarily provides emergency shelter services in addition to support services for homeless clients, but it offers year-round services. This shelter also maintains staff and personnel, unlike the ESGVCH shelter with its all-volunteer force. The average cost per person for four months of shelter and services under the Los Angeles Mission model of service is roughly \$92.⁴⁴ While cheaper than the Union Station model, this program is still marginally more expensive than the ESGVCH winter shelter. The Los Angeles Mission does not offer an equal variety of support services as the Union Station model but does offer recovery and rehabilitation services and community reintegration programs. The financial breakdown of the Los Angeles Mission model is shown in Table 3.

These findings verify the first hypothesis of this study, which posited that the ESGVCH winter shelter

Table 3. Los Angeles Mission (Religious Nonprofit That Does Not Receive Government Funds)

Annual Expenses for Program Services (Includes Emergency Shelter and Recovery Services) ⁴⁵	\$13,115,674 ⁴⁶ (/12 = \$1,092,973 per Month)
	Operational Cost for Four Months of Service (Equivalent of ESGVCH) = \$4,371,891
Average Number of Emergency Shelter Beds Filled per Night ⁴⁷	397 (x120 Days/4 Months) = 47,640 People in Four Months
Average Cost per Person for Four Months of Shelter and Services	\$4,371,891 / 47,640 People = \$92

Source: Los Angeles Mission, "Services and Programs," accessed February 26, 2017, <https://losangelesmission.org/learn/services-and-programs/>; Los Angeles Mission, "Financial Statements with Independent Auditors' Report June 30, 2016 and 2015," accessed February 26, 2017, <http://losangelesmission.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/LAM-Financials-2016-Final.pdf>; and Los Angeles Mission, "Los Angeles Mission: The Crossroads of Hope," accessed February 26, 2017, <https://losangelesmission.org/>.

model of homeless assistance is more cost-effective than similar largely government-funded models. The Union Station model represents a large homeless assistance program that receives almost one-quarter of its funding from government sources. As hypothesized, the ESGVCH winter shelter is a cheaper model of public-private partnership that provides targeted emergency shelter assistance with supportive programs and services. This finding was predictable given the entirely volunteer-run model of the ESGVCH. The public-private partnership model avoids the substantial cost of maintaining staff and personnel that both the LA Mission and Union Station shelters have; therefore, it is not surprising that the ESGVCH model is cheaper.

Comparison of the Union Station shelter and the privately funded LA Mission also proves that the latter is significantly cheaper than the largely government-funded model. Furthermore, the LA Mission is only marginally more expensive than the ESGVCH model. This affirms the underlying principle of the first hypothesis, which predicts that homeless assistance models that are predominantly funded by the private sector are more cost-effective. It also provides additional support for the practicality and

cost-effectiveness of the ESGVCH model, which services a competitive number of individuals at a cheaper cost than other homeless assistance models throughout LA County. This is primarily due to its all-volunteer force and partnership with local congregations and churches, which help offset the cost of operating the shelter.

Hypothesis 2: The ESGVCH shelter is more successful in meeting the needs of homeless clients visiting the shelter.

To assess the shelter experiences of homeless clients and previously homeless clients of the ESGVCH winter shelter, a series of personal interviews were conducted at St. Dorothy Catholic Church and Glenkirk Presbyterian Church between December 16 and January 7, 2017. A total of 21 homeless clients were interviewed, along with six formerly homeless clients and one currently homeless shelter volunteer, all of whom either work or volunteer at the winter shelter. The six formerly homeless workers and volunteers successfully transitioned out of homelessness because of the ESGVCH shelter and the services it provides, while the one currently homeless shelter volunteer is in the process of transitioning off the streets.

The 21 homeless clients interviewed were asked a series of three questions. Question 1 asked, “Have you ever stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church?” If clients answered yes to this question, then they were asked a follow-up question: “What shelter/s did you stay in before, and how does St. Dorothy/Glenkirk compare?” Question 2 asked, “What is your opinion of the spiritual reflection time, scripture reading, prayer, and Bible study provided by this shelter?” Question 3 asked, “If you could make one suggestion to improve this shelter, what would it be?”

In response to Question 1, eight of the 28 total people interviewed said they had stayed in a shelter not operated by a church. The majority of these respondents had stayed in local shelters in LA County, including Union Station shelter, the Los Angeles Mission, the Volunteers of America of Los Angeles Pomona Armory, and various shelters in downtown LA. Of the eight respondents who had stayed in shelters not operated by a church, one stated that he preferred the Union Station shelter to the ESGVCH model because it offered real beds instead of cots and built-in showers instead of portable showers. One of the eight respondents reported that he noticed no significant difference between the ESGVCH shelter and others he had stayed in. Six of the eight respondents reported having a much more positive experience at the ESGVCH shelter than others they had stayed in. All six of these respondents cited the quality of the staff and services provided by the ESGVCH shelter as the primary distinguishing factor between it and other shelters. Praises of the staff and volunteers were common responses, and one client explained, “No one at other shelters I have stayed at seems happy or like they really care. There are never any hellos or goodbyes, but this shelter is different. This shelter is wonderful, and the volunteers speak to you like you are a person not a second-class citizen.”⁴⁸

In response to Question 2, none of the 28 people interviewed reported that they felt uncomfortable, offended, or bothered by the optional religious aspects of the ESGVCH shelter. Several indicated that they identify with different faith traditions than

St. Dorothy and Glenkirk but appreciate that the religious aspect is involved for those who choose to participate in it. Fourteen of the 28 people interviewed reported that they appreciate the integration of religious aspects into the shelter, and seven of the 28 people interviewed reported that they maintain a neutral position on the incorporation of religious components.

Of the 14 people who reported that they appreciate the religious aspect, many explained the important role faith plays in encouraging them, inspiring hope, and fostering community. Responses in support of the religious aspect included, “The world is a horrible place for poverty-stricken people, but a spiritual person has integrity, and we need those kind people. I appreciate the spiritual time Glenkirk provides.”⁴⁹ Other interviewees stated, “I’m a Buddhist, but I appreciate the religious content that is optional for those who need it,” and “I appreciate the spiritual reflection time because I’m going through hard times, and it helps.”⁵⁰

In response to Question 3, various helpful comments were provided. Although a significant majority of people interviewed stated that they preferred the ESGVCH shelter to other programs, 19 of the 28 people interviewed offered suggestions of how the shelter could be improved. The most common suggestions to improve the shelter included allowing clients to stay longer instead of waking them up early in the morning to leave, allowing clients to keep belongings during their stay and store them during the day at the shelter, and lengthening the amount of time the shelter is operated from four months to five or six months. A detailed description of suggestions and recommendations is provided in the appendix.

Six of the seven formerly homeless clients of the ESGVCH shelter also cited the hospitality and high quality of the staff and volunteers as a distinguishing factor in their experience at the church-run shelter. Three of seven interviewees explained that the faith element incorporated into the ESGVCH shelter played a positive role in their shelter experience and that they appreciated the opportunity to engage in the religious services offered. The other four indicated that the religious aspect was not important in

their transition from homelessness and that they maintained a neutral stance on the ESGVCH shelter's inclusion of religious options for clients. Two of the seven formerly homeless clients interviewed made suggestions to improve the shelter. Their suggestions are further explained in interviews 25 and 27 in the appendix. Three of the seven interviewees reported that they were invited to attend the shelter by a friend when they were homeless.

The majority of formerly homeless clients reported that the church-run shelter's high-quality volunteer staff and services distinguished it from other shelters they had stayed in.

In response to the follow-up question "What role did the shelter and the services provided play in helping you transition from homelessness?" various responses were given. Interviewee 22 explained that when they came to the ESGVCH shelter, "Everyone was friendly, polite, service oriented, and there was no drama." This individual was hired to be an independent coordinator for the shelter and is currently paid by stipend through the ESGVCH. Interviewee 23 is currently still homeless but has been attending the ESGVCH shelter for two years. This individual now volunteers with the shelter and lives in a car. Interviewee 24 has been a volunteer with the shelter for four years and used the shelter services provided to get a job and a residence, successfully transitioning out of homelessness.

Interviewee 25 was homeless for six years before successfully transitioning off the streets through the ESGVCH shelter's services and has now volunteered with the shelter for five years. Interviewee 26 and their spouse became homeless and visited the ESGVCH shelter. They began volunteering at the shelter while still homeless but were able to gain employment through the shelter and now have a car and home. Interviewee 27 explained, "The coalition helped me get off the streets and get healthy. Now I am employed through the Veterans Association and have a job, a place to live, and without the coalition, I would never have gotten this job." Interviewee 28 began to volunteer at the shelter while homeless but was eventually hired by the shelter and was able to secure steady employment and housing. Overall, the ESGVCH shelter's staff and services played important roles in helping the seven formerly homeless clients transition out of homelessness based on their own personal testimonies.

