November 13, 2019

Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

Council directed me through a budget note last June to organize a public safety working group with three interconnected, long-term goals: (1) reduce response times for first responders by triaging calls more effectively to appropriate service providers; (2) identify resources in multiple bureaus for “Rapid Street Response,” and (3) make recommendations for efficiencies across the public safety system related to day-to-day business operations, technology, administration, communications and outreach.

Commissioner Hardesty and her team, in collaboration with the Mayor’s Office, have worked diligently to develop a Portland Street Response pilot to provide a non-emergency response to people who are experiencing a mental health crisis or have a non-urgent medical issue. The goal of the pilot is to deploy responders, trained in behavioral health, crisis intervention, and medical assistance, to reduce police and firefighter interactions with people who have not committed a crime or who do not require emergency medical attention.

The Portland Street Response pilot will consist of two person teams responding to specifically triaged calls in Fire Management Area #11 (the Lents neighborhood in South East Portland.) At the outset of the pilot, the team will be staffed with an Emergency Medical Services Specialist, currently employed in Portland Fire and Rescue, and a contracted crisis worker. Future teams will consist of an Emergency Medical Responder with a background in crisis work, and either a Crisis Worker or Peer Support Specialist. Data will be collected to analyze which team composition best meets the needs of the community members in need of help.

The team will operate a van equipped with supplies to triage low acuity medical needs, as well as food, water, and other items intended to help reduce the harm and trauma of being on the streets. This pilot will not reduce houselessness or the root causes of it, but it will reduce the trauma associated with being houseless. It will also reduce police contacts with individuals experiencing mental health crises.

The Portland Street Response pilot is the result of work conducted by a stakeholder group of representatives from the City, County, local service providers, and advocates. Input from the houseless community was collected through a community engagement work group, through
listening sessions, and on-the-ground survey work. Because this is a pilot program, it will be flexible, making programmatic changes based on what is learned in the field to constantly improve throughout the pilot period. This means that, at the end of the year, the program may look different than did at its initiation.

Portland Street Response will track key performance indicators, and data will be collected throughout the pilot. The program will also include further community engagement as part of the evaluation process. Portland Street Response will return to Council to present a progress report six months from when the team is deployed. A final report will be issued at the conclusion of the 12-month pilot, with recommendations for next steps based on what we have learned.

The pilot will be funded with the $500,000 approved in the FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget.

Enclosed in this report you will find further details outlining the pilot. I believe that these recommendations represent an earnest and pragmatic start towards an evolution in our response system that better serves some of our most vulnerable residents. While this recommendation does not represent a unanimous decision on behalf of all stakeholders involved in the work groups, it represents a thoughtful approach that upholds the City's responsibility to provide a modern, robust, first response system that meets the evolving needs of our community.

As for the direction in the budget note to make recommendations for efficiencies across the public safety system, I am proud to say that the public safety directors, with support from their Commissioners-in-Charge, have agreed to the attached charter and to jointly funding a program manager to take a disciplined, multi-year approach to integrate our work, wherever possible, to deliver cost-effective service to our growing city. I am encouraged by the initial collaboration and am excited to sponsor this group.

Sincerely,

Tom Rinehart, Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment: PSWG Charter
Public Safety Budget and Operations Working Group
Charter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>The purpose of the Public Safety Budget and Operations Working Group (PSWG) is to propose actions over a three-year timeline (FY 2020-2021 – FY 2022-2023) with the following results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Achieve ongoing, sustainable general fund savings of at least 2% within and across the public safety bureaus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Follow Council’s vision for Portland Street Response by developing a system of appropriately triaged non-emergency calls, which utilize first responders, skilled in prevention and behavioral health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Increase trust and collaboration among the public safety bureaus, and community stakeholders, with short and long-term goals of providing effective, efficient, and integrated service to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Make recommendations for effective coordination between the City’s public safety operations, community non-profit organizations, Multnomah County, and other public agencies that provide an array of prevention and intervention services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Membership | The PSWG Executive Team, with support of Mayor Wheeler and Commissioner Hardesty, will be sponsored by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), Tom Rinehart. The role of the Sponsor is to both chair the Executive Team and communicate regularly with the Mayor and Commissioner Hardesty. Chief Danielle Outlaw, Portland Police Bureau (PPB); Chief Sara Boone, Portland Fire and Rescue (PF&R); Bob Cozzie, Bureau of Emergency Communications (BOEC), and Mike Myers, Portland Bureau of Emergency Management (PBEM), shall make up the Executive Team, along with the CAO. |

---

An Equal Opportunity Employer

To help ensure equal access to programs, services and activities, the Office of Management & Finance will reasonably modify policies/procedures and provide auxiliary aids/services to persons with disabilities upon request.
The abovementioned leadership from PPB, PF&R, BOEC, and PBEM will designate financial and operational leadership to participate on the **Staff Team**. The Staff Team will be chaired by PBEM Director Mike Myers. The Staff Team representatives should be subject matter experts empowered to speak and make decisions on behalf of their bureau.

The Staff Team will be supported by the CAO’s team and will include other subject matter experts, as needed, at the discretion of the CAO.

The Executive Team shall designate or recruit a **Program Manager** tasked to lead the operational efforts associated with the PSWG purpose and measures.

**Governance**

The five entities of the working group will strive for consensus in decisions with financial and operational impacts for any and all bureaus. In the event of disagreement among the group, the CAO will mediate, discuss with Commissioners-in-Charge, if needed, and have final decision-making authority on a recommendation to the full Council.

**Team Responsibilities**

**Executive Team** – the PSWG Executive Team’s role is to provide strategic direction for this effort and make decisions based on the recommendations of the Program Manager and Staff Team.

The Executive Team expects the Program Manager and the Staff Team to work together collaboratively to create and implement plans to achieve alignment across bureaus, and to elevate issues, as needed, for their consideration, review, and direction. The Executive Team will help align the PSWG with other related projects and programs in their bureaus.

**Bureau Roles – Financial and staffing commitments**

- Designate financial and operational leadership to participate on the Staff Team. Designees should be subject matter experts, empowered to speak and make decisions on behalf of their bureau leadership.
- Prioritize Staff Team participation, communications, projects and tasks as identified by the Chair, Executive Team, and Program Manager.

**Program Manager** – The Program Manager is responsible for the active stewardship of the PSWG purpose, and for working toward successful implementation of measures. The Program Manager will:

- Work with the Sponsor and Executive Team to develop a framework for successful implementation of PSWG purpose and measures.
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- Collaborate with the Staff Team to develop recommendations and action plans for successful implementation of PSWG purpose and measures.
- Schedule and manage Executive Team and Staff Team meetings, and maintain team project records, including providing the Staff Team with direction for records maintenance.
- Bring decision recommendations to the Executive Team members, individually and collectively.
- Coordinate with related projects and project managers.

Staff Team — The PSWG Staff Team is responsible for crafting and refining strategies and approaches for plans, policies, implementation plans, and for completing research and analysis within their subject area. The Staff Team members will:
- Attend and participate in regularly scheduled meetings.
- Serve as the primary liaison within their bureau.
- Be responsible for maintaining open lines of communications with their bureau leadership, with respect to this program and other bureau activities with impacts on the PSWG.
- Bring forward opportunities to the Program Manager and the Staff Team.
- Provide advice and recommendations for how to implement and improve this program.

Decision Making Authority & Issue Elevation

The Executive Team has decision making authority to set vision, authorize budget recommendations and changes in operations and structure. The Executive Team works collaboratively to jointly agree on the best approach to meet the PSWG purpose and measures. The CAO will mediate disagreements and elevate decisions to the Mayor and Commissioner Hardesty as appropriate.

Staff Team members will endeavor to resolve inter-bureau conflicts and disagreements, although conflicts that cannot be resolved at the staff level will be elevated to the Executive Team by the Project Manager.

The Program Manager elevates issues and topics to the Executive Team by preparing a written briefing paper or memo in advance of the discussion at the Executive Team meeting.

- At minimum, the briefing paper must include a problem statement, options and recommendations. Background information may be provided as needed.
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- Decisions and agreements resulting from Executive Team meeting discussions will be documented in the program files, or as otherwise directed.
- The Program Manager will manage and retain all documentation, including record of decisions and agreements.

Duration and Timeline

The Public Safety Working Group is impaneled and charged according to this charter from the time of signature of the Commissioners-in-Charge and Executive Team members, and functions from that date forward until dissolved by either of these same principals.

The PSWG will report quarterly to the full Council through the CAO.

