



Vera Institute of Justice.

Outline of strategies for reducing the numbers and improving the living conditions of the men housed at the Men's Shelter on the Bowery.

Men's Shelter

VERA INSTITUTE
LIBRARY
2037

The following report on the Men's Shelter is an outline of strategies for reducing the numbers and improving the living conditions of the "homeless" men who presently are using the Shelter services. This report probably will not please many readers. It does not offer any magical solutions to the complex social problems of men on the Bowery. We have found no new, dramatic ways to alleviate their personal misery or erase the burden carried by the surrounding neighborhood. We have purposely avoided any pie-in-the-sky measures that would involve the expenditure of millions of unavail^Aable dollars.

Our recommendations do call for both an outlay of some additional funds and a major coordination of services by the network of different agencies which share responsibility for the men who now must turn to the Shelter. Our step-by-step plan with specific recommendations for each agency includes:

1. study extensively the referral system leading men to and from the Shelter to identify potential diversion targets and to tighten referral procedures.
2. set up alternative, secure, low-cost housing off the Bowery for recovering alcoholics, ex-mental patients, and supported workers; upgrade existing Bowery housing.
3. improve the physical condition of the Shelter facility, as well as the service delivery system to the reduced numbers of men relying on the Shelter.

4. establish a new, non-profit supported work project which would help rehabilitate recovering alcoholics and provide needed services to both the "homeless" men and the surrounding community.

We feel that our proposals are practical, realistic and with concerted effort, could produce some long-range effects. Thus, what follows is first, a summary of what could be done, who should do it, and an estimate of how much it would cost, and second, a fuller description of our recommendations and the rationale for proposing these solutions.

IV. Supported Work:

We recommend the creation of a non-profit supported work program providing jobs for fifty "homeless" men performing public service work in the Bowery community. Wildcat Service Corporation and the Manhattan Bowery Project could co-sponsor such a program which would assist men to become independent and possibly to leave the skid-row environment.

Wildcat could provide the administrative expertise. At this time, Wildcat would not be able to consider adding an alcoholic population to its own program, nor do its crewmembers seem interested in working in projects on the Bowery, but its five years of experience could provide valuable marketing, planning and administrative services. The Manhattan Bowery Project could supply the on-site supervision of workers and projects.

Based on the original Wildcat model, the funds for the project would come for a combination of sources: HR grants will cover part of the salaries of the supported workers; some reimbursements for services provided, while small at first, could cover some project costs, and the bulk of support would come from project grants from such agencies as LEAA, CETA, DOE and NIAAA. Individual components of the project are discussed below, but, in summary, the overall costs for the first year for fifty workers and five projects would be about \$575,000. Reimbursements would bring in about \$144,000 leaving the need to find funding ^{for} about \$431,000. A proposed budget follows:

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR A NON-PROFIT SUPPORTED WORK PROJECT

Expenses:

Salaries:

7 work supervisors @ \$12,000	96,600
+ 15% fringe	
1 Project director 18,000	20,700
+15% fringe	
50 supported workers @ \$4940	271,700
+10% fringe	
Administrative staffing and overhead; i.e. payroll, marketing, planning secretarial (summarized)	100,000

Projects:

Escort Service (15 men)	
Uniforms @ \$150	3,250
Walkie Talkies @ \$1,000	3,000
Laundry Service (10 Men)	
plant operation	60,000
supplies, overhead	7,200
Street Clean-up (8 men)	
supplies	1,500
uniforms @\$150	1,200
Wall Mural (6 men)	
supplies	3,100
consultants	2,000
Physical upgrading (painting, tree planting etc.) (11 men)	
supplies - paint, tools etc.	4,000
uniforms	275

TOTAL \$574, 525

Income:

HR payments (195.50 per man per month)	117,600
Charges for services, i.e. laundry	6,000
Reimbursements from HRA clothing and trans- portation budget (proposed)	20,000

TOTAL \$143,600

Recruitment could easily begin among the men in the Bowery who have already had some work experience or period of sobriety, such as the Shelter's own work program, outpatients in the MBP clinic, "volunteers" from the Bowery Residents Committee. These programs should continue to operate as a feeder into the supported work project but all have expressed a need for a work outlet for their men. A brief description of the current embryonic programs will suffice to demonstrate the availability of "work ready" recovering alcoholics who could be served by such a program.

- The Shelter's own work program consisting of 40 men each working approximately 10 hours per week, earning between \$18.50 and \$27.50 per week performing mostly custodial duties inside the Shelter but also doing some painting, escorting men to hospitals and clinics and cleaning Third Street twice a day. The program is very loosely structured and men volunteer for job assignments.

- STEP II's program at the Hotel Endicott includes 10 hours per week of cleaning along Broadway between 72nd and 96 Streets. The super vacs and other supplies are paid for by local merchants. Each man works only an undemanding one hour or so a week and is paid a small allowance. The man also receive limited job counseling and can only stay on the program for six months.

- The Bowery Resident's Committee on the Bowery has a staff of 5 or 6 ex-derelicts trained to work as counselors

and recreation aides 25 hours per week and another larger group of men who volunteer their time, often as much as 25 hours per week, running a coffee shop, cleaning, mopping, and manning the front door.