The results of these interviews with currently homeless clients of the ESGVCH shelter and formerly homeless clients affirm Hypothesis 2 of this case study, which predicted that the church-run shelter's services are more successful in meeting the needs of the individual than other large urban shelters. The majority of clients interviewed who have stayed in other shelters in LA and surrounding cities reported that they prefer the ESGVCH shelter to other options. Additionally, the majority of formerly homeless clients reported that the church-run shelter's high-quality volunteer staff and services distinguished it from other shelters they had stayed in. These churches' emphasis on volunteerism and charity are the primary motivations behind their partnership with the ESGVCH, and this is the driving force behind their volunteers' service and donations. This is a crucial component to the shelter's success, for it is evident in the staff's attitudes toward clients, which is reportedly highly encouraging, and the congregations' sheer quantity of voluntary contributions of food and monetary support.

The religious emphasis on charity these churches promote makes this public-private partnership shelter unique. The ESGVCH shelter harnesses the power

of the religious sector and private donations and combines it with a small grant of public funds to provide successful services because of strong volunteerism. Ultimately, the ESGVCH shelter proves to be an efficient model of public-private partnership to assist the homeless that is more successful in meeting the needs of the individuals it serves than competing shelters. The elements of religious volunteerism and charity the churches provide are a crucial component of this success.

In addition to homeless clients, several Glendora city officials were interviewed and asked their perspective on the ESGVCH shelter, along with what they think is the most effective way to help the local homeless population. When asked the best way to help the homeless in Glendora, one elected official explained, “I think transitional housing would be most effective. And you have to have some emergency housing because you have to be able to get folks off the street first and then move them into transitional housing.”⁵¹ This perspective supports the holistic theory, which advocates for both an emergency shelter network and the Housing First model, depending on the needs of the community and services available.

In Glendora, where no temporary housing is available, local elected officials interviewed recognize not only the importance of the emergency shelter system but also the need for more permanent solutions to chronic homeless. Local elected officials also affirmed the success of the ESGVCH shelter in meeting the needs of the individuals that visit the shelter, which supports Hypothesis 2. One official interviewed, who participates in the ESGVCH shelter as a volunteer regularly, explained, “It is our goal that their [homeless clients] spirits are fed along with their bodies. We try to train volunteers . . . to treat guests with respect and kindness.”⁵² This perspective demonstrates the depths to which Glendora’s community has invested into the ESGVCH shelter. Whether an elected official or church congregation member, it is the support of dedicated volunteers that makes the ESGVCH shelter model so successful in meeting the needs of the homeless clients it serves.

Policy Recommendations for Local Elected Officials

Results of this case study have several important implications for local policymakers, elected officials, and city administrators. The most obvious yet significant finding of this research is that public-private partnerships in the form of temporary homeless shelters can prove to be both cost-effective and more successful in meeting the needs of the individuals they serve. This finding affirms the efforts of Glendora’s churches and the ESGVCH. Cities throughout LA County with similar homeless populations and community actors might replicate this public-private partnership and experience the same positive outcomes as Glendora in assisting the local homeless population.

City officials can help mobilize the community and volunteers to assist the homeless at temporary shelters, public-private partnership shelters, and existing homeless services in their cities.

Local legislators and elected officials can recruit churches and nonprofits already engaged in homeless outreach services to explore developing temporary shelters like the ESGVCH model. However, promoting temporary emergency shelters like the ESGVCH model cannot come at the expense of other long-term solutions to homelessness such as permanent housing and the Housing First model. As the literature

suggests, these services offer vital support to the most severe cases of homelessness, while emergency shelter can solve the immediate short-term needs of LA's largely unsheltered homeless population.

This was affirmed by one of Glendora's elected officials interviewed. When asked what Glendora's greatest need is to assist the local homeless population, this individual explained, "Well we don't have any transitional housing, and the biggest problem there is 'not in my backyard.' So until folks are open to the possibility of that, so for Glendora it might be scattered housing. . . . Even now, there is some push-back when the winter shelter is in town. Trying to get people to understand and realize the complexity of the issue is hard."⁵³ As this individual suggests, local elected officials might face challenges implementing necessary policy to assist the homeless due to lack of community support and education. Thus, educating citizens on the issue of homelessness is an important role for legislators, elected officials, and community leaders in helping the homeless in their cities.

This study also indicates that temporary public-private partnership shelters ought to be prioritized along with long-term services such as temporary and permanent housing in every city in LA County, not just scattered housing in select cities. In addition to advocating a holistic system of homeless assistance services, city officials can help mobilize the community and volunteers to assist the homeless at temporary shelters, public-private partnership shelters, and existing homeless services in their cities. As this study indicates, volunteers and staff play a crucial role in homeless clients' perception of shelter services and can have a highly positive effect on shelter experiences.

Recommendations for Concerned Citizens

The results of this case study also have several important implications for concerned citizens who want to assist the homeless in their city. Recommendations for this audience are based on data gathered through several interviews with local elected officials and shelter coordinators who have much experience

educating citizens on homeless outreach and prevention. According to these sources, one of the most important and helpful things local citizens can do to help the homeless is educate themselves on the programs and services for the homeless offered locally, including emergency shelters, addiction support services, housing voucher programs, and related services. Connecting local homeless people with these services is a key step in helping them transition off the streets. Connecting the homeless with these services is often more beneficial than giving money, which can entrench homelessness and prolong stints on the streets, keeping people from seeking out support services for assistance.

In accordance with furthering personal education on homeless services available locally, concerned citizens can volunteer with community efforts to help the homeless, whether at emergency shelters, rehabilitation programs, or food banks. Donating clothes, food items, or charitable donations to these programs is an effective way of supporting the homeless that is instrumental in providing them the necessary services that can help them transition off the streets. Furthermore, local businesses can partner with homeless assistance programs to provide food, clothing, medical care, dentistry, barber services, and more, for homeless clients visiting shelters and assistance programs. These approaches, which help the homeless, support the good work that established programs are already doing to assist local homeless populations but engage the community and concerned citizens in the process.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is limited in its scope because it only examined two of the six churches that contract with the ESGVCH nonprofit to provide temporary emergency shelter. The two churches examined are located in the city of Glendora, while the other four are located in various cities throughout the East San Gabriel Valley. An in-depth study of all the church-run shelters working with the ESGVCH was infeasible for this study because of the small size of the research team and the

limited time window in which the shelter is offered. Further research into the efficiency and success of this public-private partnership shelter could explore the format and effectiveness of each emergency shelter site, in addition to collecting private interviews with homeless clients at each location. This would allow for a more well-rounded perspective of the ESGVCH shelter that would include other cities' approaches, besides solely Glendora, California.

Concerned citizens can volunteer, donate, and educate themselves on homeless assistance programs in their cities.

An additional limitation of this study was the small sample size of homeless clients interviewed. In total, 28 current and formerly homeless clients of various ages, genders, ethnicities, backgrounds, and religious affiliations were interviewed. Included in this sample were single adults, married and childless adults, and adults who were married with children. No homeless families or children were interviewed, as the ESGVCH shelter does not provide shelter to homeless families and instead connects them with other city programs that provide them with hotel vouchers for the night. The primary reason for the small sample size of clients interviewed was the excessive length of time each interview took to conduct, averaging roughly one hour per client. A larger research team would be beneficial in future studies of this format to gather a larger sample of interviews from which to draw conclusions.

This study's financial analysis of the Los Angeles Mission and Union Station Homeless Services also presented a challenge, as the data were based on these organizations' annual financial reports. Ideally, these shelters would have been visited, and interviews

would be conducted with staff and clients. However, this was beyond the scope of this study because of the small size of the research team. Future research might focus on the client experiences of these shelters compared with the ESGVCH shelter to further explore shelter experiences of the different emergency shelters. Interviews with homeless clients of these organizations could shed light on the comparison of staff, programs, and client experiences between public-private partnership organizations with a religious focus, privately funded secular shelters, and privately funded religious shelters.

Conclusion

The city of Glendora in LA County is fortunate to offer a diversity of homeless assistance services, particularly through the unique partnership that exists between LAHSA, the nonprofit ESGVCH, and St. Dorothy Catholic Church and Glenkirk Presbyterian Church. With a combination of public funds from LAHSA and private donations and volunteerism from church congregations, a cost-effective and accommodating temporary shelter is offered to the local homeless population. Although emergency shelter is only a temporary solution to chronic homelessness, it is necessary in cities such as LA, with well over a majority of their homeless population unsheltered.

Scholarly literature on homeless assistance predominantly favors the Housing First theory, which rejects the need for a large emergency shelter network in favor of permanent housing for the homeless. The theory of shelter reform coincides with Housing First, advocating for a redistribution of funding from emergency and temporary shelter services to permanent housing. Contrary to these theories, the holistic theory accounts for the need for some cities such as LA to expand emergency shelter services, along with permanent and temporary housing options. It is this latter theory that accommodates shelters like the ESGVCH model, which plays an important role in the community and as a service provider in LA County. This case study of the ESGVCH shelter discovered that it is more

cost-effective when compared with two other shelters in LA County, one receiving significant public funding and the other none at all. Additionally, the ESGVCH shelter proved to be more successful in meeting the needs of the homeless clients it services based on the testimonies of shelter clients.