The CAO will lead an annual evaluation of the PSWG’s work and propose changes to the Charter if needed, with the support of Public Safety Directors.
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Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted Wheeler, Mayor</td>
<td>10/22/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Hardesty, Commissioner</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Rinehart, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>11/5/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Danielle Outlaw, Chief of Police</td>
<td>11/7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Sara Boone, Fire Chief</td>
<td>11/12/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Cozzie, Director, Bureau of Emergency Communications</td>
<td>11/17/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Myers, Director, Portland Bureau of Emergency Management</td>
<td>11/17/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE

Pilot Program Recommendations

November 21, 2019
Portland Street Response Implementation Plan

MISSION
To provide a branch of first responders who are trained in behavioral health, crisis intervention and on-scene medical assistance; whereby enabling Portland Street Response to reduce Police, Fire, and EMS interactions with individuals who have not committed a crime, and who may be experiencing a mental health crisis or have an health concern that does not immediately threaten their life, or the lives of individuals around them.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION OVERVIEW
Portland Street Response is designed to serve as a third branch of the City of Portland’s first responder system: Police, Fire, and Portland Street Response. The Bureau of Emergency Communications’ (BOEC) role will be to dispatch Police, Fire, or AMR (ambulance service) if the call relates to saving a life, reporting a fire, or reporting a crime. For other non-life-threatening (but crisis-related) scenarios currently responded to by Police and Fire (such as behavioral health issues and welfare checks) Portland Street Response will be dispatched as an unarmed, first responder team, trained in behavioral health and on-scene medical assistance.

Two primary benefits of creating this new branch of first responders for non-life-threatening but crisis-related calls are:

(1) Enables the City of Portland to free up Police and Fire resources to attend to life saving and crime-related calls for help; and

(2) Provides quick and compassionate response by trauma informed members trained in crisis management, emergency medicine, and behavioral health.

PROPOSED MEASURABLE OUTCOMES
1. Reduce the number of non-warrant arrests that result during a 9-1-1 response.
2. Reduce the number of individuals transported to the emergency department for low acuity medical related issues that could instead be addressed in a pre-hospital care setting.
3. Reduce the number of behavioral health and lower acuity medical calls traditionally responded to by Police and Fire.

Legal Activities & Decisions
i. CONTRACTS
   a) An RFP will be issued for Crisis Worker positions.
ii. **ORDINANCE**
   a) An ordinance may need to be passed to create job classifications that do not currently exist, to be run out of Portland Fire & Rescue. This will be determined through appropriate legal and policy channels.

**Logistics & Decisions**

i. **BUREAU OF EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION (BOEC) CALL PRIORITIZATION AND DISPATCH** *(See Appendix A)*
   a) What specific call codes will be dispatched to Portland Street Response?
      See the appendix for possible call types.
      The call transition committee is recommending that we not dispatch based on call types. Instead BOEC will dispatch by the criteria/scenario listed in Appendix A.
   
   b) Will Portland Street Response have a special code that will separate those calls *(when querying the data)* from Police, Fire, & AMR dispatched calls?
      Yes, BOEC will use a new “PSR” typecode for all Portland Street Response calls.
   
   c) How and when will BOEC train their call takers of the new dispatch system?
      BOEC estimates needing 45 days to train all staff once the Pilot Program has been slated for implementation.
   
   d) How will this new process of dispatching to Portland Street Response tie in with the new dispatch prioritization BOEC is currently working on implementing for Fire, but not Police?
      For the Pilot Program, ProQA, a new dispatch software currently being implemented, will not be directly associated with dispatching Portland Street Response to calls. In the future, ProQA has many prioritization options for call information which may allow BOEC to specifically refer and dispatch Portland Street Response based on specific criteria set in the ProQA software. Based on industry practices, we recommend that BOEC first reach operational compliance with ProQA before it is utilized to alter current fire or medical responses to dispatch Portland Street Response.
   
   e) Portland Street Response will be connected to the Police dispatch system, but not Fire. How will Portland Street Response receive a dispatch that may have traditionally come through for Fire, but will now be dispatched
to Portland Street Response?
If Fire needs Portland Street Response to respond, the Fire dispatcher would send a “PSR” coded call to the Portland Street Response dispatcher.

f) Portland Street Response can also self-dispatch. How will that work and how will it get recorded by BOEC?
We recommend that Portland Street Response self-dispatch either by voice or mobile data computer. If by voice, the dispatcher will create a call. If by mobile data computer, the computer creates a computer aided dispatch call. We anticipate that the computer in the vehicle will mirror what is currently in Fire vehicles.

g) How will Portland Street Response dispatch Police or Fire if their assistance is needed?
The Portland Street Response dispatcher will coordinate that request either on the same talkgroup or coordinate with the Fire dispatcher.

h) How will BOEC decide to dispatch to Project Respond vs Portland Street Response?
Project Respond will continue to co-respond when PPB requests assistance. Portland Street Response will be dispatched by BOEC as a first responder when the criteria outlined in Appendix A is met.

ii. PILOT LOCATION (See Appendix B)
a) What areas of town should Portland Street Response conduct a pilot?
Portland Street Response will operate the pilot in Fire Management Area (FMA) 11 which is in the Lents neighborhood.

b) Does Portland Street Response operate out of a station? Leased location? Always mobile?
The Fire Emergency Medical Services Specialist will be based out of Fire Station 1 in downtown, and Fire will provide the vans. The team will remain mobile.

iii. PILOT START DATE AND DURATION
a) When can Portland Street Response feasibly initiate its pilot?
The pilot will begin as soon as Council approves the report, but the vans won’t hit the street until spring of 2020 in order to accommodate hiring, contracting, training, uniforms, etc.
b) *How long should Portland Street Response anticipate running a pilot program?*
   
   One year.

iv. **PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE SHIFTS (See Appendix C)**
   a) *Will Portland Street Response operate on a 24/7 basis or less? Will this differ in the pilot vs long term?*
   
   Portland Street Response will run Monday – Friday from 10am to 6pm. The long-term goal is for the program to run on a 24/7 basis. Appendix C shows Fire call volumes by day of the week and time of day. This information was used to inform the proposed shift recommendation which correlates with some of the busiest times of day. Please note that this may change as the pilot moves forward.

v. **PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE STAFFING**
   a) *Who will serve on the Portland Street Response team?*
   
   Portland Street Response will respond in two person teams. The first team will be staffed with an Emergency Medical Services Specialist currently employed in Portland Fire and Rescue and a contracted Crisis Worker. Future teams will consist of an Emergency Medical Responder with a background in crisis work, and either a Crisis Worker or Peer Support Specialist. While the program would be housed in Portland Fire and Rescue, there is no intention to require employees of this program to be fully trained fire fighters.

vi. **PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE INCIDENT TRACKING**
   a) *Will Portland Street Response use its internal Fire Incident System (FIS) to chart incident reports?*
   
   Yes, at this time we anticipate creating a customized incident form in Fire’s incident system.

   b) *Meds is a software currently in use by AMR, who provides ambulance services in Portland, and currently being implemented by Portland Fire and Rescue. Will Portland Street Response use Meds to file electronic medical reports?*
   
   Unsure. If yes, we will have AMR create a simplified form for EMR staff.

vii. **PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE REFERRALS (See Appendix D)**
   a) *How will Portland Street Response make referrals for wrap-around services?*
   
   Portland Street Response will utilize the Street Roots resource booklets, provide transports to referral agencies, and will utilize the Unite Us app
funded through Kaiser Permanente. Unite Us is a social care coordination platform where providers across sectors can send and receive referrals.

b) Will Portland Street Response hand off cases to Project Respond, CHIERS, and Portland Street Medicine for follow-up?

Yes. Appendix D provides a high-level process/systems map that was created by PF&R in response to the System Alignment and Mapping work group’s Executive Summary. Appendix D covers three areas:

1. Process map: Chronological steps of the process from dispatch to closing the case for all Portland Street Response calls

2. Decision points: Decisions that will be considered along each step of the process by either BOEC or Portland Street Response that may result in collaborating with another organization or City agency.

3. Community organization and City agency intersections: Specific points in the process at which Portland Street Response will co-respond, collaborate, or hand off cases to various community organizations and/or City agencies.

PF&R is currently reviewing Appendix D with the Chairs of the System Alignment and Mapping work group and anticipates a deeper look at these intersections.

viii. PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE PROTOCOLS AND POLICIES

a) What protocols and policies are being prepared for the pilot?