- Project Renewal in Brooklyn, set up by the Manhattan Bowery Project, has a contract with CETA to clean 80 playlots around the city and each of the 20 men in the project earn \$85 per week. Vocational counseling, job finding, and encounter-style therapy groups are important components of this program. As the strongest work program of ex-alcoholics, a number of its graduates would make likely candidates for supervisory positions in a work program on the Bowery.

- About 100 patients of the MBP outpatient clinic who are detoxified and in counseling programs have been identified as "work ready" and need job placements.

Proposed Projects -

A full description of some of the public service jobs that could be performed by this initial group of fifty men follows. Of course, there may be other needs and jobs that could be identified later.

1. Escort Service - will provide, by appointment, escorts for men traveling to and from the hospital, clinics AA meetings, trips to investigate alternative housing, and other identified trips outside the Bowery community. Easy Ride, the Lower East Side transportation project of the Vera Institute, is available to provide lower cost, or no-cost transportation. This could account for a considerable savings

to the Shelter's present transportation budget which could be a source of re-imbusement to the project. Escorts would also assist men in getting to their lodging houses, to meals, out of the "Big Room" of the Shelter, to the laundry and other day facilities in the area.

Once the state sobering-up station is opened on nearby Lafayette Street a few blocks from the Shelter, escorts could assist men and women to its 24-bed, 24 hour care.

It is in the realm of "street work" that the escorts could be the most effective. Dressed in uniforms and perhaps equipped with walkie-talkies, the escorts could patrol the streets and could provide a variety of needed services: identifying those needing sobering-up at the state station, alerting MBP's rescue car to those needing more serious medical attention, being the "eyes and ears" of the police to spot potential trouble areas and disruptive men, deterring harrassment of community residents by aggressive or acting out men, also protecting the men from hurting themselves. The escorts could also be trained in providing emergency medical care, first aid, and assistance to the possible hospital commitment of the occasional mentally deranged man undergoing a psychotic break alone on the streets.

Most importantly, they would constitute a presence on the streets that would offer security to both the weaker alcoholics and the elderly community residents by isolating the "Hawks" from their normal prey. It is difficult to directly confront the criminal behaviour of these "Hawks".

We feel a protection system might constitute a more effective, less dangerous way to deal with this problem.

Ideally, such a service could operate in the evening hours as well as the day. The captain of the local precinct, the 9th, while not concerned with crimes against homeless men as such, had success in using a civilian guard in his last command and seems open to such a proposal. Recruitment and training would have to be carefully worked out.

Thus, the Bowery escort service will provide protection and security for both the derelicts and the community in general and will lead, hopefully, to an expanded use of existing services by the Bowery men.

Budget: As a labor-intensive project, costs for materials would be low. Considering 15 men, more than enough to cover two-eight hour shifts, seven days a week, the only OTPS costs would be for uniforms (at @\$150 per set) and three walkie-talkies (@ \$1000 per set) for a total of \$6,250.

Another major aspect of the escort service would be training but a number of agencies offer free training in the type of skills the escorts need, for example, the Red Cross offers free first-aid and cardiopulmonary treatment training. Local crime detection units of police precincts give free block-watchers training and the Manhattan Bowery Project has nine years experience in training its people to work with derelicts in the streets. Local mental health clinics, such as Beth Israel, would be available to train the escorts in dealing with psychiatric patients.

And as previously noted, a possible area of reimbursement for services is HRA's budgeted expenditures for transportation, at the current rate of 50¢ per ride on public transportation. Easy Ride's rates -- which could be either free or at the proposed rate of 15¢ - could account for considerable savings to HRA and a possible source of income to the Escort Service. We have estimated it to be about \$10,000 but ~~that is~~ a more solid estimation of actual use of Easy Ride would have to be made. ~~rather rough.~~

2. Laundry Service - would consist of a service that would 1. wash and/or dry clean a man's clothing while 2. he was taking a shower, having a haircut or shave and possibly undergoing de-lousing, if necessary. It would be operated on an assembly line basis so that a man would meet his clothes after an hour or so and a number system could be used so a man could not use the lounge and showering service for more than that hour's time. There is a closed laundromat on Second Avenue, north of Third Street that might be investigated as a possible site. (As of now, we have been unable to locate and question the owner about costs and suitability.)

At the present time there are no easily available and frequently utilized showering and laundering service for the men. Getting a shower at the Shelter is difficult at best and involves much waiting time to get a caseworker's approval and the ability to maneuver around the bureaucratic system. The men are actually discouraged from asking for a shower, unless they are very loused up and in dire need. There are

only three working shower heads and no personnel or enough towels to service the area. Apparently, there is one, uninstalled washing machine at the Shelter.

While a man could get a shower at his lodging house he must pay a deposit for his towel and worry that his belongings are being ripped off because the area is most often unsupervised. Missions which do have showers limit their clientele to the most stable men, a qualification that applies to all too many services on the Bowery.

Presently, the commonly accepted practice is to wear one's clothes until they literally fall off or become so loused up they are thrown away and a new set is requested through the Shelter's other bureaucratic system, clothing issuing. A new set costs between \$12 and \$15 and the city has contracts with four private vendors^{who supply} used, clean clothes. The Shelter's total clothing budget was \$80,000 last year but it is difficult to estimate how many issues each man may receive. The policy is to give out new sets "as needed" but clearly some men abuse the system more than others by using it more frequently. The only other laundry that exists is a service laundromat on Second Avenue that charges per pound and thus is not used by the Bowery men.