These findings have important policy implications for both local legislators and elected officials, along with concerned citizens who want to help the

homeless in their community. While local officials can recruit and support public-private partnership shelters, concerned citizens can volunteer, donate, and educate themselves on homeless assistance programs in their cities. With the support and contributions of state and local government, religious communities, and community actors, programs like the ESGVCH shelter can thrive and expand, successfully and efficiently helping the homeless.

Appendix: Interviews

Homeless Clients Interview Question 1

“Have you ever stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church, and if yes, what shelter/s did you stay in before, and how does St. Dorothy/Glenkirk compare?”

Interview 1	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter not operated by a church, and this shelter is as good as it gets. The food is better than at other shelters, and the staff is better. The people who work here are genuinely concerned. They are aware of peoples' problems and try to work with them.
Interview 2	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church. I stayed in Pasadena shelters like Union Station, and it was better because it has real beds not cots, built-in showers, and professional cooks.
Interview 3	No, I have not stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church, but there are lots of people at this shelter who want to help, and that makes it good.
Interview 4	No, I have never stayed in a shelter before.
Interview 5	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church in Las Vegas, and this is better.
Interview 6	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church like the LA Mission and Pomona shelters, but the church-run shelter and the others are all the same.
Interview 7	No, I have never stayed in a shelter before, but I had no idea that people volunteered like they do at this shelter. I feel blessed by the work the volunteers do. I appreciate the opportunity to stay here and all the services provided, because this is more than just a place to sleep.
Interview 8	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church, in downtown LA. This shelter is much better because there are lots of weird and violent people in the other shelters. This shelter is in a better area, with less alcohol abuse and violence.
Interview 9	No response.
Interview 10	No response.
Interview 11	No response.
Interview 12	I have only stayed in church-run shelters.
Interview 13	I have only ever stayed in church-run shelters.
Interview 14	I have only stayed in church-run shelters.
Interview 15	I had never stayed in a church shelter before coming to this shelter, and I appreciate this shelter.

Interview 16	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church like the Pomona Armory, but this shelter is better because they have nurses, haircuts, and dentists that sometime visit to take care of us.
Interview 17	Yes, I have stayed in a shelter that was not operated by a church before, and the church-run shelter is better. It is cleaner. The staff are better and much more friendly.
Interview 18	I have only ever stayed in shelters run by churches.
Interview 19	I have only stayed in shelters run by churches.
Interview 20	This is my first time in a shelter run by a church, and I am grateful for people like those who work here who open their doors, and I won't complain.
Interview 21	Yes, I have stayed in other shelters not run by churches like the Pomona Armory. This is better because no one at other shelters I have stayed at seems happy or like they really care. There are never any hellos or goodbyes, but this shelter is different. This shelter is wonderful, and the volunteers speak to you like you are a person not a second-class citizen.
Interview 22 (Formerly homeless client who now works for the ESGVCH)	I came to this shelter because I loved it. Everyone is friendly, polite, service oriented, and there is no drama.
Interview 23 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	This shelter was different from others because it was a friendly place and I like the atmosphere. There is a good staff and good food.
Interview 24 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	When I came to this shelter it was my first time at a church-run shelter. I used the shelter services offered here to get a job and a residence, and now I volunteer at this shelter and have done so for four years.
Interview 25 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	Yes, I have stayed in other shelters not run by churches, and this shelter is much better. A friend brought me to this shelter when I was homeless, and I was struck by the respect and kindness of workers and volunteers. The churches and workers were very sweet. Some of the other shelters open and close strictly, leaving people in lines on the street to get in, but here we never turn someone away.
Interview 26 (Formerly homeless client who now works for the ESGVCH)	When I came to this shelter it was my first time on the streets or visiting a shelter. I was scared, but the shelter services helped me. The staff made a big difference, and I became a volunteer, got sponsored by a fellow volunteer at the shelter, and got a job. Now I have a car and a house.
Interview 27 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	No response to question on previous shelter stays, but the coalition helped me get off the streets and get healthy. The coalition helped me get a job, a place to live, get work clothes, and without the coalition I would never have gotten a job. It was not about changing who I was, but changing what I was doing. That is what the coalition helped me realize and change.
Interview 28 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	Yes, I have stayed in other shelters not run by churches, and I chose this shelter because everyone here is a volunteer, and the people here really want to do the right thing.

Homeless Clients Interview Question 2

“What is your opinion of the spiritual reflection time, scripture reading, prayer, and Bible study provided by this shelter?”

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Interview 1 | I am a Buddhist, but I appreciate the religious content that is optional at this shelter. |
| Interview 2 | I think it is beneficial to have the religious component. |
| Interview 3 | I am glad they offer the religious elements at this shelter. |
| Interview 4 | It is good to have spiritual reflection time. |
| Interview 5 | It doesn't bother me that they offer a spiritual time, and I think it is good for the people who want it. |
| Interview 6 | I am not going to participate because I need the time to eat, sleep, shower, and keep to the tight schedule the shelter keeps us on. It is a rushed system here. |
| Interview 7 | The spiritual reflection time doesn't bother me. I appreciate it. If you are willing and open to it, the spiritual stuff is helpful. |
| Interview 8 | The spiritual reflection time is good and uplifting and brings hope. I agree with the spiritual time offered here. |
| Interview 9 | No response. |
| Interview 10 | I respect the religious component. |
| Interview 11 | The world is a horrible place for poverty-stricken people, but a spiritual person has integrity, and we need those kind of people. I appreciate the spiritual time Glenkirk provides. |
| Interview 12 | I appreciate that they have spiritual reflection time as an option for some people. |
| Interview 13 | The spiritual reflection time doesn't bother me. |
| Interview 14 | It is nice to have the spiritual reflection time and keep in touch with yourself. It is nice to listen to the Word of God. |
| Interview 15 | I appreciate the Bible study for people who need it. I don't use it personally though. |
| Interview 16 | The spiritual reflection time is good for people who need it, and I think it is good for drug addicts. I personally don't believe though. |
| Interview 17 | To each their own. |
| Interview 18 | It doesn't bother me that they have a Bible study option. |
| Interview 19 | I think the spiritual reflection time is OK, and I will never turn down prayer. |

Interview 20	I appreciate the spiritual reflection time. It's something positive that some people really need, and it is good for some people.
Interview 21	I appreciate the spiritual reflection time because I'm going through hard times, and it helps.
Interview 22 (Formerly homeless client who now works for the ESGVCH)	The faith element doesn't bother me. The spiritual stuff is badly needed.
Interview 23 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	No response.
Interview 24 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	No response.
Interview 25 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	The spiritual reflection time is good, and we need more of it.
Interview 26 (Formerly homeless client who now works for the ESGVCH)	The religious component and faith element of the shelter did not make a difference in my time at the shelter, but the staff and volunteers did.
Interview 27 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	The spiritual reflection time is a very good thing. When I was homeless at the shelter, I attended the Bible studies and AA meetings, and it helped.
Interview 28 (Formerly homeless client who now volunteers with the ESGVCH)	The religious component did not affect my stay at the shelter or experience.

Homeless Clients Interview Question 3

"If you could make one suggestion to improve this shelter, what would it be?"

Interview 1	Provide entertainment for homeless clients. [Suggested late-night movies to give people who can't sleep something to do.]
Interview 2	Churches should fully set aside two weeks to host the shelter and suspend other programs and activities during the shelter weeks.
Interview 3	Improve the food by getting it donated from local grocery stores and restaurants.
Interview 4	No suggestions for improvement.
Interview 5	Let clients stay longer and let them store belongings at the shelter during the day.
Interview 6	Let clients stay longer.
Interview 7	Require every client to shower to improve cleanliness of the shelter.
Interview 8	Improve respect and enforce order among clients who are staying at the shelter.
Interview 9	Improve the education of staff on how to help the mentally ill.
Interview 10	Improve cleanliness of the shelter.
Interview 11	None. The church is great.
Interview 12	None. It is just nice to have a roof over my head.
Interview 13	Provide a buffet line for serving meals so that food people don't want does not get wasted.
Interview 14	Ensure that there is enough hot water for everyone in the showers.
Interview 15	Allow clients to sleep in because they have to wake up at 5:00 a.m. in order to exit the shelter in the morning.
Interview 16	Post security guards in the men's and women's restrooms to prevent vandalism. Make sure the bus drivers know where they are going. Ensure clients sleep in their assigned cots.
Interview 17	Provide one steady place for people to stay by using money spent on transportation.
Interview 18	Provide TV and sanitation masks to prevent sickness from spreading in the shelter.
Interview 19	Provide more activities for clients like TV.
Interview 20	Make special exceptions for elderly clients and allow them to leave their belongings at the church for the day.

Interview 21	If the weather is bad, keep people from being out in the bad weather and lengthen shelter hours. Provide extra blankets for clients on cold nights.
Interview 22	No suggestions.
Interview 23	No suggestions.
Interview 24	No suggestions.
Interview 25	Increase religious component of the shelter. Glenkirk Presbyterian Church is the only church that offers an optional Bible study for clients. This service could be expanded in other churches.
Interview 26	No suggestions.
Interview 27	Run the shelter longer. Even one month extra might give clients enough time to get housing.
Interview 28	No suggestions.