- Safety protocols
- When to dispatch to Police, Fire, or AMR
- Training policies or protocols
- Making referrals and connections with outside community organizations
- When Portland Street Response will transport people
- What food and supplies Portland Street Response will provide
- How Portland Street Response will help store belongings if an individual requests transport and they are unable to bring all of their belongings

Cost Analysis

i. PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE PROGRAM COSTS (See Appendix E)

- Vehicle(s), maintenance, insurance and gas
- Mobile Data Computer, radios, and Computer Aided Dispatch System
- Uniforms
- Food, water, first aid supplies
- Branded materials (e.g. business cards, educational brochures, etc.)

ii. PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE PERSONNEL (See Appendix E)
- Staff salary and benefits
- Training

Pilot and Go-Live Activities & Decisions

i. BOEC
   a) *When will BOEC be prepared to feasibly initiate a pilot given the changes required to their process and system?*
      Any time, but it will take 45 days from start to finish to train employees.

ii. HARDWARE ASSESSMENT
   a) *Will the Portland Street Response team need iPads, Mobile Data Computers (MDC), radios, or any other hardware to complete their work? If so, how many for the pilot vs the full rollout?*
      The Portland Street Response team will need 2 iPads, 1 MDC, and 1 radio. The pilot will help us determine how many are needed for future rollouts.

iii. TRAINING
   a) *What kind of training will Portland Street Response receive and how soon should training begin prior to the pilot?*
      We are currently considering contracting with the White Bird Clinic to assist with training, but Portland Fire and Rescue will also put together a training that address the technical aspects of first response (e.g., radios, MDCs, etc.), and any training needed for the Emergency Medical Responder position such as CPR, Stop the Bleed, and wound care.

iv. APPARATUS
   a) *Outfit Community Health Assessment Team van with a mobile data computer*
   b) *Add Portland Street Response decals to the van*
APPENDIX A
CALL TRANSITIONING RECOMMENDATIONS
BOEC Implementation Recommendation

For Portland Street Response

Response Area: BOEC will dispatch to the pilot area in Fire Management Area 11 – Lents. We are reasonably confident that the Pilot Program can be absorbed into our current workload. As the program grows, we envision the service area expanding Citywide, utilization increasing, and therefore, we will need increased funding for FTEs (additional dispatchers) to staff a dedicated talkgroup.

Radio monitoring: We recommend that PSR would respond on an authorized portable radio which is sponsored by PPB.

MDC utilization: We recommend that PSR utilize a Mobile Data Computer (MDC) to view queued calls for PSR-response to advise the dispatcher on their ability and timeliness to respond to queued calls, allow PSR to self-dispatch to queued calls, and maintain non-urgent off-air communication with the dispatcher through MDC-messaging.

BOEC CAD Call coding: We recommend that when a call meets PSR criteria, and is within the predefined coverage area, BOEC will code the calls with existing call type codes, but dispatch the call to PSR via the radio. If PSR is available to answer the call, or will be within a timeframe that does not put the caller or any others at risk, the call will be queued to be answered by PSR. If the call is of a priority such that it must be answered if PSR is not readily available (e.g. person down), that call will be dispatched to the next best available first responder. All calls answered by PSR will ultimately be coded PSR. At the end of the pilot, all calls responded to by PSR can be analyzed to ensure we have the proper criteria to expand the program.
Response scenarios:

We recommend that PSR respond when the person:

- has no known access to weapons
- is not suicidal
- is not violent towards others (physically combative, threatening violence, assaulting)

We recommend PSR respond to the following scenarios:

- Person outside needing a welfare check:
  - person down, unchecked (condition unknown)
  - person intoxicated or drug-affected
  - person outside yelling
- Person outside needing referral to services that do not have access to a phone.
- Person outside needing a face-to-face mental health check when they cannot be transferred to the Multnomah County Crisis Line (MCCL) by phone.
- Co-response/mutual aid request from emergency responders (Police, Fire, EMS)
- Response requests from non public-safety entities (Project Respond, CHIERS, Multnomah County Crisis Line, etc.)
- Self-dispatch by PSR

BOEC Training:

BOEC estimates needing 45 days to train all staff once the Pilot Program has been slated for implementation.
APPENDIX B

PILOT LOCATION
The Portland Street Response pilot will take place in Fire Management Area 11 – Lents Neighborhood
APPENDIX C

PORTLAND STREET RESPONSE SHIFTS
Below are two diagrams showing Fire call volumes by time of day and day of the week. This information was used to inform the initial proposal for shifts to be Monday – Friday, 10am – 6pm. Please note that these shifts may change as the pilot moves forward.

Fire Call Volume by Time of Day
Fire Hourly Call Distribution 2017-2019

Sunday: 1,393
Monday: 1,271
Tuesday: 1,441
Wednesday: 1,500
Thursday: 1,437
Friday: 1,496
Saturday: 1,466

Total Number of Records: 10,000
APPENDIX D
SYSTEMS MAP
### Portland Street Response (PSR)
Connecting the right resource to the right response

#### Systems Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>911 Call Received &amp; Dispatched</th>
<th>PSR First Contact</th>
<th>PSR Assessment</th>
<th>PSR Intervention</th>
<th>PSR Case Procedures &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEPS</td>
<td>80/2C dispatches appropriate response unit to the scene</td>
<td>PSR team locates client and confirms contact/location</td>
<td>PSR team introduces itself to the client and explains and/or confirms purpose of contact</td>
<td>PSR team assesses nature of crisis and if additional resources are needed</td>
<td>PSR team transports client (voluntarily) to appropriate resource</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Decision Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY BUREAUS AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOEC</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>PPB, ECIT or Regular Officer</td>
<td>PPB, BHT</td>
<td>DFR</td>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>MCLNOMAH COUNTY CRISIS LINE</td>
<td>PROJECT RESPONSE</td>
<td>CHIERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Links

- Location and purpose of call
- Response reveals mental health crisis
- Response reveals non-mental health crisis
- Response reveals substance use
- Response reveals weapon use
- Response reveals severe mental health risk
- Response reveals other medical condition
- Response reveals a weapon is visible to the officer
- Client required to undergo wrap-around care

Client is a high-utilizer for wrap-around care
APPENDIX E

BUDGET DETAILS
Estimated Annual Expenses for Phased In 2-Team Pilot

PERSONNEL - Fully loaded salary and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1: 12 Month Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMS Specialist/Program Manager</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Worker</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>265,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 2: 6 Month Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Responder (EMR)</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Worker</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM EXPENSES FOR 2-TEAMS (PHASED IN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>16,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPads, Cellphones, Radio</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Supplies (first aid, food, etc.)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,330</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNUAL TOTAL** 438,330

Assumes backfill for EMS Specialist vacation and sick leave is covered with existing PF&R staffing at no additional cost.

Costs account for one team to operate for a full 12 month period with an additional estimate of a second team starting 6 months into the pilot year.

Start-up costs such as training or consulting are not included.
APPENDIX F
EXTERNAL WORK GROUP
RECOMMENDATIONS
Portland Street Response

External Provider Subgroup
Themes from Early Discussions...

**Expansion:** Are there existing programs and services that we can identify would benefit from expansion and where do those currently exist? Identifying service gaps.

**Creation:** Is this something that is brand new and created from the existing network?

**Collaboration:** Is there opportunity for development of relationships and network of services that can meet the response needs?
What are the *means* and what are the *ends*? How can the City leverage an *existing network* to achieve these ends?

In a contracted service provider model...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The City gives funding to one or more organizations to provide a service (via sole-source, multi-award, or partial contracting)</td>
<td>• The Contracted organization[s] provide services. The City(clearly) mandates:</td>
<td>• The &quot;what&quot; and &quot;how&quot; become an embedded part of the City's service provision network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engineering Standards (Specifying WHAT and HOW you're providing it)</td>
<td>• The &quot;whom&quot; are a population being provided services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance Standards (Here is what you need to accomplish)</td>
<td>• The City develops metrics and benchmarks to measure success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To whom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workplan for this subcommittee

Goals
- Determine how the City could achieve its vision for this program via contracting.

Required knowledge
- Understanding "what" needs to be provided.
- Understanding "to whom" it needs to be provided to.
- Understanding "how" it could be provided.

Guiding Analytical Questions
- What is the substructure of the current service provision network?
- What are the hydraulics of this substructure?

What tools would we use to answer these questions?
- Conduct an environmental scan via Requests for Information.
Programs
- Project Respond
- Homeless Services Street Outreach

Mobile Crisis Team
- 36 Crisis Clinicians; 24/7 Response Model; Co-located across city (Central Precinct, County Library, Providence Hospital, etc.) or dispatched through BOEC or MCC; Fleet of 12 vehicles to transport staff who can also arrange emergency transport via ambulance, cab, or bus.
• Programs
  • Outreach Rounds

• Medical Care Team
  • Portland Street Medicine is organized to address the healthcare needs of people experiencing homelessness in Portland. Our volunteer clinical teams include interdisciplinary medical providers and social workers who staff three outreach rounds each week. Our practice is mindfully limited to immediate acute care, essential primary care to those who are unable to access traditional primary care, the triage of clinical priorities, and trust building.
What the RFIs Tell Us...