The laundry/shower service will give needed services to the men, will provide off-street space and time which is sorely needed, and may, perhaps, save the city some of its clothing costs.

Budget:

The initial capital outlay for a completely new laundry consisting of 6-8 washers and 4-6 dryers, plus one dry cleaning machine would roughly work out to at least \$60,000 and a used set-up has been estimated in the range of \$35,000 to \$40,000 depending on the condition of the machines. (Repairs contracts with mechanics usually run about \$75-\$100 per month plus the costs of parts.) This does not include the monthly charges for rent, garbage pick up, gas, oil, electricity and water. The outlay for the other half of the service: five shower heads, four sinks, two barber chairs, mirrors, lounge furniture etc. would be another \$15,000, depending on the amount of plumbing needed to be done.

Added to the low figure of a used service, \$60,000, would be another estimated \$600 per month in rent, utilities and supplies. (\$7200 per year.)

Thus, the initial investment and operating costs would be somewhat high. A token fee of 25¢ for the laundry and shower service could be charged each man. The service could be open five days a week and if we estimate that 10% or 120 of the 1200 men who use the Shelter each day would come to the laundry/shower service, we could roughly estimate a income of about \$6,000 annual, if most men paid. This would mean that about 15 men per hour for 8 hours would use the service. Ten workers and two barbers (from nearby "Barber Schools") could handle the flow of customers. In addition, perhaps \$10,000 of the Shelter's \$80,000 clothing budget could be allocated for reimbursement for this service.

3. Pick up and sweeping of Streets -

The Shelter's work support program is already sweeping Third Street twice a day and this service could and should be expanded to First and Second Streets, the Bowery and Second Avenue, especially the more heavily trafficked commercial areas north of Third Street. It could be begun on a small basis and extended as need and ability develop. Also, trash receptacles, while present on the Avenues, are non-existent on the side streets. They should be provided and serviced by the workers. The total clean up should include not only sweeping but also picking up of accumulated trash and broken bottles. Arrangements can be made with the city Sanitation department to pick up plastic bags of trash in the receptacles. This could be an important public relations service to the residents of the community who complain of the messy conditions of the streets.

Budget: As another labor-intensive project, the costs would not be too high. An estimated \$2700 would be needed to provide brooms, shovels, other tools, a year's supply of plastic utility bags and uniforms for 6 - 8 men, sufficient staff to handle 12-16 street frontages in the area.

4. Painting, planting of trees - general visual upgrading of the Bowery area. The proliferation of derelicts and the extensive number of abandoned buildings and empty lots all contribute to the depressing, run-down feeling of the Bowery. But Fourth Street with its painted shops and

and theatres is an excellent example of the imaginative use of paint to uplift an area. The long-neglected streets around the Shelter could benefit from the planting of trees, cleaning up of debris-ridden lots, and the painting of buildings, fire escapes and gates.

Budget: Again, labor is the crucial factor. Individual estimates are difficult to make as of now since each building presents different problems with the degree of scraping, preparation, size, etc. A gross estimate of costs of supplies is \$3,000 or so and an additional \$900 for tree planting on Third Street.

5. Wall Mural - The painting of a colorful, thematic wall mural on the side of the Shelter building itself or some other appropriate Shelter building would also immediately upgrade the area. City Arts Workshop, a Lower

Budget: East Side group, is interested in helping set up mural workshops in other areas of the city. They are funded partly by the National Endowment on the Arts and the NYS Council of the Arts and the non-profit project could possibly apply for a grant for a wall mural. If not, it is estimated that the costs of materials, paint, scaffolding, tools, uniforms, etc. would run about \$3,100 and consultant fee would be \$2,000. Perhaps youths in the neighborhood could be hired under the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer budget so they could work along with the supported workers. Projects take about four months to complete and workers could then be re-assigned to existing or newly developed projects.

b. There is another aspect of supported work, which could be help ful to an overall approach of improving both the Shelter and services to homeless men.

. As has been mentioned throughout this report, a number of work projects could be completed by the Wildcat Service Coporation, at its current rate of \$2.00 per man per hour worked. They include:

1. providing paraprofessional aides to agencies working with ex-mental hopsital population, e.g. the NYSDMH mental health clinic proposed for the Shelter and sponsored by St. Vincent's Hospital and a SRO supported housing project for hospital releasees.

2. renovating deteriorated SROs to meet inspection requirements so they can qualify for supported housing program for ex-mental patients. Projects would be paid for by SRO owners and/or project grants to help start-up such a housing project.

3. renovating existing lodging houses in the Bowery with start-up funds generated by the NYS Department of Mental Hygiene.

4. providing the managerial and maintenance skills to run a SRO supported work project or a "community residence" in a city-owned SRO either as a separate Wildcat project, or in connection with a voluntary agency already involved with ex-mental patients.