**Interview 1: Glendora City Official,
September 26, 2016**

Tell me more about the public-private partnership in Glendora's Community.

Historically, it has been the faith community and nonprofit organizations that have carried a lot of the burden of trying to meet the needs especially of the homeless community. And they are better equipped because unfortunately, oftentimes when you get the public sector involved and government there are so many restrictions on how they can help people, where they can help them, and so by the time you try to meet some of those requirements, and then also you have the issue of public funds, and where and how you can use them, dispersing funds to one group of individuals and not to others, then you have a discrepancy with the gift of public funds. So, when assistance is done by the private sector, especially by nonprofits and the faith community, that allows for much more flexibility in what is done.

What areas do you serve in with the public-private partnership?

I am primarily involved as a pastor through my congregation, and we assist people whether they come to us individually. Also we have two programs we operate in cooperation with the community: the Empty Bowls program and the Empty Cups program. Both of these partner with several groups and organizations to raise funds, and those funds go back to assist St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Shepherd's Pantry, and food vouchers that are given out at the police department to assist families and individuals in need. And then also we participate with other churches in the Crop Walk, which is communities reaching out to people through church world service, and that raises funds for both local and international hunger relief. We are also part of the East San Gabriel Valley Coalition for the Homeless, and that organization operates year-round in trying to meet the needs of the homeless in this part of the valley, and they do a tremendous job. We don't have a permanent shelter in this part of the valley, so it is during the cold weather months that the coalition operates a cold weather shelter. And

so that meets the needs of individuals in this part of the valley at that time, and it moves from church to church staying there for two weeks at a time.

Is the work you do in the community a focus of your work as a city official or as a pastor?

It is a focus of my work as a pastor, and I am also a chaplain with the police department. In that role, I assist people in need that sometimes in that role I get called upon by the police department if they encounter someone that might need help, then I try to connect them with resources.

Is that local or in Glendora?

That is primarily in Glendora, but I also work with other chaplains in a geographic area coordinating them. But, most of my work is in Glendora, and then the other thing too is that just trying to coordinate with other churches we look at what needs are available and trying to help with that. One of the other organizations I am involved in is Glendora Church Homes, and they have grant money they give out to seniors and people with disabilities. We received a large sum of money last year, and we wanted to make a grant available to assist with the homeless, so we gave some funds to the WYCA, and they created a position of a person who is a case manager, and she has been helping individuals to try and find what services are available and be a point of connection to other places.

For the Glendora Church Homes, is there a qualification that must be met to receive help, such as agreement to get addiction help, therapy, etc.?

With the case manager, she tries to ask all those questions. We don't determine that but give the money to them, and the case manager finds out if they have addictions or if they have other issues that need to be addressed because any time that you start trying to address the needs of the homeless there may be layers to that. Like trying to figure out how people got to be in that place—is it purely economics, is it mental illness, is it addiction, is it a variety of things? So that is what that individual tries to do is find out and connect people with resources. Not always do people want to

change or access those resources, but if they do then she is able to connect them with that.

Within Glendora, are these the main services available to homeless people?

There are other churches that give out food and motel vouchers, so there is some of that going on, but in terms of an organized program, these would be the larger organized programs. Of course the East San Gabriel Valley Coalition, being the largest one. Now the police department as well as Covina and West Covina and Azusa have all partnered to create a mental health evaluation team. And so we have an employee from the department of mental health. That person gets sent on calls when there are individuals who have mental issues, and sometimes those are some of our homeless. So that is another resource to be able to address that as well.

In your opinion, what is the most effective way we can help the homeless on a local or citywide basis, and what is the city of Glendora's greatest need in this area?

Well we don't have any transitional housing, and the biggest problem there is "not in my backyard." So until folks are open to the possibility of that, so for Glendora it might be scattered housing where one apartment here and one apartment there, that in Glendora it would be challenging to try and locate one place where you would be able to have several individuals unless there was more community buy-in. Even now, there is some pushback when the winter shelter is in town. Trying to get people to understand and realize the complexity of the issue is hard.

Have you noticed an increase in crime when the shelter is in town, or is there an increase in police activity, or is it overly stigmatized?

It varies. Over the last few years that has gotten better because the police department and shelter staff have tried to work together to try and minimize that.

It seems like Glendora's police force is actively partnering with the city council and the shelter. Is that abnormal for other local cities?

No, I would say that is more the norm. And I would say the partnership that they have is more with the community and with other resources. It is not necessarily a partnership with the city council because this didn't start from the top down but from the bottom up.

What is the name of the church you pastor, and does your church host the winter shelter?

No, Glenkirk and St. Dorothy do it because you have to have a certain type of facility, and ours doesn't meet the requirements. We have stairs and don't have anywhere for showers.

Have you volunteered with the Winter Shelter Program?

Yes, I volunteer every year and am on the planning committee for St. Dorothy.

Can you walk me through what goes in to a planning meeting and what is involved in the process?

I think there are about eight of us, and behind those eight people are all the other people who are cooking the meals, making lunches, cleaning the hall, getting supplies, donating supplies, donating money, just being there to provide staffing each night because there are people who work in a used clothing boutique and there are people who set up that and organize clothes. The guests have an opportunity each night to go into the boutique, get a new shirt or jacket, pair of pants, socks, or underwear, and there are also people that service the food and then cleaning up the messes afterwards and helping run the showers. There is someone who coordinates volunteers and keeps track of it. Groups come in to give haircuts. They have nurses from APU who give medical check-ups. They provide a lot of different resources. My responsibility is to organize the spiritual element of it. While the shelter is at St. Dorothy, there is an overarching theme for the whole time and a scripture of the day. Each of the guests that comes in gets a card with a daily scripture, and I have different prayers and meditations that I give prior to each meal. It is our goal that their spirits are fed along with their bodies. We try to train volunteers that they are being the presence of Christ and they are to treat guests with respect and kindness.

Have you noticed that there is a difference in the shelter when you include the spiritual element? How many people are receptive; does it seem like it is feeding a need?

People are very receptive, and I think they feel valued. That is the most important thing is that you want them to feel valued because oftentimes they are not. And so for the individuals that come and volunteer, it gives them the opportunity to put a face and a name to each of those individuals rather than just someone who is under the overpass or on the side of the freeway. You are finding out those peoples' stories.

What is the size of the congregation it takes to pull this shelter off?

For instance, at St. Dorothy they have volunteers from their congregation but many other churches and faith communities, making it truly a community effort.

So there are multiple faiths involved in this shelter? Is there an outlet for homeless clients to connect with their own faith community if it is different than St. Dorothy?

We make that known to them who the folks are that night who are there, so they can connect with them. We don't have a synagogue or a mosque in Glendora, so we don't have representation from the Jewish or Muslim community. If we did, we would probably include them in this. And when the shelter is at Glenkirk, I know they invite the Episcopal church to volunteer and probably other churches.

Is there a set budget for the church to run the shelter?

I think the coalition provides some funds, and they get money from the congregation, and perhaps they have a line item in their budget. They get donations from businesses. There are restaurants in town that provide dinner on different nights. They have a lot of organizations and groups that donate to that effort.

Do you know the quantity of funds the coalition gets from the county to operate the shelter?

What has been happening the last few years is that there is a big push for permanent housing. So the county said we are not going to give so much money

to shelters, because we want all the money. So the coalition and other groups that run shelters were having their funds reduced because the popular thing to do was to go to permanent housing. Well, meanwhile there is no permanent housing, and where do these people go in the meantime? So there is that internal battle of where does the money go, how is it best used, because everyone has a different opinion on how those dollars should be divided. So what the county has been talking about is making that pie bigger. So that when they divide the funds, everybody can get a little bit more, so there has been the initiative to get additional funding, but I think that we need different ideas because there is only so much money out there, and how are you going to divide it?

Where is the closest permanent housing for the homeless in LA County?

That question can be answered a lot of different ways because there are the HUD vouchers, the Section 8 vouchers. So if someone were to apply and qualify for that, there is a limited amount of that in Glendora, but primarily in cities to the south and the west of us and also in Pomona, but that is one way. In terms of a block of housing or anything more than that, Whittier has done some things with that. They have three levels, a temporary shelter, transitional housing, and they also have some permanent housing, but a lot of cities were moving in that direction and using redevelopment funds. But when all the redevelopment money went away, all those plans went away as well. So I don't know if Whittier ended up having to sell their permanent housing units.

Looking to the future, what is the best way to help the homeless in Glendora? Would it be to expand the Winter Shelter Program and get more churches involved or provide permanent housing?

I think transitional housing would be most effective. And you have to have some emergency housing because you have to be able to get folks off the street first and then move them into transitional housing. But a limited amount of emergency housing, not necessarily a shelter but some type of emergency housing.

Does the shelter still play an important role in Glendora, and is it important that we have the shelter, or should we reallocate those resources?

Until we have more emergency and transitional housing, you must continue the shelter, especially for the cold weather months.

Considering all the work the churches do and all that goes in to the shelter, is it sustainable?