- Increased funding to organizations could allow for expansion of services either already delivered or expands their capability.
- Increased funding to organizations could allow for collaboration of services already delivered with other organizations to create a unique model of care.
- Increased funding to organizations could allow for creation of new service delivery.
Synthesize and combine workgroup
What remains to be answered...

• **Analytical questions that need to be answered:**
  • What are the *real* costs of contracting this service?
  • What are the *opportunity* costs of contracting this service?
  • If contracted, who would *manage* the contract?
  • At what *point on the service provision spectrum* could City government best insert policy/funding to achieve its goals?
  • What *components of the existing substructure could be augmented* to achieve the City’s goals?

• **Philosophical questions that need to be answered**
  • *Who* should provide this work?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contracted employees would have existing knowledge of current</td>
<td>• Difficult to change policy (not a City owned/operated resource)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders and network of services. Many are currently educated subject-</td>
<td>• Cost of operationalizing such a program are unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matter experts in the field.</td>
<td>• Performance standards not yet developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing network has compiled data from stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Engineering standards not yet developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing infrastructure of services exists (fleet, MCC and BOEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interface, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not starting from scratch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing data from service providers could incorporate PSU</td>
<td>• An economic contraction could create funding constraints across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder survey data to create a cybernetic loop.</td>
<td>• Duplication of services could create inefficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City could elevate or enhance existing economics of scale and scope</td>
<td>• Unidentified gaps in scope could create blind spots for program services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via the contracting process (via subsidization, engineering/performance</td>
<td>• Project needs leadership and champions throughout the development—and after the integration—of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards, or other government action)</td>
<td>the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibly a more economical than creating program from whole cloth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibly more efficient, could &quot;purchase&quot; more outputs per unit of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources invested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations:

• City of Portland run a pilot with a contracted service model and compare services

• Develop formal consultation relationship with CAHOOTS
APPENDIX G
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WORK GROUP
RECOMMENDATIONS
Portland Street Response Community Engagement Work Group Final Report

The Community Engagement work group’s goal has been to ensure that community members are engaged and inform the creation of Portland Street Response from the onset of the program’s development. The group has held numerous listening sessions, meetings, and distributed surveys with a variety of stakeholders throughout the city. The team also created and conducted a community logo design contest. Winners were announced November 15th and will their submissions will be used to inspire the final design by a paid artist awarded by RFP. The majority of designs we received were from Street Roots.

Our first priority was holding listening sessions that raised the voices of houseless individuals that are among the most impacted in our current first response system. We held four listening sessions with this community: one at Sisters of the Road, one at JOIN, one with the Homeless Youth Continuum, and one with Central City Concern. Our group also partnered with Portland State University’s Homeless Research and Action Collaborative to create a survey targeting the houseless. Individuals from Right 2 Survive also lent their time and talent to this process and went out in the field to ensure that houseless individuals representing a large geographic area of the city were represented.

The recommendations resulting from this effort are as follows:

- Portland Street Response needs to be separate from the Police
- Prioritize training in mental health, de-escalation, trauma, and listening
- Portland Street Response should not be armed or run warrant checks
- Uniforms should be recognizable and distinct from other first responders
- Referrals and transportation services would help the teams be effective
- Connect Portland Street Response with place where people can go
- Educate community members about emergency calls
- Treat people with compassion and dignity.
- Carry supplies such as food, water, and hygiene products.
- Include a peer support worker in program and value the lived experience of houselessness
- Create a culture that is respectful to LGBTQIA+ community and caters to their unique needs

An additional survey was developed and sent out the business community, neighborhood associations, and non-profits throughout the city to learn about their experiences with our current first response system and wishes for the Portland Street Response. Overwhelmingly, respondents indicated that they would like a new service to call that would not involve any of the current first responders in our system.

We held three listening sessions with rank and file police officers at North, Central, and East Precincts. The officers we spoke to asked many good questions about the program and shared a lot of good information with us about the kinds of scenarios they believe could be addressed by Portland Street Response. From these three groups we learned that they are often asked to move along houseless individuals from storefronts, and that a lot of time is spent fielding calls for “unwanted” persons. The officers we spoke to were largely supportive of transitioning these kinds of calls to Portland Street Response.

Members of the work group also spent an afternoon at the Bureau of Emergency Communications doing a “sit-along” listening to 9-1-1 calls and talking with dispatchers. Overwhelmingly employees believed
that this new resource wouldn’t be difficult to incorporate into the work they’re currently doing, and that it would be a useful resource for citizens.

The Community Engagement Workgroup intends to continue working together on our next phase of community engagement – public education. We plan to help inform the community about the pilot’s launch as well as work on a public education campaign around when it’s most appropriate to call 9-1-1.

The development of the Portland Street Response has put community first since it’s inception, which is why we also launched a logo design contest that closed on November 12th, 2019. Three winners will inform the vision behind the final logo design for the Portland Street Response. Winners of the logo design contest will receive $250 each. A request for proposal is currently open to the community for a paid opportunity to create the art and branding for the new program.

Through all our listening, surveying, and engagement with stakeholders throughout the city, the Community Engagement Work Group believes the following recommendations will lead to a successful Portland Street Response pilot.
APPENDIX H
PSU SURVEY - BELIEVE OUR STORIES AND LISTEN
Believe our stories & listen

Portland Street Response survey report

conducted with and for unhoused people

A collaboration of the Portland Street Response Community Outreach workgroup and
Believe our stories and listen
Portland Street Response survey report
Sept. 19, 2019

Report prepared by Greg Townley, Research Director, Portland State University Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative and Associate Professor of Community Psychology at PSU; Kaia Sand, Street Roots Executive Director; & Thea Kindschuh, Mapping Action Collective


Additional report copies available at news.streetroots.org/portlandstreetresponse

The Portland Street Response Community Outreach workgroup spearheaded this survey: Yesenia Carillo with the Office of Commissioner Amanda Fritz; Ebony Clarke, Multnomah County Director of Mental Health and Addiction Services Division; Angela Donley with the Office of Commissioner Jayapal; Thea Kindschuh with Mapping Action Collective; Matt McNally with the Office of Commissioner Hardesty; Ibrahim Mubarak, Executive Director of Right 2 Survive; Greg Townley with Portland State University Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative; Winta Johannes with the Office of Commissioner Eudaly; Kaia Sand, Street Roots; and Neal Sand, Yellow Brick Road.

This work was done in collaboration with Mapping Action Collective, Portland State University Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative, Right 2 Survive, Sisters of the Road, Street Books, Street Roots and Yellow Brick Road.


Thank you to Sisters of the Road, JOIN, Central City Concern, and Yellow Brick Road day center for hosting listening sessions with the Office of Commissioner Hardesty; and to Outside In for gathering additional information. Thanks to Helen Hill, Kayla Jones, Nina Lee and DeVon Pouncey with Street Roots; Stefanie Knowlton and Marisa Zapata with the Portland State University Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative; Danielle Klock with Sisters of the Road; and Diana Rempe with Street Books.

The Office of Community and Civic Life supported this research.
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“I would like to see street response be the city’s first response in dealing with the homeless crisis. I want street response to be the city’s compassion.” – survey respondent
Introduction

Many advocates, local officials, and people experiencing homelessness agree that the city needs a better way to respond to low-priority calls for service involving those experiencing homelessness and behavioral health crises.

Costly police resources are ineffectively dispatched to handle these types of calls. Last year, the Oregonian reported that 52% of all arrests in 2017 were of people identified as homeless. Willamette Week’s report on the city’s 911 dispatch center showed that Portland residents call 911 to complain of an “unwanted person” more than any other reason. Disability Rights Oregon showed that 72% of arrests at area hospitals targeted unhoused people between 2017 and 2018.

“As long as we deal with homelessness with a police response, people’s lives will be needlessly entangled in the legal system.”
– Street Roots

This past March, Street Roots called for a new model of response to calls involving unhoused community members as well as people experiencing behavioral health crises in public. Street Roots reporter Emily Green outlined a plan, which it called the Portland Street Response. Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty was working on a related effort which her office then began referring to as the Portland Street Response (PSR).

The mission of PSR is to send the right resource and response to the right person at the right time. The vision is a system that appropriately responds to the high number of "unwanted persons" or welfare check calls and frees up police resources to focus on preventing and solving crimes.