RECOMMENDATIONS	AGENCY	ESTIMATED COST (annual)
<u>I. Referral System:</u>		
a. undertake a thorough study of referral system leading men to and from Shelter to identify users, referral points and diversion targets	HRA - in cooperation with referring agencies, police, hospitals, etc.	\$10,000
b. review administrative procedures for giving assistance to "homeless" men	IMCs and EAU of HRA	
<u>II. Housing:</u>		
a. expand STEP programs from two to six to house 100-200 recovering alcoholics	NYSDMH and NYCDMHH AND NIAAA - provide program funding for staff	\$240,000
	HRA - put men on HR assistance	\$235,200 (100) \$470,400 (200)
	local community- contract with STEP for small work projects	
b. set up two new programs of SRO supported housing for approximately 300 ex-mental patients	NYSDMH and NYCDMHH- provide program funding	
	OSHS of HRA - provide training and staffing	\$180,000
	Wildcat - provide paraprofessional workers; competitive contracts for renovating below standard SROs	
	NYSDMH - reconsider Community Residence status for housing of ex-mental patients	
	local hospitals, mental health clinics, social work schools - provide part time professional staffing	

RECOMMENDATIONS	AGENCY	ESTIMATED COST (annual)
<u>II. Housing (continued)</u>		
c. upgrade existing Bowery housing	HRA - inspect lodging houses for violations; set up dormitory for 50-100 men on Shelter fifth floor	no additional cost
	NYS DMH - provide start-up monies to upgrade section of lodging house	\$22,000
d. set up SRO housing for 50 workers in a supported work program	HRA - put men on HR assistance	\$117,600
	Wildcat - establish work program (see below)	
<u>III. Shelter-</u>		
a. re-organize administration and staffing along lines of MBP report	HRA	no additional cost - present budget would be re-allocated to fit needs of reduced population
b. improve physical condition of facility	HRA - extend Shelter's supported work program to painting, kitchen etc.	
	Community Board #3- consider a new proposal from HRA for community development monies	\$1,000,000
c. improve control of security guard system	HRA - study different methods of reporting and supervision	
d. organize citizens advisory board to Shelter	HRA, Coalition on Men's Shelter, committee of clients - cooperate to set up board	

RECOMMENDATIONS

AGENCY

ESTIMATED
COST (annual)IV. Supported work:

- | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| a. establish a non-profit supported work project for fifty recovering alcoholics recruited from existing work programs on Bowery | Wildcat - co-sponsor and provide administrative overhead | \$574,525 |
| | MBP - co-sponsor and provide on-site supervision of projects and men | |
| | HR - put men on public assistance to provide salary funds | \$117,600 |
| | <u>reimburse for services</u> LEAA, CETA, DOE and/or NIAAA - provide project grants to help start up program | \$ 20,000
\$431,000 |
| b. Wildcat Service Corporation should bid for paid contracts in related Shelter areas. | | |
| 1. paraprofessional aides | | |
| 2. renovate sub-standard SROs to qualify them as housing for ex-mental patients, workers or as "Community Residences" | | |
| 3. manage a SRO housing project as a "CR". | | |

I. Referral System:

In recent years the total population annually serviced by the Shelter has decreased from 11,500 in 1973 to about 9,000 in 1976. However, community opposition has intensified as the population has changed from predominately white, older alcoholics to a mix composed of some traditional, skid-row alcoholics, more younger, black alcoholics, more multiply addicted men and increased numbers of patients recently released from the NY state mental hospitals.

How did these men get to the Shelter? In looking for answers to this question we were hampered by conflicting opinions within agencies about their reliance on the Shelter and by a lack of solid information about the referral points to the Shelter. Our knowledge of these routes is therefore incomplete.

Statistics provided by HRA show that ex-mental patients now account for close to 40% of the total population using the Shelter each year. And, in spite of the fact that they have greater difficulty managing their lives and suffer from more severe psychological disturbances than the traditional alcoholic, a mental health clinic to help meet some of their needs is still in the planning stages.

The ex-mental patients seem to end up at the Shelter when they deteriorate in aftercare programs set up for them upon their release (the quality of the aftercare set-up varies greatly from hospital to hospital) or, as some allege, when they

are directly referred to the Shelter by their releasing hospitals or others in the referral system.

Many of them should not have been released in the first place. For most, medicated or not but usually disoriented, the Bowery is a dangerous and frightening place, ill-equipped to deal with their special problems. They are easy victims for the "Hawks" which are plaguing the Bowery neighborhood. Obviously, supportive housing facilities and aftercare programs are needed to help these patients stay in their communities and away from the Shelter. Since they are eligible for SSI and Medicaid, they are prime targets for any diversion program.

Other studies reveal that the percentage of men at the Shelter who are there for the first time that year - the so-called "new" cases--has risen substantially over the past ten years. In 1966, 28% of all shelter clients were "new" and in 1976 the figure had increased to 48%. Of these "new" cases, about one third is increasing its length of stay each year. Presumably, the more seriously mentally disturbed patients are making up a large proportion of these "new" cases who rely heavily on Shelter services.