They have been doing it for a long time. But I think that they are going to need to continue to look at ways to adapt it to current needs, especially with the increase in the homeless population.

Interview 2: Glenkirk Presbyterian Church Shelter Administrator, October 14, 2016

Can you tell me about the winter shelter operated at Glenkirk Presbyterian Church?

It is sponsored by the ESGVCH, which is located in Hacienda Heights, their office. We have been involved with them since 1993, when it first started the very first year. Glenkirk now, I know it has been several years, is the only Protestant church involved, and the rest are all Catholic churches, probably because the founder was from St. Vianney's in Covina because they just reached out to their parishes and got Catholic churches to participate, and I really don't know how Glenkirk found out about it, but they brought it to Glenkirk. But today it is still only Catholic churches that do it; St. Dorothy does it two weeks before we do. Each church takes the homeless for two weeks, and it starts in mid-November and runs through March. Sometimes, depending on if they extend it to mid or end of March, but they set the dates every year of when they will host it. For the last 10 years, we have hosted it in the first two weeks of January; St. Dorothy is the last two weeks.

At one time we did it for three weeks, and it was a bit of a strain on our facilities. Our facility is really used seven days a week by support groups like AA, NA, ELNON, and several other programs. So there isn't any night of the week that someone isn't renting

space on our property. So when we shut it down for two weeks we have to shut down all of our programming. We allow the groups that meet in these buildings and still meet, but we take over the whole administration building, the event center, and our fellowship hall. No one can meet in there during the two weeks. So doing it for three weeks was a stretch. The coalition has predetermined bus stops throughout the community. There is usually one in Almonte, Baldwin Park, Hacienda Heights, Covina, Azusa, and they have two buses that run, and they pick up the homeless at about 5 a.m. They usually arrive here [at the church] at 6 a.m. and 7 a.m., but sometimes they are late. They check them in, they have a whole screening process they use. And our people, we supply the food and volunteers. They supply all the organization and running of the actual shelter.

And that includes the screening you mentioned?

They have a whole screening, they have social workers that come, they have people from the Veterans that come and talk to vets about some of the programs they might be able to get them into. And we do have a couple of volunteers that help them do that, but they organize and run that portion. We just have to make sure we have an internet connection for them. And each one of their participants [homeless clients] gets an ID card so they get their ID card, and the coalition is very funny, they give them a coffee cup when they come in, a Styrofoam coffee cup when they come in that they usually write their name on. And if they want a second cup they have to go back to the coalition. I think they did it to make them responsible for something that we are not just going to keep giving them something every time they want a cup of coffee. They throw it out, ask for more, create more trash, require more supplies. The homeless that come here know their routine. They know they aren't allowed to ask for another coffee cup unless they have a good reason. We feed them dinner. We have to supply showers, which we happen to have showers. I think we are the only church that has showers still. We have an area that when we converted this school into a church, there was a gym, so we put showers in there thinking that it was

a ministry outreach but we are at the point where we want to tear them out if we could. They are just hard to maintain. So the churches that don't have showers have to bring in portable showers.

And is there a company you contract out to for that service?

Actually the coalition handles that and pays for that and provides for the delivery and pick up. It is kind of like a trailer. And also the churches that don't have adequate bathroom facilities, they also bring in a truck for that. We happen to have enough to meet their requirements. Their requirements are really very low for the number of bathrooms you need for them. So after we have dinner and clean up, then we turn it back to the coalition, and they are the ones who spend the night here with them. No church members stay the night. We used to, a few years ago we were trying to accommodate families, so we had them over in our classrooms, and we did have a facility person around for them all night when they were there. But the coalition and the church decided that really it wasn't working the best, so we decided not to do families anymore.

So do they get a voucher instead?

Yes, they get a voucher instead to go to a motel or something. And when they are in Glendora, the police department has vouchers for the homeless and the police department helps out a lot with Glendora to take a little stress off the coalition for having to provide hotels every night.

So the police department funds these?

Yes. I don't know if it is the police department per se, but we have our own police department in the city, and it comes from the city in some shape or form. But that is where we send, if we have walk-ins during the day outside the coalition time, we always send them over to the police department.

So then, what we do before we leave at night is, lunch has already been packed in a brown bag and we set out food for a continental breakfast. So the coalition gets them up and gives them their breakfast.

Is there a schedule in the morning they follow, like everyone up by 8 a.m.?

Oh yes, but they are up at like 5:30 a.m. because the buses pick them up at 6:00 a.m. or 6:30 a.m. They have a very early wake-up call. And as they get on the bus or as they leave, they get their sack lunch. And they are gone during the day. A few of them will linger around, and we are reasonably tolerant of them being around. Depending on sort of what they are doing. They are not really allowed to hang around on the campus. Because the city of Glendora really pushes for them not to be here. Because both St. Dorothy and Glenkirk are right across from the high school. So it is an issue. If a couple of them we see sleeping behind our bushes, we will let them stay until 10 or 11 o'clock, but once they get up and start moving around, we tell them you know the rules, you have to leave the property and go back to where you normally are, you should have gone on the bus today and gone back to your normal habitat where you stay during the day. And 99 percent of them follow the rules really well. There are always a few stray ones, especially the ones that have cars and drive here.

So there are people who have cars that visit the shelter?

Yes. There are people who basically live in their cars when the shelter is in session. Yeah, they live in their cars and will try and push it, but once they get up and start moving around, we have to ask them to leave.

Are their activities built in to the structure of the shelter with things for them to do?

It is really just allowing a social time for them. We happen to provide Bible study for them every night, and we also have a clothing store. They don't pay anything for it. They really like coming to ours. We have it set up like a boutique. There are hangers with different sizes of the clothes, and the people that run it are very particular about the quality of the clothing they put out for them. They don't let raggedy clothes go out. Our congregation brings a lot of the clothes; we also ask for sign-ups for food because we try to break down all the food into manageable, like we need to make mashed potatoes, we might need 50 pounds of potatoes. Well that is too much for one person to buy, so you break it up into five 10-pound bags for people.

They take slips and bring the allotted food on the nights they are assigned to bring the food, but we also ask them to buy underwear and socks.

Do you manage the financial side of the shelter, or do you have a board that handles it?

We have a team that is a volunteer team that runs it. We have 35 volunteers every night that come in and do the cooking, serving, cleaning, sign-in for the showers, helping with the coalition. There are 35 positions, and so I have a head leader who comes up with all my night leaders and assistant night leaders. We always have a leader and an assistant, so we always have two people that are in charge that night. And we have a head cook that oversees the preparation team. So I have one person that manages all the menus, food, and getting all the cooks and servers. I have two head servers because they have to train people. It's really a production. And if you come in and don't know what you're doing, it slows the whole process down. So we have two head servers, and they show the team that night, there are about 16 servers every night. We don't do buffet style—we actually serve at the tables. So we have six or seven people dishing up food on plates, and a team that takes the plates around with the food. We also have beverage servers. So 16 of them to run a night.

How many guests is the average per night?

The lowest it has been in the past years is 120. The most is 210.

Per night?

Yes, per night.

And do the same people usually come back every night?

Frequently they are the same people, but there is a good turnover of new people that come in every night too that either hear about it or happen to be traveling through the area. Quite a few are repeats. It has been almost four years that I have spent almost every night here with them. I got to know a lot of them then.

In your experience with the shelter program, what is the percentage of turnover with those who are coming into the shelter?

I know the coalition in the past few years has been really striving to get them permanent housing. To get them out of the homeless situation. Over the 25 years or so I have been dealing with it, there are sort of three categories of people who fall into the homeless. They are what we refer to as the habitual homeless. I spoke to some of them for several years, and they didn't really want to do anything else. That is, they were—I don't want to say happy because that is not the right adjective—content with being homeless and really had no aspirations to do anything else. I knew one gentleman for six years, and in the last two years he didn't show up, and we assumed he probably died. But, he had a daughter and some family that lived near, but he just did not want to do anything else. So we refer to them as the habitually homeless; they don't want to do anything to change their plight, in fact they actually fight against getting out of their plight. They don't want to participate.

Years ago when it started, there were a lot of alcoholics and drug addicts, which we do still have our share of alcoholics and drug addicts, but it is not nearly as high as it used to be. What we are finding now, and it is due to changing laws, is people who are socially inept or mentally challenged and don't have the capacity to hold down a full-time job. And there used to be programs and places for these people to go live, and unfortunately, it was during the Reagan era that it really was changed and a lot of the laws were changed to be able to reach out and help those people. So it is unfortunate because I think the majority of the people we see now, and I don't know if it is more than 50 percent, but probably about 50 percent are really those who are challenged in some way. They either have a true mental disability or they are really socially challenged and don't function in society.

I would say at least 50 percent of them. Because we go around and talk to the people you can tell when you start talking to them. The ones I talk about that are habitually homeless, literally the one guy I mentioned I knew for six years, he used to own a plumbing business and had a home. He just walked away from it all. Obviously he had some challenges too, some type of either social like Asperger's these days, or autism or something that you can't deal with stresses and

realities. But he was a fully functioning adult until probably his late 40s. And then, he chose to be on the streets.