The Portland City Council allotted $500,000 toward developing the Portland Street Response pilot in July. Commissioner Hardesty’s staff, in collaboration with Mayor Ted Wheeler’s staff, are charged with bringing a plan to City Council this November.

Several work groups focused on call transitioning, internal logistics, external logistics, and community engagement were formed to help develop this plan. This report presents the methods, findings and recommendations from a collaborative survey process conducted by the community engagement work group and several partnering organizations aimed at ensuring that the voices of individuals experiencing homelessness are at the forefront of conversations informing PSR.
Executive Summary

A team of community partners spread out across the city July 16 and 18 to interview people experiencing homelessness to help inform the design of the Portland Street Response pilot project (PSR). An additional team went out on Sept. 6.

Members of Street Roots, Sisters of the Road, Right 2 Survive, Street Books, the Portland State University Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative, the Mapping Action Collective, Yellow Brick Road, Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty’s office, and Alissa Keny-Guyer’s office interviewed 184 unhoused people. Participants formed teams of two to three, each lead by a Street Roots vendor or someone else who had experienced homelessness.

Teams engaged people experiencing homelessness in discussions about what the PSR pilot should look like, including who the first responders should be, how they should approach individuals in crisis, what types of services and resources they should bring with them, and what types of training they should have. Following the interviews, responses were analyzed and summarized into this report to provide guidance for this important initiative based directly on the needs and experiences of unhoused people.

Survey respondents had powerful examples of both positive and negative interactions with first responders ranging from “horrible, embarrassing, degrading” to “compassionate, supportive.”

A thread that weaves through all the responses in the survey is a call to be treated humanely. For example, regardless of whether respondents answered that their experiences with first responders were positive or negative, many experienced being treated rudely rather than with politeness and respect.

While many respondents stated that police should not be present for any responses, others wanted police presence when it made the most sense: theft, robbery, harassment, violent crimes, danger to a child, rape, and domestic violence. Most preferred non-police responses for calls about camping, sleeping, drug overdoses, and mental health crises.

If not police, then who? The most common response was “mental health professionals.” Numerous respondents also noted the importance of social workers for referring people to housing and health services; peer support specialists and/or people with lived experience; and, to a lesser extent, EMTs and firefighters. These responders should make the unhoused community feel safe through a variety of measures. The top suggestions: an assurance to not run checks for outstanding warrants, to not bring weapons and to bring food and water.

Helpful supplies to bring while responding included hygiene products, backpacks or bags for people’s belongings, and first aid/medical care supplies. Respondents also discussed the importance of getting connected to or referrals
to housing and health services, with transportation to services being the second-most commonly reported need.

“Mental health awareness” was the most common answer when people were asked what training first responders should have. Respondents also noted here and elsewhere how important it is for responders to have good listening skills, and not to make assumptions about what the person needs.

The people surveyed were overwhelmingly positive, supportive, and excited about the Portland Street Response. Numerous individuals emphasized the importance of respecting human dignity and treating people who are unhoused as human beings with a variety of complex life circumstances and needs.

Some of the most illuminating information from the survey comes from reading the experiences of those living unhoused, in their own words. It shows how critical it is to find the right response to the right situation at the right time.

“When you already feel hopeless, and you’re at the end of your road, and you’re ready to jump or hang yourself, no one wants to be labeled or called an ‘unwanted person.” – survey respondent
Methods

survey development

We developed the survey to provide an open platform for unhoused individuals to discuss their needs and preferences in what the Portland Street Response (PSR) should look like. Questions and sample response options were based on themes that emerged during listening sessions with unhoused individuals facilitated by Commissioner Hardesty at Sisters of the Road and JOIN. Questions included how first responders should present themselves, what they should have with them, under what circumstances they should be present, and what services they should provide. Sample response options included lists of potential first responders (e.g., firefighters, mental health professionals, nurses), types of supplies and services they should offer (e.g., first aid, food/water, transportation), and types of training responders should have (e.g., trauma-informed, de-escalation, cultural competency). After the survey was drafted, we shared the document with a variety of stakeholders, including advocates, service providers, and elected officials’ staff. Modifications were made based on their suggestions.
Trainings

Before conducting the surveys, participants gathered at Street Roots for a training led by Ibrahim Mubarak of Right 2 Survive and Neal Sand of Yellow Brick Road to discuss how to safely approach people with respect and without making assumptions about their needs and experiences. Right 2 Survive has previously conducted surveys of people in encampments for the Western Regional Advocacy Project. Yellow Brick Road trains volunteers on how to provide street outreach.

Greg Townley and Thea Kindschuh from Portland State University instructed surveyors to engage willing individuals in conversation and write down the information that emerged. Given the goal of engaging respondents in a dialogue about PSR, they emphasized the importance of being flexible and allowing individuals to respond to questions in an open manner rather than using a more standardized approach with specific, limited response options.

“Centering the voices of those who are often left out of these public safety policy conversations is the most powerful part of this experience.”
– Greg Townley, Research Director for the PSU Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative

Ibrahim Mubarak and Neal Sand lead the July 16 training at Street Roots

Greg Townley and Thea Kindschuh explain the survey process.
Survey process

After the trainings each day, participants formed teams of two or three, each led by a Street Roots vendor or someone else with lived experience of homelessness. Portland State University students working with the Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative joined many teams. As they left Street Roots, teams selected locations based on areas of the city scheduled for sweeps in the coming weeks, or based on Street Roots vendors’ knowledge of camps, shelters, sidewalks, and parks where they knew people would be gathering.

Survey teams canvassed their designated areas for two to three hours. They approached individuals on sidewalks, in camps, and in shelters to ask them if they were willing to speak with them about their experience interacting with first responders. Conversations ranged from very brief (five minutes) to quite lengthy (30 to 45 minutes), with the intention of allowing survey respondents to share their experiences interacting with first responders and think about what a preferred model could look like. Responses were recorded with pen and pencil on paper copies of the survey.

Survey teams brought bags of granola bars, toilet paper, sewing kits, batteries, copies of the Street Roots Rose City Resource Guide, and other basic necessities to thank people for taking the time to talk with us. While some individuals we approached were busy doing other things or not interested in speaking with us, the vast majority of those who we approached were willing to speak with us and were appreciative of the opportunity to inform PSR.

Media coverage of survey process

KGW with Maggie Vespa

Portland Mercury

Street Roots

Village Portland

This project resonated with a wide audience on social media as well, with dozens of social media posts that were shared by hundreds of people and organizations.
Cory Elia surveyed people on the Springwater Corridor where he was houseless from 2010 to 2013. He wrote an account of his experience surveying for *Village Portland*.

“The most disheartening part of this excursion was when my group ventured on to the part of the Springwater Corridor that runs parallel to the 97th Ave MAX stop and saw a Rapid Response work crew conducting a sweep of the camps.”

– Cory Elia
Street Roots vendors Amy Turco and Sean Sheffield surveyed people at the camp where they were staying as well neighboring camps.

“It is important to get the word from the streets. The homeless community has more trust with other members of the homeless community than with the housed community.”

– Sean Sheffield
Street Roots vendors Cornell Clemons and Mark Rodriguez and Yellow Brick Road supervisor Neal Sand surveyed people camping in Old Town.

“[The surveying experience] was beautiful and lovely. Through the work of Street Roots we could help lots of other people.”

– Cornell Clemons
"You can live in the woods, and when you get back indoors, you will be amazed how your opinions can change." – George McCarthy

“I enjoyed partnering with the Street Roots vendors. I think that their presence broke down barriers and made it easier for folks to trust me, which allowed for richer conversation.”
– Holly Brott, Community Psychology graduate student at PSU

Street Roots vendor George McCarthy and PSU student Holly Brott paired up, surveying at the Do Good Multnomah shelter. Holly marveled conversations she never would have had without George, and George appreciated listening to how Holly presented the survey and summarized ideas.
Methods: Accounts from surveyors

“I went to St. Francis and CityTeam, and people were open because I know people there. People were glad that something like that’s going to happen.”