However, the other two thirds, or about 3,000 men per year, leave the Shelter after only a few days stay. They are likely to be those men who are inappropriately referred to the Shelter by Income Maintenance Centers, Emergency Assistance Unit, police and hospitals. The HRA agencies are restricted in the type and amount of services they can give to "homeless" and single males because of a tightening up of HR and SSI eligibility. These men

are caught in a vicious circle -- they turn to their local welfare centers for assistance but are categorized as "homeless" because they have no address and are sent to the Shelter. Perhaps some of their needs could be met locally -- a solution that may only become obvious once their particular needs and routes to the Shelter are studied more carefully than we have been able to do. While the stay of many of these men may be relatively brief, the administrative demands on the Shelter personnel is heavy and diverting them could free up the staff to deal more effectively with long-term users.

Also, many of the men who end up at the Shelter are the victims of the administrative procedures of a bureaucratic system which has built-in barriers to giving support to those most in need. The DSS requirements needed to prove eligibility for public assistance -- face to face interviews, employment interviews and physical exams etc. -- are too strictly applied to a population that is made up of drinking derelicts or mentally ill people, many of whom are medically diagnosed as schizophrenics. All the often the deranged or alcoholic man, unable to comply with confusing rules and frequent reporting dates, is cut off from assistance and through a variety of routes ends up at the Shelter. This bouncing on and off different aspects of the system is, of course, vastly more expensive to the taxpayer than well-planned, preventive services and programs.

It has been argued that diversion cannot be controlled at the point of referral since there are "hundreds" of referral sources to the Shelter. The New York State Democratic Task Force

Report, "Shelter Care for Men", identified seven major referral sources: self-referral (18.4%), friends (19.9%), Income Maintenance Centers (14.8%), Hospitals (8.1%), Police (6.1%), Social Security (7%), and private agencies (14.2%). The balance is unknown.

Even a very preliminary look at some clients has revealed an area where immediate tightening up could bring about some changes. The Division of Post Institutions Services of DSS provides case work services to ex-mental patients who had been in continuous care in mental hospitals for at least five years. Presently, there are about 1500 DOPIS cases living in NYC, with an expected growth rate of about 50 per month. Many of them live in SROs and while they are seen by their caseworkers every so often, it is not unusual for some to find their way to the Shelter when they become disoriented. By simply providing the Shelter staff with the computerized listing of all DOPIS clients, unnecessary stays, even brief ones, at the Shelter could be eliminated.

The whole area of referral points and administrative procedures of the Department of Social Services deserves much greater investigation than we have been able to give at this time and we recommend to HRA that it undertake a more exhaustive study. We estimate that it would cost approximately \$10,000 to hire an outside planner - including salary, fringes and a small allowance for intra-city travel --for the six months it would probably take to undertake a thorough study of the referral picture. However, if HRA assigns one of its own staff this cost could be eliminated.

Despite the apparent abundance of figures available, there exist no hard data showing typical routes taken by men on their way to the Shelter, pinpointing who these men are, why they are coming, where they come from and where they go once they leave. Such information would allow for more systematic planning, better coordination of agencies' services and possibly the discovery of diversion points which would head off some men before they arrive at the Shelter. However, without such data, it is difficult at this time to offer any more specific recommendations which would lead to a reduction of the numbers of men referred to the Shelter.

II. Housing:

The most startling aspect which evidenced itself during the course of this study was the ^{contrast between the} spirit of community and caring we observed in small-group residential programs ~~and~~ the aimless, despairing character of the men waiting on the cafeteria line or milling about the "Big Room" of the Shelter. Housing which provides dignity, some independence and supports is the priority need of the men currently turning to the Shelter for assistance. Alternative housing should be set up for a) recovering alcoholics in a network of STEP programs; b) ex-mental patients supported by SSI and c) workers in a supported work program for alcoholics. Such diversionary programs could take about 450 men from the Bowery and reduce the population at the Shelter allowing the staff to concentrate its casework services to a smaller group of men.

In addition, the existing housing on the Bowery, the sub-standard, privately owned but city-supported lodging houses, must be upgraded to provide those left on the Bowery with decent living conditions. Presently, there are about 1200 men each night sleeping in the six lodging houses contracted by the city for its clients. The conditions of the houses has been well-documented - roach-infested, poorly lit and badly ventilated little cubicles with minimal toilet facilities and no day-time accommodations. A less therapeutic environment for alcoholic and mentally ill men could not be

imagined. The frequent and expensive re-admissions to hospitals and the difficulties in rehabilitating long-term Shelter clients are probable results of these living conditions.

There are alternatives both on and off the Bowery which could provide better housing at little or no additional costs to the city. Our recommendations in the area of housing include:

a. Increase the number of STEP programs from two to six by expanding the program to other SROs in Manhattan and Brooklyn.

An expanded program of 4 new STEP programs, housing 20-25 men each, could provide alternative housing for approximately 100 men (or 200 men if done on six months cycle) at a cost of about \$240,000 per year (\$60,000 each). This would include the same staffing as the current STEP programs, but an added vocational counselor working full-time. (See budget, Appendix A - at end of Housing Section.)

NIAAA and the NYSDMH could be approached to continue their sponsorship of STEP-type programs. The Bureau of Alcoholism of NYSDMH is proposing a cut of about one third of its budget by closing some of its direct service delivery programs, including, most prominently, five alcohol residential units in the New York City area. The bureau expects to divert its funding from direct delivery of service to the support of locally-planned and operated programs. The STEP programs are excellent examples of the type of local programming that would be eligible for these diverted funds.