For the mentally ill, and such a large number of them, what is the standard operating procedure for the coalition when they find someone like that?

In today's environment, I think they do what they can for them. I think they try to get them into the regional centers in California, and I don't know if they exist outside California. I'm sure other states have something. Anyone who has children with autism, or Asperger's, or any other kind of social or mental disorder if they can get them into the regional centers, they are basically I don't want to say taken care of for life, but there is someone there focusing on them. My girlfriend's son, who was extremely severe, when he turned 18, the regional center got him moved into an apartment, sharing with another person from the regional center. They go every week and check on them. They make sure they get jobs. He has been working at CVS for 10 years and rides a bike and has a relationship with a woman who also has issues. What's hard for some of these older people is that they don't have a sustained history that they can give to a doctor or to a regional center to say, "I was diagnosed at this age, these are things I have tried to do." They have none of that paperwork because they are homeless.

So the three categories of homeless are?

The habitually homeless, the mentally ill, and drug and alcoholics. And then there is a tiny little bit of the people who are just down on their luck, and those are very temporary. They usually just lost their job, or their home was foreclosed on. They usually get themselves out of that situation within a year. They are usually back at work or have a place to live.

Would you say the shelter is instrumental in helping them reach those goals?

I know that the counselors have places they try to send them to get jobs and things. I don't know how successful they are because I have never seen results of their tracking. We always, every year, we get one or two families that come in who are living in their car saying,

"My husband just lost his job," or "we got evicted from our house." We also send people like that over to our Shepherd's Pantry in Glendora on Arrow Highway. As a rule they don't give food and stuff to homeless people because the food has to be prepared. So they get groceries. During the homeless ministry, if we have families that come in, we call them and say that we are sending someone over, and they can get them some food. A lot of them have stoves they have in their car. So I guess there are really four categories including the people who are really just down on their luck, short term, lost their jobs, but they don't stay in the system very long. They find jobs and get reestablished.

You mentioned that Glenkirk provides a Bible study. How important is it for there to be a spiritual faith component to the shelter? Have you noticed positive effects of the spiritual component in clients' lives?

I think it is helpful. Out of 120 to 180 people a night, we usually get about eight to 12, at the most 15 who come to the Bible study. So it is a small percentage, but when I talk to the three or four gentlemen who put on the Bible study, is that their feedback is that they are so appreciative. They have reported that several people have come to know Christ over the years, and to them, it brings a sense of peace to them. Especially for those who are marginally mentally handicapped, they feel so much more accepted like there is hope for them. Because a lot of those people have been thrown out of their homes by their families, especially people with social disorders like Asperger's, they can be real pains to live with. A lot of families just get fed up and throw them out, and they have no place to go, they can't hold down a job, they have no place to live. That is where knowing God, knowing Jesus, can give you a sense of peace, that there is something else out there than what you have been living with.

I know there are several churches that operate shelters with the coalition. Do you model each other or come up with the structure for the shelter on your own?

I know we used to model each other when St. Dorothy started. So St. Dorothy started modeling us and viewing how we do sign-ins, serve food, and those sorts of things. In the first few years when I was a volunteer

before I worked at Glenkirk, my friend and I ran the shelter for three years. And we spent a lot of time at St. Vianney's and St. Dorothy when it was coming on board. We went to several other ones [churches] to see what they did. Some of them had their clothing for the clients in a pile on the floor for people to dig through. And I think we wanted ours to be different.

We always refer to the homeless as our guests, and we want to make sure that they are welcome and we are not looking down on them or pitying them, but are valuing them. And so we really wanted to make the clothing store something special for them. So they felt that it was more of a gift than here is some old, used clothing if you want to dumpster dive. It just sort of felt wrong. And the homeless like to come here because we are the only church where they can leave their cots up all day. Also other churches, they come in and they eat and they have to take the tables down and put the cots up. The coalition, they usually have about 10 guys helping to put the cots up, but we have a large enough facility where we can keep the cots up all day. And what really helped us last year, because we had so much rain, the city asked us to stay open during the day, which was absolutely unheard of. First the coalition asked us, and I was like let me check with my department to check that it is ok. And I didn't even have time to call them before we were asked to open all day. So we had cots up and TVs set up so they could watch TV during the day. The Coalition liked it because they didn't have to do as much work, and some of the homeless liked it because they got to leave their stuff on their cot.

Can you tell me about the financial operation of this shelter? Which do you think is more economically feasible, privately operated shelters or publicly funded shelters?

Well I haven't seen a lot of permanent year-round facilities, so I am probably not going to be in a position to answer that. I know there is one in Pomona that they had been trying to run year-round, and they did a fair job of it. But the building ended up getting condemned. And so they were starting to look at the coalition's model. It was primarily independent funding, but I know they also got some local or state funding. It was run through a church, but not church funded.

They thought their program worked very well, but I am not sure where they got their funding from, but I know some came from the state.

How much would you say is the total operating cost for one night of hosting the shelter for your church community?

I would say probably counting food about \$1,500.

To serve about 210?

To serve about 200. Because that is about \$600 to \$700 dollars in food. And to run our lighting and air conditioning and have a facilities person doing set-ups. And if you had somebody besides volunteers you would be paying at least a couple hundred dollars a night. So I would guess \$1,500 would be a low, and \$2,000 would be a high.

Again, it would depend on the personnel hired.

You guys only use volunteers, right?

Yes, we only use volunteers, so for us it is only about \$600 to \$700 for food, and just the utilities and hot water would run for, well if it was all volunteers you could probably do it for \$1,000 a day.

How much would you say a typical night of utilities costs for your church?

Utilities would be about \$260 a day based on our facilities, and we have a pretty big facility. Our electricity bill is what kills us. Usually the lowest we can get it even in the winter months is down to about \$5,000. During the summer months it runs between about \$7,000 and \$8,000 a month.

So your church uses all volunteers. Do you know if St. Dorothy and other churches do?

I believe that almost all of them are volunteer.

And for the coalition?

With the coalition it is a combination of volunteer and paid. They have some of their regular homeless people who have earned the right to volunteer. They have to do a lot of work, but it gets them in earlier and they can have a cup of coffee and sit down, and they get a badge that says they are a volunteer. It makes them

feel like they are trusted and can do more things.

This is one of our church's favorite outreaches. In fact, we share it with some other churches because they don't have room, so we have Grace Episcopal in Glendora that comes one night, we have Lavern Heights Presbyterian Church, First Presbyterian Covina, First Baptist in Covina, CCV in San Dimas, and the Latter Day Saints, the Mormons.

And do they give funds or food or volunteers?

In order to participate they have to provide all the food and all the volunteers for that night. We will fill in for the shower monitors and the clothing store because those are odd positions. It is the only way they are allowed to come serve, because our people want to serve. We take five nights off the table right away for those outside churches. We always have our two-night leaders here though.

How did you find those other churches to help volunteer? Did they come to you?

Yes, most of them came to us.

Is it helpful to have them?

It is very helpful. When we first started, there were 45 to 55 people that would show up back in 1993. And as it started growing, when it hit 100 to 110, much less going up to 140 every night, trying to get all the food started to become an issue. So we have actually gone to where the church purchases all the meat we provide. So we do a chili night, pulled pork night, meatloaf night, and sherry beef. We purchase the meat, and it is about \$450 on the meat for those meals. We found it was easier. Some people just want to give money. They don't have time to go shop, they don't want to volunteer, because I don't want to say there are people afraid of the homeless, but they are uncomfortable. They just want to give money, so we have about 3,000 slips that have to be taken for toilet paper, paper towels, and stuff.

Slips?

Yes, we actually do online sign-ups for something to bring. To bring corn, green beans, coffee. For them to sign up to bring things.

And who manages all this?

I do. That is why I factored into that cost I gave you some staffing because there is a lot of administrative, and the bookkeeper. We start planning this in September of every year, and it's in January.

Interview 3: Glendora City Official, December 6, 2016

You have shared with me in the past your unique perspective on homelessness. Would you elaborate on that?

I have a brother who has drug problems. He is 48 or 49 years old, and right now I am not sure where he is. He might be living on the streets, he might be crashing somewhere, but he left the state of California. When we were dealing with his situation, I came up with a different perspective to the point of I thought to myself every time somebody gave him a dollar, they were helping him to maintain that lifestyle. So as long as he reached out to people and they were willing to give him money, it made the person who did the giving feel good, but it didn't do anything to solve the problem. And so it sort of took me in a different direction with my opinion because now, and I am not proud of this, but I actually get a little angry with people when I see them giving a homeless person money. Now when I see them giving food or something like that it is not the same reaction, but when I see them giving money I think of it as being a selfish act because when you are giving someone money it makes the giver feel good, but you are not really doing anything to help solve the problem. And so what I do now and what I advise people to do is there are great programs now out here that deal with this. That you have probably had some interaction with. Salvation Army is one of the best ones, to take my money and contribute to those types of organizations because that is where people can go to get help if they need it. So it is sort of a different extreme going from one side to the other. Again I don't feel that someone who gives someone money is a bad person or doing something wrong. It is just every time I see it I think, "Wow you don't realize that what you are doing is not helping them, and it is

making you feel good, but in reality it is not benefiting the person who needs help.”