– David Northcut
“These interactions provided me with a greater understanding of the needs of those experiencing homelessness, and the entire survey process was a window into the way organizations, activists, and students can collaborate to ensure that underrepresented voices are heard.”
– Wendy Nuttelman, Applied Linguistics graduate student at PSU

"It was encouraging to see people from different backgrounds and affiliations coming together to address an issue. But I most appreciate the Street Roots vendors I worked with who let me into their world. I hope we have a chance to collaborate again in the future."
– Emily Leickly, Community Psychology graduate student at PSU

“Clearly there are experts in our communities with lived experiences whom we should be listening to and collaborating with in order to implement long-term, compassionate solutions that serve the community as a whole.”
– Katricia Stewart, Community Psychology graduate student at PSU

“The experience has brought color to the lived experience of homelessness that I did not have before. I learned about the many perspectives that unhoused people have toward police and medical personnel, and, where those services fail, the day to day strategies the people we interviewed use to care for themselves and one another.”
– Sarah Mercurio, Urban Studies graduate student at PSU

"The Portland Street response experience importantly shaped my knowledge around homelessness and first response operations in Portland by putting me in direct contact with the local community. I hope those voices and insights will support further research and projects for the homeless population, in the belief that they should be involved in shaping their solutions and interventions."
– Marta Petteni, Designer and Research Analyst, Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative
Street Roots vendor Wayne Moore surveyed near Sisters of the Road with two PSU students.

“All media needs to keep building on this idea.”
– Wayne Moore
Three researchers tabulated, categorized, and coded responses pertaining to each of the survey questions. Questions 1, 2, 3, and 8 were open-ended and required thematic coding. For example, for Question 1 (“Have you interacted with a first responder, and if so, what was it like?”), we grouped findings into two general categories of negative and positive experiences. Within each category, we further grouped responses and identified general themes, including attitude and treatment; reason for the response; response time; sweeps; responder roles/which responder; responder competency/provision of help; and relationship development.

Questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 included lists of possible response options that were tallied to yield numeric totals. Each of these questions also allowed respondents to indicate other answers that were not provided as response options. In some cases, these responses were grouped into pre-existing categories, while in other cases they were used to create new categories or retained in a general “other” category.
Findings

On July 16 and July 18, 2019, members of Street Roots, Sisters of the Road, Right 2 Survive, Street Books, the Homelessness Research & Action Collaborative at PSU, the Mapping Action Collective, Yellow Brick Road, and Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty’s office interviewed 184 unhoused individuals across the city (see map below) to help inform the design of the Portland Street Response (PSR).

Below we report summary findings from each survey question before outlining general recommendations and conclusions. Responses are not intended to be aggregated or wholly summative, but rather provide general considerations for the PSR from those living outside or in shelter. The information collected is intended to be considered alongside other data sources to determine the best pilot model for the PSR.

Figure 1: Map of Portland Street Response Unhoused Survey locations
**Findings**

**Question 1:** Have you interacted with a first responder, and if so, what was it like? Was there anything positive about any of your experiences that you’d like to see more of?

Responses ranged from negative to positive, and varied widely. In general, most of the negative comments were associated with police officers, while the positive comments included a mix of information about police, firefighters, and EMTs. Other reasons for the negative or positive experiences are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Interaction</th>
<th>Positive Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and treatment (e.g., people treated rudely and without compassion)</td>
<td>Attitude and treatment (e.g., responder was calm, genuine, reassuring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for response (e.g., police are not needed because person is just trying to sleep, get food, find shelter)</td>
<td>Responder competency/provision of help (e.g., a firefighter gave water, listened, and was kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder roles/which responder (e.g., need better classification of the problem and clarification of who should respond)</td>
<td>Relationship development (e.g., getting to know people and building a relationship with them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time (e.g., slow response or not at all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeps (e.g., a first responder told a camp they had to leave on Christmas Eve, threw away all belongings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reason for rating first responder experience positive or negative

Regardless of how they rated their interaction, numerous respondents discussed being treated rudely rather than with politeness and respect. Lastly, respondents discussed the necessity of faster response times for health concerns, emergencies, or violence. Additional comments about their experiences with first responders are included on the following pages.
Findings

**Negative**

“Police are not helpful.”

“Horrible, embarrassing, degrading, make you feel unwanted, like scum.”

“They don’t respond. I called police three times, and they didn’t come.”

“Most of the interactions have been with police - they had been called on by business owners mostly. The police don’t help them - waste of time. Person is just trying to sleep, get food, find shelter.”

“Mom was suicidal. I helped her call 911 - wanted mental health person, not cops, as mom was deeply afraid of cops. But mental health person not available. Five cops responded.”

“People won’t call 911 because they don’t want police to respond. They’re afraid, and people are dying.”

**Positive**

“First responder was very calm, very genuine, reassuring.”

“Officers had good mutual respect for people on the streets”

“Twice cops came in the night to check up on us to make sure we were okay and that there were no homicides in the area”

“The first responders were compassionate, supportive, and got my friend the help she needed in a way she was totally comfortable with”
Question 2: In what situations would you like police to be present?
Question 3: In what situations would you not want police involved?

The next two sections summarize individuals’ responses to questions about when police should or should not be present in response to crisis calls. While many respondents stated that they would never call the police and that police should not be present for any responses, many others reported a more nuanced opinion of when police should or should not be present. The table below shows the situations in which respondents largely thought police should be present or not present, and situations where respondents disagreed. There was not a clear consensus about these issues, but emergent themes included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should be present</th>
<th>Areas of disagreement</th>
<th>Should not be present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Danger of suicide</td>
<td>Camping, sleeping,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Intoxication</td>
<td>loitering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>De-escalation</td>
<td>Drug overdoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes, weapons</td>
<td>Aggression/ nonviolent conflict/ arguments</td>
<td>Mental health crises, including someone not on their medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger to a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: When police should and should not be present

“*What is weird and what is against the law are two different things.*”

“*Once, somebody needed an ambulance, and cops arrived. I’d want the EMTs to be the first responders.*”

“*[Police shouldn’t be present] when we’re just trying to survive.*”

“*If someone is just camping, minding their own business [police shouldn’t be present].*”

“*Addiction issues in any situation – no cops.*”
Question 4: Who should be involved instead of police?

When asked who should be involved as first responders instead of police, the most common response was “mental health professionals.” Numerous respondents also noted the importance of social workers for referring people to housing and health services; peer support specialists and/or people with lived experience; and, to a lesser extent, EMTs and firefighters. The figure below illustrates the number of respondents who suggested each category of potential first responder.

![Figure 2: Who should the Portland Street Response (PSR) first responders be?](image)

Other recommendations included:

- Anyone but police
- Depends on the situation
- Crisis, grief counselors
- Medical teams walking around
- People who can provide legal advice
- People who can provide transportation
- Teams with varied representation
- People who can’t arrest you. When cops appear, people with warrants disperse. The ones who disperse are often the ones who need help.
- Appreciate cops doing their job, but don’t need cops and firefighters as often
Question 5: How would you want them to approach you? What would make you feel safe?

Respondents provided a variety of suggestions for how first responders should approach them, including what would make them feel safe. First, individuals noted the importance of having assurance that their IDs would not be run to check for outstanding warrants. Second, respondents noted that provision of food and water is a critical component of the street response. Individuals also wanted assurance that weapons would not be present. When asked specific questions about what types of uniforms or other visual signs of affiliation with the PSR should be considered, the most popular response was “colored shirts.” Some respondents thought that uniforms could be helpful if they clearly distinguished them from other first responders, while sirens and flashing lights should be avoided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assurances</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDs won’t be run for warrants (86 respondents)</td>
<td>Colored shirts (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of food, water (81)</td>
<td>Uniforms (29 yes, 11 no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons won’t be present (66)</td>
<td>Vests (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police won’t be present (54)</td>
<td>Designated vehicles (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deportation agencies won’t be notified (47)</td>
<td>Sirens/ lights (3 yes, 17 no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymity of caller (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Assurances, appearance of PSR responders that would make people feel safe
Findings

Other responses included:

“Obviously not police”
“Regular people without badges”

“Open mindedness”
“Not a person in uniform”

“Anything given that is needed”
“Wearing a smile”

“A pastor would be good”

“Non-judgmental”
“Make it easy for me to understand.”

“Don’t start asking questions and making assumptions.”

“Don’t bring the police attitude.”
“Don’t make it look like I’m giving you information and snitching.”

“Presenting and announcing themselves, asking opinions”

“Easy to talk to and patient”
“Like a person, no different from them”

“Don’t be racist.”
“Believe our stories and listen.”

“Don’t get too close to my tent.”
“People just need someone to listen.”