The upgrading would include painting, plastering and adding toilet facilities - most of which Wildcat could do at a lower cost than private contractors. Hopefully, such a first step might encourage other owners to upgrade their facilities, especially if improved houses are assigned Shelter clients on a preferred basis.

Another possible approach is to inspect lodging houses on the same basis that SROs are inspected for use by welfare clients. Those with violations would have to be taken off the Shelter's list until they are cleared up. However, there are numerous political and ^{legislative} difficulties with this idea and we feel economic pressure might, in the long run, be more effective. If the population of the Bowery declines with the proposed diversion to off-Bowery housing, it might be possible to use the decreased occupancy rates to foster competition among the lodging houses to pressure owners for repairs and renovations in return for referrals.

Finally, another alternative would be to establish a dormitory on the fifth floor for about 50-100 men. The recreation room on the fifth floor is closed at five p.m. and cots could easily be set up, there are already adequate bathroom facilities. Perhaps those men who come to the Shelter after midnight and are housed in the lounge of the Big Room, sleeping on benches, could use this floor. Or men from the supported work program could be housed here. The savings in lodging houses tickets, at \$1.65 per man per night could pay for a small staff to manage the dormitory. (MBP's detox unit on the fourth floor has few problems with a 48-bed facility manned by a small staff each night.)

A number of Jane West and Endicott graduates continue to live in other sections of the hotel, returning to STEP to socialize and receive help as needed. They have stabilized other floors of the SROs-- a rippling effect that is an added dividend of the project. Owners of SROs seem willing to cooperate with renting sections of their buildings because the programs bring stability and assured occupancy of a number of rooms. Even the communities involved which were originally opposed to the idea relented once the positive results of supported housing became evident.

b. We recommend that a system of supported SRO housing be established for selected numbers of ex-mental patients currently using the Shelter. The project should be coordinated either by HRA directly or by a private voluntary agency supported by public funds. The model would be the Aberdeen Project at the Hotel Aberdeen located in a non-residential area of midtown, briefly described below.

We feel that it would be feasible to set up two such programs, each housing between 100-150 men, thus bringing about 300 ex-mental hospital patients to a more stable, therapeutic and humane environment. The total costs for such programs is estimated to be \$180,000 or about \$600 per person per year (not including SSI costs.) Food service would vary, changing the costs of the program, depending on the facilities of the selected hotels. This SRO housing alternative for ex-mental patients is another example of the type of local planning and programming that would be eligible for funding from the NYS DMH. (See budget in Appendix B at end of

Housing section.)

The two current programs both have waiting lists among men who have gone through detoxification. The costs are relatively low since the men are supported on HR grants (about \$246 per month) and food stamps. They live in single rooms of a hotel, the Jane West in the Village or the Endicott on the Upper West Side, paying approximately \$150 per month in rent and \$60 (or \$38 in food stamps) for three meals a day, prepared and eaten communally.

Total program costs are just under \$45,000 to cover staff and supplies. The staff at the Endicott is composed of full time director and counselor and part-time vocational rehabilitation counselor, health educator and psychiatrist, (A number of tenants also attend Roosevelt Hospital's outpatient clinic as Medicaid patients.)

The men at the Endicott operate a small cleaning business sweeping the streets of upper Broadway aided by some funds from local merchants. One basic improvement in an expanded program would have to be the strengthening of the vocational rehabilitation services and work component so the men will be exposed to more training and job opportunities during their stay. Perhaps the enrollment period should be extended from six months to one year.

The Endicott program is sponsored jointly by a grant from NIAAA and the NYS Department of Mental Hygiene (NYSDMH). The Jane West program is similar and its costs are covered by NYSDMH and the NYC Department of Mental Health and Hygiene.

The Aberdeen Project houses 170 hospital releasees supported on SSI and by a casework system cooperatively run by seven public and private agencies, including the Office of Special Housing of HRA, the Hudson Guild and Bellevue Hospital. There is a limited meal service, tenants eat most meals in local restaurants and a banking service is provided to help tenants manage their monthly checks. Many tenants attend day programs, school, training programs, mental health clinics, but many are also at the hotel for the entire day. No night-time or weekend staff has been assigned or is needed. All have had extensive histories of hospitalization in state mental hospitals and a study done by Bellevue Psychiatric Dept. has shown that one effect of the program has been a marked decrease in the frequency of costly re-hospitalizations. Again, the atmosphere of communality, even in this comparatively large group setting, was remarkable.

The Aberdeen's success is based on two factors: 1) staff is not recruited or assigned but is composed of people who have volunteered after visiting the program. Thus, staff enthusiasm and morale seems high; 2) seven local agencies have joined together to help the program work. Their approach is based on teamwork not hierarchy, responsibility and funding are shared. The total costs for the Aberdeen model is about \$80,000 per year, including a special \$9,000 grant from NYSDMH and NYCDMHH for some food and a small work project and a \$2,000 grant from the National Council on the Arts for an art program. Salaries for the Office of Special Housing staff of one social worker and two aides is \$35,000 annually, plus fringes (one aide

is on the CETA payroll). The other eleven part-time workers representing a variety of agencies include three psychiatrists, social worker, social work students, activity therapists and health aides at a total salary cost of another \$35,000.