How did your experience with your brother affect how you approach this issue as a public servant?

One of the things I have seen on a statewide level with our legislators, elected officials, and leaders is an attempt to try and solve this problem by throwing money at it. And there was somebody that said something years ago that it is surprising how many problems a job can solve. If people have a job, that solves a lot of problems in the world. If someone has a reason to get up every day and do something productive to take care of their families. And I have done a lot of letter writing, emailing, and talking with people by saying, why are we talking about subsidizing housing or why are we talking about continuing to increase funding for certain programs as opposed to figuring out ways to create jobs for those people and looking at those opportunities instead? And the answer I get typically is that they are trying to do both, but I don't see that. I see more of the fact that LA County alone, the amount of money they spend on every single homeless person in LA County, they could probably give them a job and put them on the payroll, and it would probably be cheaper than the money they spend on a variety of programs. And that is not going to solve everyone's problems; there are a lot of mental health problems. In my brother's case it is drug problems, but if there were something for them to do to be productive, I think that would be a bigger solution than trying to subsidize housing where the habits they have had their whole life aren't going to change if they have a roof over their head.

How does LA handle the cases of severe mental illness and addiction? Can they hold down a job?

There are a lot of programs available. And what I have seen with a lot of these programs, and I appreciate that there is an attempt to address it, but what I have seen is that there is not the ability to. . . . People, they used to if you were mentally ill, put you in a hospital and throw away the key, and you were just out of society's sight so we didn't see you. Well it went from that extreme to now we have all these programs available

for you, but you are not required to participate, and there is not an incentive to participate. So I think a lot of crime comes from people with mental illness and drug problems, but there are people out there that don't think it is fair to force people into rehab programs. So they get caught, arrested, or convicted of something, they serve a little jail time and are let back out on the street. And I would support maybe saying, when you come out you will enroll in a rehab program, and if you don't complete the program you are going back to jail. There has to be some consequences for not trying to get your life back together. Because it is difficult when someone starts going down that path.

How do you see the public-private-sector partnership in light of homelessness in LA County? Is it a productive thing? Is it more of something the private sector should handle, or should the public sector handle this?

On the private-sector side, what I see being most successful with the programs they have is getting people a place to sleep, some clothes, getting them a little education and that type of stuff for the people that are looking for help. But on the government side, I think more emphasis needs to be put on the people who are not willing to get help on their own. It again is difficult to say you should take someone with a mental illness and lock them up until they admit they need to do something—that is an extreme—but there needs to be more consequences than what there are now where people seem to just go through this revolving door. We will see here in the city where someone will get picked up, and they can be held up to 72 hours on a mental health watch, and at the end of the 72 hours they are just released. And that can happen to someone three, four, 12, 10 times.

As a city official, is there a discussion of the problem that the police are burdened by having to incarcerate the homeless, and the homeless are equally harmed because their record gets another addition, making it harder for them to get employed?

Honestly no. Here in Glendora we have been relatively insulated from the homeless problem, and there are a couple of reasons for it. The gold line train ends at the border of Glendora now, so it is relatively easy for

people to get on the train, and they just get off at the end of it to have somewhere to be. And our chief of police made a comment when he was talking somewhere one time that people in Glendora are nice, and so the homeless people for the most part get well taken care of. And there are guys who have been on the streets here for 20 years.

Yes, I got to meet a few of them.

Yes, and they know that they don't bother anybody. I have had conversations with them, and they seem like OK people, and they know if they stay out of everybody's way. There is one guy I talked to, and he said he never has to ask anyone for money, and people come up and give him money because the people of Glendora are such good people that they know he needs help, and they come and they give him money. And so that type of thing going back to it makes us all feel good to do something like that, and the people of Glendora are good people so they do those things because they think it is helping. But my perspective is that I don't think it helps the situation. I will be honest, if you have had conversations with some of those guys, they are OK with their lifestyles. They don't think anyone should be feeling sorry for them. This is what they have chosen, and they are OK with it. They aren't proud of it, but they don't have a problem. They wouldn't fix it if they hit the lottery tomorrow. They like that lifestyle of having no responsibility for something.

There is a legitimate argument to be made that the shelter system is more of a Band-Aid on a deeper issue that is not being solved. What do you think is an effective way to have a more long-term solution?

I don't have enough knowledge to know if there are programs like this out there, but I am in real estate, and I am a landlord. And there are people that are on government-assisted rental programs for 20 years. There needs to be a goal set when someone gets involved in a program like this. When we are spending \$30 to 40,000 per homeless person a year on programs in the county, we could be giving those people jobs that pay those people the same. I look at these programs, and I knew a lady with two babies, and I believe she had those babies for no other reason than to stay on

the assistance programs because she lived in one of my houses I owned for a period of time. As her first child became 14 or 15 years old, she became pregnant again because this particular program she was on was for kids at a school age. And she did it a third time when her first son was 24 and her second was 12, she had another one, and she was able to stay on that program for almost 20 years. And so it again, I look at the people that put this together, but to be able to have something where this is going to be the next program for five years of your life. Year one, we take care of 80 percent of your expenses, and year two it is going to be 60 percent, year three it will be 40, in order to get people to be able to take care of themselves. Unfortunately, there is a reward for doing poorly. Especially in Southern California, I talk to people that when they go out and get jobs they lose some of their benefits. Sometimes it is more financially beneficial for them to not work. I would like something that takes a look at somebody who is getting some assistance if they get a job and are doing something, taking some of their assistance away punishes them for working. Leaving the assistance in place as they try to improve themselves until they get to a point where they can take care of themselves seems like it would be a smarter program to me.

Do you know if most of the homeless in Glendora are on some type of government assistance program?

Yes. Most of the ones I have had interaction with they pick up a check somewhere. It is enough for them to be able to get by and buy some groceries and occasionally spend the night in a hotel. But it is surprising how many people have mailing addresses where they don't have a home.

As someone involved in real estate, there are several prominent arguments to assist the homeless that include permanent or temporary supportive housing. Are these feasible solutions?

Permanent housing under no circumstances. Because again it is that age-old thing that when you go to the national park you don't feed the bears. If somebody knows they are going to have a permanent situation, they have no incentive to improve their situation. The problem with temporary housing is where do we want

to put it? And it sounds terrible, but if you think about it, pretty much anyone you talk to, they don't want something like that in their neighborhood. I don't know if it is possible because one of the things the state is trying to do is legislate; we will be required to supply some type of temporary housing in order to continue getting some funds from the state of California. What that is going to do is put us in a situation to make that decision that somewhere this housing is going to have to be available. Now I am going to look at it as a real estate person, wherever we choose to do that it is going to hurt the neighborhood. People don't want to live in a neighborhood with housing like that. You don't want a place like that to be too nice, because if it is extremely nice people will take advantage of it. And if it is not very nice, it still hurts the neighborhood because it is run down. So it comes back to I don't know what to do with that. Do I think that is a good solution, yeah, but where do we put it? It is sort of like the prisons. When they talk about releasing people from prisons because of overcrowding, the easy solution is to build more prisons, but where, because no one wants a prison in their backyard.

There is a lot of debate on this issue, and both sides make such good points.

And you know, again I look at it like there isn't a solution to the problem. The best we can do is try to figure out a way we can live with it. And do what we can to help those that want help. For the people that don't want help, for the people who would rather get high than go to work, they have to make a decision for themselves. And believe me, I struggle constantly with the fact that, am I going to get a call that my brother was found dead in the street somewhere? Or will I get a call that he has signed up for rehab? The life he is living right now is not going to continue. We are going to receive one of those two calls. And as a family, we have done everything we know to do to try and help him, and we have spent a lot of time with doctors with advisers, trying to advise us what we can do, and we have come to the conclusion, he has been dealing with this since he was a teenager, so he has got to make the decision. We actually, my brothers and I, put a letter together that we put together a number of years ago

that we told him if he ever decides to walk into a Salvation Army or a rehab clinic and ask for help, he has a letter that has our names and numbers and it says to contact us and let us know he has reached out for help, and we will be there. Until he makes that decision, we don't know what else to do.

Interview 4: St. Dorothy Catholic Church Shelter Administrator, November 9, 2016

(Interviewee did not consent to be recorded.)

Can you break down the operational cost of the shelter for me?

All of the food is donated, so it is much cheaper, and all the ingredients and menus are set. The only cost for electricity and utilities is covered by the church, and this is covered by a surplus of donation funds.

Tell me a little more about the history of the shelter.

The shelter started at St. Dorothy in 2003.

How is the shelter operated? By an all-volunteer staff?

Yes, the shelter is operated by an all-volunteer staff. There are 15 total that work in the kitchen as cooks or servers. In the boutiques we typically have about five volunteers. We have five working as shower monitors. In total, it is an average of 35 to 40 volunteers with a core team of 10.

Can you tell me about the religious/spiritual time St. Dorothy offers?