“Don’t just assume I need mental health treatment.”
**Question 6: What supplies would you like them to be able to provide?**

Again, food and water were noted as important supplies for first responders to bring with them, along with hygiene products, backpacks or bags for people’s belongings and first aid/medical care supplies. Respondents also discussed the importance of responders connecting them to or making referrals to housing and health services with transportation to services being the second most commonly reported answer to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health/ Medical</th>
<th>Basic services</th>
<th>Additional suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/ water (97 respondents)</td>
<td>Transportation to Services (83)</td>
<td>A good word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid and Non-Emergency Medical Care (79)</td>
<td>Storage for belongings (81)</td>
<td>Natural healing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene products (77)</td>
<td>Backpacks/ bags (79)</td>
<td>Dental services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needle Exchange (73)</td>
<td>Crisis Counseling (77)</td>
<td>Hygiene services - restrooms, showers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wound care (71)</td>
<td>Protection from threat/ danger (74)</td>
<td>laundry vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention, Assessment, and Intervention (70)</td>
<td>Clothing (73)</td>
<td>Somewhere to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin (69)</td>
<td>Resource Connection and Referrals (66)</td>
<td>Supplies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery services/ Respite beds (50)</td>
<td>Transportation of partner or dependents (65)</td>
<td>Socks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naloxone (42)</td>
<td>Housing Crisis (63)</td>
<td>Portable chargers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse (40)</td>
<td>Grief and loss counseling (61)</td>
<td>Flashlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pet care/ accommodations (57)</td>
<td>Foot powder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution and Mediation (54)</td>
<td>Baby wipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection from/ separation from partner (50)</td>
<td>Umbrellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heating supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand sanitizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Types of supplies and aid that PSR first responders should offer
Question 7: What kinds of training would you like them to have?

Reflecting the general importance of mental health services noted throughout this summary, “mental health awareness” was the most common answer when people were asked what kinds of training first responders should have. Respondents also noted here and elsewhere how important it is for responders to have good listening skills and to not make assumptions about what the person needs without first learning about what is going on in their lives. The figure below illustrates the number of respondents who indicated the importance of each type of training included in the survey.

Other recommendations included: urban studies, medical training, survival skills, lived experience, sign language

“[They] should be able to recognize drugs/ medication. I look like I’m using when I’m not because of my medication, dehydration, etc. Someone trained on the difference is important.”

“All very important, they’re not going to assume things if they’re aware of all the things listed. Sensitivity to what’s going on.”
Question 8: What other considerations would you like the Portland Street Response to keep in mind?

The people we spoke with were overwhelmingly positive, supportive, and excited about the Portland Street Response. Numerous individuals concluded their conversations with us by emphasizing the importance of respecting human dignity and treating people who are unhoused as human beings with a variety of complex life circumstances and needs.

In addition to providing specific suggestions for the street response program (e.g., having people who are unhoused involved as first responders; providing legal advice), respondents also noted broader suggestions for the city to consider (e.g., providing more space for people to camp; turning land into shelter space self-managed by unhoused people; and developing hygiene stations). People we surveyed are excited to learn that changes are being made to how first responders engage with people experiencing homelessness, stating “I would like to see Street Response be the city’s first response in dealing with the homeless crisis. I want Street Response to be the city’s compassion.”

Considerations were grouped into the following themes:

Respectfulness, dignity, and humanity:

“When you already feel hopeless, and you’re at the end of your road, and you’re ready to jump or hang yourself, no one wants to be labelled or called an ‘unwanted person’.”

“They are really people with real issues, and to them it might BE life or death. Don’t compartmentalize them!”

Provision of transportation, resources, housing, and spaces to just be:

“Refer or transport to spaces you’re allowed to be.”

“Availability of resources. People need response and resources all the time.”
**Importance of mental health services:**

“Not everyone is out here on drugs. Some are because of mental health issues or because they lost a family member/partner/spouse.”

“Mental health is a big problem on the streets. Mental health counselor should be on the Portland Street Response.”

**Additional suggestions include:**

“When stepping into a situation to keep an open mind. There is always more to a story/situation than what you first see. Don’t assume or judge, ask questions, ask what they think would resolve the problem the best.”

“Common sense – do not rely on profiling, book smarts. Do not be like parole officers.”

“Have people on the streets be the responders”

“Re-educate people about what 911 is for. It’s for emergency.”

“Response team should meet everyone, get to know people.”

“PSR should have scheduled time for review by peer support specialists, advocates, and those currently homeless.”
Recommendations

We provide the following recommendations for the Portland Street Response pilot project based on the findings presented above, with a reminder that these should be considered alongside other data sources noted in a later section of this report.

**Portland Street Response needs to be separate from the police.**

While many respondents stated that they would never call the police and that police should not be present for any responses, others wanted police presence for certain situations, particularly when it came to theft, robbery, harassment, violent crimes, and danger to a child.

Findings suggest that some members of the unhoused community value the police for their role in addressing violent crime and protecting safety in certain situations, but want other responders for calls about camping, sleeping, drug overdoses, and mental health crises.

**Prioritize training in mental health, de-escalation, trauma and listening**

When asked who the first responders should be instead of police, the most common response was “mental health professionals.” Similarly, when asked what types of training they should have, “mental health” was most commonly noted. However, participants also expressed the importance of social workers for referring people to housing and health services, conflict resolution counselors, and peer support specialists and/or people with lived experience of homelessness. Further, some respondents expressed concern about over-emphasizing the role of mental health clinicians who may be too quick to diagnose or suggest medication or hospitalization. They prefer that responders come equipped with listening skills, de-escalation training, and an understanding of trauma-informed care. First responders also need to be very familiar with the local community and with available housing and health service resources.

“Not Every Crisis is a Crime.” Poster art made by a Street Roots vendor.

“What is weird and what is against the law are two different things.”
– survey respondent
Portland Street Response should not be armed or run warrant checks
First responders can make the unhoused community feel safe through a variety of measures. The top suggestions included an assurance that background checks would not be run for outstanding warrants, that weapons would not be present, and that food, water, and other basic necessities would be offered. Other helpful supplies include hygiene products, backpacks or bags for people's belongings, and first aid/medical care supplies.

Uniforms should be recognizable and distinct from other first responders
Colored shirts with a logo and designated vehicles were suggested as ways to make the PSR responders recognizable and distinct from other teams.

Referrals and transportation services would help the teams be effective
Respondents also discussed the importance of getting connected to or referrals to housing and health services, with transportation to services being the second most commonly reported need.

Connect PSR with places where people can go
Given the number of people who mentioned the importance of having a place to go when they are in crisis, there is an opportunity to connect PSR with Multnomah County's recent purchase of the Bushong building at 333 SW Park Ave., which they hope to turn into a walk-in center for people experiencing homelessness, mental illnesses and addictions. County elected and health officials intend for this to be a space where people can address basic needs (e.g., taking a shower, doing laundry), engage with mental health services, use the computer or charge a phone, and access transitional housing.

Several respondents also discussed the need to devote more city and county land to villages and shelter space managed by unhoused individuals, as well as developing more hygiene stations.

Educate community members about emergency calls
Several respondents discussed frustrations with community members who call 911 whenever they see a homeless person or tent, typically when no emergency is present.

This reflects a growing trend of "unwanted persons" calls, which have increased by more than 60% since 2013. Indeed, Portlanders place these types of calls, on average, once every 15 minutes. Similarly, as Street Roots reported in March 2019, Portland's Bureau of Emergency Communications (BOEC) received more than 24,000 police non-emergency and 911 calls related to homelessness in 2018. Of these, 80% were categorized as low priority.

When police show up to non-emergency calls related to nuisance or behavioral issues, it can lead to an arrest, which can then lead to barriers in people accessing housing and employment. There is a need to better educate community members about when to call 911, when to call the police non-emergency number, and when to call other teams (e.g., Cascadia's Project Respond, Central City Concern's CHIERS) to address public safety concerns and medical issues that individuals experiencing homelessness may face. It also speaks to the impor-
tance of Portland Street Response working closely with BOEC to know when PSR should be dispatched instead of police officers, and to consider eventually having its own designated call-line.

Treat people with compassion and dignity
A common underlying theme across the results is a call to be treated humanely and with dignity. Numerous individuals concluded their conversations with us by emphasizing the importance of respecting human dignity and treating people who are unhoused as human beings with a variety of complex life circumstances and needs. In the poignant words of one respondent, “When you already feel hopeless, and you’re at the end of your road, and you’re ready to jump or hang yourself, no one wants to be labelled or called an ‘unwanted person.’”

First responders should approach people with compassion and avoid making assumptions about their situation. They should listen to their needs and work with the individual to best identify the necessary supports and services. It is critical for responders to have an awareness of the trauma of being homeless and the very real risks that people face on a daily basis, including the alarming level of violent acts committed by housed individuals against unhoused people.