We are well aware that such supportive housing needs a main sponsor to coordinate and establish the program, as well as close cooperation among different agencies. Some of the other issues which would have to be worked out include:

Facilities:

SRO Managers who are experiencing high vacancy rates would have to be identified and approached on their willingness to open their hotels to ex-mental patients. Renovations which may be needed on some buildings currently with violations would have to be paid for by the owners. (Costs for this cannot be calculated until such buildings are identified.) Guaranteed occupancy is a device used successfully to encourage owners to renovate their hotels. Wildcat, perhaps, could bid competitively for some of these renovation and repair jobs. Or funding agencies, such as SDMH, could provide some start up monies for renovations as part of a grant package. Ideally, non-residential areas could be found but if that is not possible, careful education and preparation

community leaders would have to take place to help insure their necessary cooperation.

Staffing -

The Office of Special Housing Service, if funded, has experienced personnel to provide training and casework services for an expanded program. Wildcat could provide paraprofessional aides (either crewmembers or graduates) at a lower cost. A cooperative system made up of hospitals, social work schools, mental health clinics etc. would have to be set up to provide professional medical and psychiatric services. Clients who are eligible for Medicaid could pay for other out-patient psychiatric costs, as needed.

Other supports-

Assistance from HRA and SSI would be needed to divert men from the "homeless" category to HR or SSI assistance. And, of course, HRA caseworkers at the Shelter would conduct a screening and referral process to select appropriate men.

Another possible way to fund such a supported housing system would be through a re-consideration of the status of "Community Residences" by the State Department of Mental Hygiene. Currently, "Community Residences" are licensed by the state, receiving both start-up and program monies, to provide non-institutional housing for hospital releasees. But SROs do not qualify for "CR" status under the interpretation currently in operation. The main problems seems to be size - "CRs" are usually defined as small group homes, for about 25 people, with a 24-hour staff. However, the availability of

such housing facilities in a city like New York is somewhat limited. We believe that the state should investigate the existing SRO programs for ex-mental hospital patients to determine if the preventive, supportive care they provide achieves the same ends as those defined for "Community Residences".

A favorable reconsideration of SRO housing could allow an organization like Wildcat to lease a city-owned SRO and run it as a "Community Residence" for ex-mental patients. Wildcat could provide the custodial, kitchen, maintenance, managerial and paraprofessional services and "contract out", at no cost, for professional services.

c. In considering the problem of on-Bowery housing we have found that it is much more difficult to loosen the stranglehold of the private lodging houses on the housing situation than it is to set up alternative housing. Because of the monopolistic arrangement, there seems to be few leverage available to pry the lodging house owners into upgrading on their own needed renovations and repairs. The houses are run virtually independently of city or state inspection or certification. One proposal that might be helpful, at least in alleviating the daily misery of the men who stay on the Bowery, is public funding of needed renovations. Again, it is the NYSDMH which has already expressed interest. They have suggested using some \$22,000 in existing NYSDMH start-up monies for a demonstration project to upgrade a section of a lodging house for use by 75 ex-mental patients who would be clients in their proposed mental health clinic at the Shelter.

will be met by the partial state funding of the proposed mental health clinic and by the projected reduction in the Shelter population.

b. The physical condition of the building and the maintenance and repair services are in great need of improvement. The community residents rightly complain of the unsanitary odor and the safety problems involved with hundreds of men lining up outside three times a day for meal. The clients and staff can only be further demoralized by the seeming lack of interest in the condition of the building.

HRA had submitted a proposal to local Community Board #3 for one million dollars in 100% federally financed community development funds to affect some renovations. They included: remodeling the first floor to allow better access to the dining room, added toilet facilities and some upgrading of the outside of the building. It was turned down at the time and we feel that HRA should re-work the proposal and re-submit a more detail plan of renovations and costs after discussing it with the Board or the Shelter committee of the Board. While it is too late for submission for fiscal year 1978, it is not too early to begin planning for fiscal year 1979.

In this area of physical upgrading, there already exists in the Shelter structure a group of men in their supported work program who could take on more cleaning, painting, repairing duties. The workers currently clean the floors but their work could be expanded to include running the kitchen, painting and repairing on an on-going basis.

c. The security guard system was of major concern in the 1973 report and our study has revealed that the situation is unchanged. Numerous recommendations have been made in the past by MBP and others in order to deal with this poorly trained, deployed and supervised staff. Incidents of unprovoked attacks on clients have been reported and guards have rarely been observed on duty during many visits to the Shelter. The basic problem remains the lack of an overall, onsite supervisor who is responsible for the security guard staff. Each shift has its own head and often he is not physically stationed at the Shelter. Ideally, the guard staff should report and be responsible to the facility director, but at the least, a supervisor should be at the Shelter and some reporting procedures should be established so tighter control can be insured.

d. Finally, a citizens advisory board should be appointed to meet with and advise the Shelter director and staff on problems relating to the community's and client's concerns. This would resolve the difficulties caused by the serious lack of communication and understanding that exists among the three groups whose daily lives are involved with the Shelter. Interested citizens who are members of the Coalition on the Men's Shelter and clients, perhaps those on the Shelter's supported work program, would be likely candidates for the advisory board.