We offer a prayer reflection time led by a local pastor.

How many homeless clients do you serve on an average night?

Between 130 and 150 clients are served each night.

In your partnership with the ESGVCH, what do they provide your church with?

The ESGVCH has staff that spend the night at the shelter. They also provide security personnel and cots for clients to sleep on.

**Interview 5: ESGVCH Shelter
Administrator, November 29, 2016**

(Interviewee did not consent to be recorded.)

When and how did you originally get involved helping the homeless?

We started housing the homeless in 1993. Now we have a total of six churches that we partner with that house the homeless and an additional 30 churches that support our larger churches that directly house the homeless.

Tell me about the details and cost breakdown of how the ESGVCH contributes to the church-run shelters.

We provide transportation. We hire two city buses, and there are six pick-up and drop-off spots throughout the East San Gabriel Valley. We also provide showers if the church does not have them available. Additionally, we hire security and have four paid staff that work at the shelter. The churches pay for about 50 percent of the cost of the shelter. They provide food, space, maintenance, and volunteers, and hygiene products. We are funded by LAHSA and have hosted the winter shelter since 1995.

What is the nature of your partnership with LAHSA?

We maintain a three-year contract with LAHSA to host the winter shelter, and as far as I know we are the only organization they partner with that uses churches for the shelters. We get an annual grant of \$300,000 from LAHSA, and LAHSA automatically gives this grant. We don't have to apply for it.

Is it difficult to operate this shelter and partner with so many churches?

This is a challenging thing to do, and it takes a toll. It is easy to get very burned out. We have conflicts between the coalition and church hosts, and sometimes it is like walking on eggshells because you are dealing with people with different ideologies. There

is lots of pressure to make sure nothing goes wrong, and that means there is someone from the ESGVCH board at the shelter every night.

How does the religious component included in the ESGVCH shelter affect homeless clients?

The churches cater to the emotional and spiritual needs of the clients, and there is more focus on the individual.

How does the rotational aspect of the shelter work?

It is two-sided. We move the shelter every two weeks to a new venue so you don't exhaust the community/church hosting the shelter. On the other hand, there are advantages to staying in one place we miss out on.

How does the volunteer aspect of the shelter contribute to the program?

There is a different group every night that serves in the church. The volunteers are new each night, and they bring fresh positivity and go out of their way to treat clients specially.

How does the ESGVCH partnership run smoothly?

There are three key groups that contribute to the shelter's success. The ESGVCH, the paid staff funded by the ESGVCH, and the church workers all are immediately involved in operating the shelter. We also have a good working relationship with the Glendora Police Department, and this also helps make it work.

In your experience working with the homeless, what are some of the things that contribute to prolonged stays on the street?

Felonies and misdemeanors make it very hard to get a job and get out of homelessness. Additionally, many of the homeless I have worked with never finished high school. Also, there is no housing available to these people. Even after they go through drug and alcohol rehab, where do they go when they finish? There is a lack of housing options available for these people.

Notes

1. Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, “2016 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count Data Shows Significant Drops in Veteran and Family Homelessness Citing Focused Investment,” May 4, 2016, <https://documents.lahsa.org/Communication/2016/2016HomelessCountResultsRelease.pdf>.
2. County of Los Angeles, “Statistics,” May 25, 2017, <https://www.lacounty.gov/government/geography-statistics/statistics>.
3. Gale Holland, “Los Angeles County Spends \$1 Billion Managing Homelessness, Report Finds,” *Los Angeles Times*, February 5, 2016, <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-county-homelessness-spending-20160205-story.html>.
4. Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, “2016 Greater Los Angeles Homeless Count Data Shows Significant Drops in Veteran and Family Homelessness Citing Focused Investment.”
5. Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, “Los Angeles Winter Shelter Program for Homeless Starts December 1,” November 30, 2011, <https://documents.lahsa.org/Communication/2011/PR-WSP-2011-12.pdf>.
6. Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, “Winter Shelter Program 2015-16 Final Report,” <https://www.lahsa.org/ces/winter-shelter/occupancy-dashboard>.
7. The four other churches that host the winter shelter are St. Christopher Catholic Church in West Covina, Holy Name of Mary in San Dimas, St. John Vianney Catholic Church in Hacienda Heights, and St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic Church in Rowland Heights.
8. United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, “Housing First,” <https://www.usich.gov/solutions/housing/housing-first>.
9. United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, “Implementing Housing First in Permanent Supportive Housing,” https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Implementing_Housing_First_in_Permanent_Supportive_Housing.pdf.
10. Sean G. Massey et al., “Pathways Housing First for Homeless Persons with Psychiatric Disabilities: Program Innovation, Research, and Advocacy,” *Journal of Social Issues* 69, no. 4 (December 2013): 647.
11. *Ibid.*, 651.
12. Ana Stefancic and Sam Tsemberis, “Housing First for Long-Term Shelter Dwellers with Psychiatric Disabilities in a Suburban County: A Four-Year Study of Housing Access and Retention,” *Journal of Primary Prevention* 28, no. 3–4 (August 2007): 27.
13. Todd P. Gilmer et al., “Fidelity to the Housing First Model and Effectiveness of Permanent Supported Housing Programs in California,” *Psychiatric Services* 65, no. 11 (November 2014): 1311.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. Todd P. Gilmer et al., “Variation in the Implementation of California’s Full Service Partnerships for Persons with Serious Mental Illness,” *Health Services Research* 48, no. 6 (December 2013): 2245.
18. *Ibid.*, 2264.
19. Nicholls and Atherton’s study examined two case studies of Housing First models in New York City. The two programs examined were Pathways to Housing and Project Renewal.
20. Carol McNaughton Nicholls and Iain Atherton, “Housing First: Considering Components for Successful Resettlement of Homeless People with Multiple Needs,” *Housing Studies* 26, no. 5 (July 2011): 775.
21. Seema L. Clifasefi et al., “Exposure to Project-Based Housing First Is Associated with Reduced Jail Time and Bookings,” *International Journal of Drug Policy* 24, no. 4 (July 2013): 295.
22. *Ibid.*
23. Dennis P. Culhane and Stephen Metraux, “Rearranging the Deck Chairs or Reallocating the Lifeboats?: Homelessness and Its Alternatives,” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 74, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 116.
24. *Ibid.*, 119.
25. *Ibid.*

YOUNG SCHOLAR AWARDS PROGRAM

26. Bethany L. Letiecq, Elaine A. Anderson, and Sally A. Koblinsky, "Social Support of Homeless and Housed Mothers: A Comparison of Temporary and Permanent Housing Arrangements," *Family Relations* 47, no. 4 (October 1998): 419.
27. *Ibid.*, 420.
28. Dennis P. Culhane and Randall Kuhn, "Patterns and Determinants of Public Shelter Utilization Among Homeless Adults in New York City and Philadelphia," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17, no. 1 (Winter 1998): 38.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Laudan Y. Aron and Patrick T. Sharkey, "The 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients: A Comparison of Faith-Based and Secular Non-Profit Programs," *Urban Institute* (March 2002): 1, http://cdn.publicinterestnetwork.org/assets/gY4cn4x2qr8qYdWjCXXYOw/urban_survey.pdf.
31. *Ibid.*, 3.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. Martha R. Burt and Laudan Y. Aron, "Ending Homelessness in Santa Monica: Current Efforts and Recommended Next Steps," *Urban Institute* (December 2006): 69, <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/411410-Ending-Homelessness-in-Santa-Monica.PDF>.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*, 169.
37. Thomas P. Fodor and Lois S. Grossman, "Housing the Homeless: SROs and Transitional Housing: Critical Responses," *Built Environment* 14, no. 3 (1988): 218.
38. Martha R. Burt and Barbara E. Cohen, "Who Is Helping the Homeless? Local, State, and Federal Responses," *Publius* 19, no. 3 (Summer 1989): 127.
39. Union Station Homeless Services, "2015-2016 Annual Report," Union Station Homeless Services, <http://unionstationhs.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Annual-Report-2015-16-FINAL012317nomarks.pdf>.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Union Station Homeless Services, "2015-2016 Annual Report."
42. *Ibid.*
43. Los Angeles Mission, "History," <https://losangelesmission.org/learn/about/history/>.
44. Los Angeles Mission, "Financial Statements with Independent Auditors' Report June 30, 2016 and 2015," <http://losangelesmission.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/LAM-Financials-2016-Final.pdf>.
45. Los Angeles Mission, "Services and Programs," <https://losangelesmission.org/learn/services-and-programs/>.
46. Los Angeles Mission, "Financial Statements with Independent Auditors' Report June 30, 2016 and 2015."
47. Los Angeles Mission, "Los Angeles Mission: The Crossroads of Hope," <https://losangelesmission.org/>.
48. Homeless client interview 21, interview with the author, Glendora, January 5, 2017.
49. Homeless client interview 11, interview with the author, Glendora, January 5, 2017.
50. Homeless client interview 1, interview with the author, Glendora, January 4, 2017; Homeless client interview 21.
51. Glendora city official, interview with the author, Glendora, September 26, 2016.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Ibid.*