“Re-educate people about what 911 is for. It’s for emergency.”
– survey respondent
Additional Considerations

There are a few limitations about this process that should be noted. First, we used convenience sampling, meaning that individuals we spoke to were those who were most accessible and willing to speak with us. We surveyed in various parts of the city, but we primarily stayed downtown, southeast Portland, and other areas close to services and larger encampments. We did not go into harder-to-reach camps, nor did we include people living in doubled-up situations (e.g., couch-surfing) or transitional housing. Despite our somewhat limited scope, we did find quite a bit of overlap in information reported from people we interviewed in different settings, including camps, shelters, and service centers. Our findings also paralleled the information obtained in listening sessions with unhoused individuals at JOIN, Sisters of the Road Central City Concern and Yellow Brick Road day center. This makes us confident that while we may have missed the important perspectives of certain segments of people experiencing homelessness, our findings are representative of the experiences of many, including those who are most likely to benefit from Portland Street Response.

Second, we did not collect detailed demographic information because we wanted to focus on people’s general experiences with first responders and attitudes about what PSR should look like. Collecting demographic information would have added a considerable amount of time to the survey and discouraged some individuals from talking with us due to concerns about anonymity. Based on reports from surveyors, it is likely that our findings may over-represent the experiences of middle-aged, white, cisgender, single men experiencing homelessness, although we also interviewed a number of women and people of color. Many respondents discussed having mental and/or physical disabilities, and a few disclosed being transgender, non-English speakers, and veterans. Based on concerns about over-representing male-identified individuals in our interviews, we conducted several follow-up interviews at a women’s care day at Sisters of the Road.

Finally, we purposefully designed the survey to be flexible and adaptable, and to promote discussion and open sharing of information. Surveys were not conducted uniformly, and

**Women’s Care Day at Sisters of the Road**

Because women are sometimes partnered with people for safety, they aren’t always able to speak freely if they have dissenting opinions, so we expanded our surveying to include the Women’s Care Day at Sisters of the Road on Sept. 6. The first Friday of every month, Sisters of the Road provides a time when women can be together and get some of the care and connectedness that they may not typically experience outside, receiving chair massages and manicures, selecting jewelry, coloring in coloring books. Women can feel more at ease to speak freely than they might outside.
thus information that respondents contributed was based on what individuals chose to share about a given question rather than responding to structured questions with specific response options. Accordingly, numbers presented in the report should not be read as percentages of the entire sample of 184 respondents, but rather as general trends reflecting respondents’ general impressions, attitudes, and needs related to Portland Street Response.

The data collected from this survey represent a very important and often overlooked perspective, but it is just one of many data sources that will be used to inform the Portland Street Response pilot project. We are also doing listening sessions with homelessness service providers and homeless youth, as well as an online survey of neighborhood associations and members of the business community asking about their experiences calling 911 and other first responders, satisfaction with police response, who non-police first responders should be, and types of training that would be helpful for their business or organization (e.g., training in de-escalation, providing hygiene options). Collectively, the information from all of these stakeholder groups will inform a plan for a PSR pilot project to be submitted to City Council in November.

“Believe our stories and listen.”
– survey respondent

Conclusion

The outpouring of community support and enthusiasm for the Portland Street Response survey of unhoused individuals illustrates community readiness to mobilize around this important goal of providing a community-based, respectful response to address the current and ongoing needs of our community’s unhoused individuals as well as others who may be in crisis. It will be imperative that this street response is timely, that the experiences of the unhoused community are prioritized, and that a high standard of care is given to all community members.
APPENDIX I
SYSTEMS MAPPING & ALIGNMENT WORK GROUP
RECOMMENDATIONS
Portland Street Response - Final Work Group Recommendations

Work group: System Mapping and Alignment

Work group focus area: During the first Portland Street Response stakeholder meeting on April 19, a portion of the agenda was dedicated to the following: Workshop resources we already have across the City and County - What resources and programs do we collectively have at this time? The Systems Mapping and Alignment work group was formed shortly thereafter to facilitate a robust, thorough process to fully address this aim and produce a comprehensive, shared understanding of our current systems to help inform an improved Portland Street Response approach.

Work group members: Abbey Stamp (abby.stamp@multco.us), Dan Douthit (dan.douthit@portlandoregon.gov), Renee Huizinga (renee.huizinga@multco.us), Adam Renon (adam.renon@multco.us), Marc Jolin (marc.jolin@multco.us), Seraphie Allen (seraphie.allen@portlandoregon.gov)

Summary of findings to date: The Systems Mapping and Alignment work group planned and conducted a Sequential Intercept Model (SIM) workshop on Friday September 20. The exercise was convened by Multnomah County’s Local Public Safety Coordinating Council and externally facilitated by experts from Policy Research Associates. The workshop focused on “Intercepts” 0/1 which include crisis response, dispatch, and law enforcement. The SIM process brought together a wide array of stakeholders, similar to those participating in the broader Portland Street Response stakeholder group. They conducted a comprehensive assessment of the available resources and gaps in services, and discussed systems from other jurisdictions.

Final recommendations: The system map produced by the SIM process details an incredible amount of complexity in our current crisis response, outreach, diversion, dispatch, and law enforcement systems at Intercepts 0/1. The current volume of interventions and services in this space should inform implementation of any new Portland Street Response strategy. The Systems Mapping and Alignment work group recommends:

1. The Portland Street Response pilot program should clearly articulate how the program will operate relative to other key crisis response, outreach, diversion, dispatch, and law enforcement services mapped as part of the SIM. This should include: clear roles and responsibilities; communication, coordination, and hand-off protocols with other service providers; and expectations and agreements around data and information sharing for evaluative purposes.

2. The Portland Street Response pilot program should implement data collection strategies and a robust evaluation program to measure its effectiveness. In addition to other necessary measures, evaluation aims should address:
   ○ How integration, coordination and communication with other service providers will be measured and evaluated;
   ○ The impact of Portland Street Response on other crisis response, outreach, diversion, dispatch and law enforcement services, and criminal justice system involvement; and
○ How success will be defined and measured.

3. A Portland Street Response stakeholder group should continue to meet with clear objectives related to the integration of Portland Street Response within the current system, monitoring evaluation of the pilot program, and considering options to streamline, consolidate, and/or supplant existing interventions within our current system. Stakeholders should continue to engage in existing efforts to improve criminal justice and behavioral health systems.

As described in the Sequential Intercept Model mapping Executive Summary, cross-system and cross-jurisdiction mapping, service development, and policy recommendations would benefit from the structure and facilitation provided through the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council. PSR and other future efforts to divert individuals with behavioral health needs away from justice involvement should be championed together by the cities and Multnomah County.
APPENDIX J

TABLED RECOMMENDATIONS
The two recommendations below were ones that stakeholders felt very strongly about but were not ultimately included in the final recommendations for the initial pilot. This is not to say they can not or should not be considered for future phases of the roll out.

- **Recommendation to conduct the pilot in Central Precinct** – Through consultation with Council Offices and others, it has been decided to start the pilot in a smaller geographic area (FMA-11 Lents) than in Central Precinct. The needs in Central Precinct are much greater than what one team could address in a pilot, and the needs downtown are more concentrated around other resources that are available to the individuals most likely to utilize Portland Response resources. By conducting the pilot in FMA 11 - Lents, the team will work in a smaller area, and address the needs of individuals further away from available resources.

- **Recommendation to have a three-person team** – Initial recommendations for a three-person team were meant to address the desires of a vast majority of stakeholders who wanted the knowledge, skills, and abilities of an EMT, Mental Health Professional, and Peer Support Specialist. Given resource constraints (both budgetarily, and physically within vans) the recommendation going forward to Council is for the first team to consist of an EMS Specialist and a Crisis Worker. If a second team rolls out during the pilot, it may consist of an Emergency Medical Responder and a Peer Support Specialist.
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IMPACT STATEMENT

Legislation title: Portland Street Response – Pilot Implementation Plan

Contact name: Kristin Johnson
Contact phone: 503-823-4892
Presenter name: Tom Rinehart, CAO

Purpose of proposed legislation and background information:

This report presents to Council recommendations for the implementation of the Portland Street Response Pilot Project.

Financial and budgetary impacts:

Funding for this pilot in the amount of $500,000 was appropriated in General Fund Contingency in the FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget. It is anticipated that the pilot program will remain within this budget. Portland Fire and Rescue will request transfer of this contingency to their budget in the FY 2019-20 Spring BMP.

Community impacts and community involvement:

The stakeholder group created a Community Engagement workgroup which completed the following:

- 4 listening sessions with the houseless community
- 1 on the ground survey of the houseless community in conjunction with Street Roots and the PSU Homeless Research Action Collaborative
- 1 survey of businesses and neighborhood associations
- 3 listening sessions with PPB
- 1 listening session / sit-alongs with Bureau of Emergency Communication Dispatchers
- 1 Community logo design contest

Please refer to Appendix G for more details.
Impact Statement for Requested Council Action

**Budgetary Impact Worksheet**
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