MBP 2/10/74

d. The third group of current Shelter clients who could be most easily diverted to alternative housing are the fifty or so participants in a proposed supported work program, described in Section IV of this paper. Based on the Wildcat model, the supported workers would be earning about \$95 per week and therefore could pay rents in nearby SROs or one or two of the better Bowery hotels. Again it would be advantageous for the men to live somewhat communally, at least at first. On-site staffing for this housing may not be necessary because the men would more likely be further along the rehabilitation route than the first two groups discussed in this section. They will be receiving counseling and other supports on the job and thus, the alternative living arrangements would need no additional supports or staffing. If HR assistance could be gotten for each worker, at a cost of approximately \$195.50 per month for each of the fifty workers, or \$117,600 per year, the supported work program could augment these funds with monies from project grants. This would enable the work program to pay each man the \$95 weekly salary.

Appendix A - being re-worked

APPENDIX B

Proposed budget for supported housing for ex-
mental patients in SROs

Each program:

Salaries
(full-time):

Project director	\$ 17,000
case aide	10,000
case aide	8,000
social worker,	15,000
social workers, (2, 14 hrs/wk)	<u>5,000</u>

Salaries
(part time)

activity therapists, (2, 14 hrs/wk)	4,000
art program director (1, 7 hrs/wk.)	2,800
nurses aide (1, 7 hour/week)	2,500
home health aide (1, 7 hrs./week)	2,800
psychiatrists (2, total 10 hrs.)	<u>6,500</u>

Total: \$74,300

Other expenses:

office supplies, telephone etc. (rent is usually gratis from SRO hotel)	3,000
<u>food service program</u>	<u>\$ 12,000</u>

\$ 15,000

TOTAL \$89,300

IV. The Shelter:

Establishing off-Bowery housing and possibly reducing the numbers of men using the Shelter seems preferable to closing the present Shelter building on Third Street and setting up a network of new Shelters in other parts of the city.

While there are numerous deficiencies at the Shelter and we cannot support the quality of services currently being provided, the present Shelter does minimally meet a number of the needs of the men. And despite attempts to trace the origins of the population served by the Shelter, we have seen nothing that would justify (based on community ties) the closing of the Men's Shelter and the establishment of a new shelter or a network of smaller ones throughout the city which would provide the same services at the same costs presently provided by the Men's Shelter. Overwhelming community opposition and costs associated with the establishment of such a network seem insurmountable.

Housing and the need for help in managing their lives, including the need for food, clothing, counseling and medical care, seem to be the major motivating factor drawing men to the Shelter. The availability of free meals alone does not seem to play as large a role. For instance, last year the Shelter tightened its procedures for issuing food tickets to ferret out possible "illegal" users of the cafeteria and found mostly elderly pensioners from the neighborhood trying to stretch out their monthly allowances not men from other areas of the city

sponging off a free system.

Figures provided by HRA show that it costs \$1.92 to serve three meals a day per man. That figure includes labor, (including the salary of a nutritionists), as well as supplies and preparation and is remarkably low. Considering the volume of meals served in the small cafeteria space, the actual service of food is also quite efficient.

Adding the average costs per day for three meals, \$1.92 to the costs of one night's lodging, \$1.65, the daily budget per man increases to \$3.57. The total costs of running the Shelter - overhead, staff etc. - brings the total to about \$9.00 per man. While this compares unfavorably to the approximately \$6.35^{a day} it costs to maintain a man on HR, the incremental and capital costs that would be needed to establish a new shelter or shelters off the Bowery are prohibitive.

Also, there is no reason to believe that a re-allocation or increase of resources to support other shelters would attract the same population currently coming to the Bowery or would provide better services to homeless men. In fact, dispersal of services through a network would probably create a worse situation for the men than already exists.

While we are not recommending the closing of the Shelter, we are in no way endorsing the quality of the present service delivery system or the physical condition of the building. The city must consider a re-allocation of funds to upgrade the building and improve services to clients. We have not undertaken the additional task of studying in detail the operations of the

Shelter because the report written by the Manhattan Bowery Corporation in 1973 on Shelter services can be updated to fit present conditions. While a few of their recommendations, especially concerning the establishment of an overall facility director and a casework unit, have been followed, a number of serious problems that were discussed in 1973, still exist in 1977.

Most of the following recommendations, based on that report would not entail any increase in the ^{current} Shelter's budget ^{of just under \$5} because either outside funding would be sought or the overall reduced population would permit more flexibility in re-budgeting needed items. The recommendations include:

a. A review of the personnel structure should be made to eliminate unnecessary positions and hire new workers according to revised needs of a smaller population. As suggested in the 1973 report, improvements could be made in the following areas: increased availability of group and individual counseling for the clients; longer clinic hours; training of staff and para-professionals and use of case conferences; establishment of on-going study of selected clients, including a statistical profile of all clients to facilitate planning of services; some positive staff involvement in the presently neglected "Big Room" of the first floor of the Shelter; and the re-establishment of full-time arts and crafts program.

The overall personnel budget of the Shelter, now at about 2.7 million dollars, would not have to be raised under such re-organization because the need for increased psychiatric staff