COOK, LAKE, ITASCA, KOOCHICHING FAMILY HOMELESS PREVENTION & ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CLIK-FHPAP)

2018

Needs Assessment & Strategies

Table of Contents

Prepared by MESH

Summary

The Cook, Lake, Itasca, Koochiching Family Homeless Prevention and Assistance Program (CLIK-FHPAP) Advisory Committee formed a workgroup to study the needs of households that are facing homelessness and housing instability in the CLIK-FHPAP region. The purpose of this document is to describe the lessons learned and to propose strategies for meeting the needs and emerging trends discovered in the assessment process. Once adopted, this document will inform the eligibility and activities CLIK-FHPAP will require of selected agencies funded by CLIK-FHPAP.

CLIK-FHPAP Mission
Ensure that everyone has a safe and affordable place to live through the development of an informed, community-wide, comprehensive response.

Overview of Process

The CLIK-FHPAP Needs Assessment Workgroup met on a monthly basis from February—June 2018 to review existing data, conduct a community-wide survey, and develop this summary document. The workgroup was comprised of members representing the FHPAP grantee (3), subgrantee, and community stakeholders not funded by FHPAP. The group was facilitated by Mike Manhard of MESH, who has been contracted by Minnesota Housing to provide technical assistance to the CLIK-FHPAP region.

Assumptions

The workgroup pursued our work to create this document with the following basic assumptions:

- *The process for creating the needs assessment will be informed and educated, but will not be scientific*. The workgroup did not possess the time nor the resources to create a needs assessment process that would meet scientific standards. The workgroup did make effort to ensure data was reviewed from multiple sources and that multiple stakeholder groups were engaged. Anecdotal and hard data were both included in the assessment process and given equal weight. The workgroup also used its experience and expertise to draw conclusions from what the data did and did not tell us.
- *The needs assessment is a time-limited snapshot*. While we believe this effort can help to describe current trends and needs in the CLIK-FHPAP region, it is recognized that needs will change over time. The FHPAP Advisory Committee will need to adjust to trends that emerge and will need to conduct additional needs assessments at least once per biennium in the future.
- *Some of our current activities will need to change*. It is expected that the needs assessment will reveal needs/strategies that will require discontinuing some existing activities and creating new ones. It should be expected that the levels of funding per sub-grantee will shift and that sub-grantees will to adjust their programming as a result of the conclusions drawn from this process.

Questions We Sought to Answer

The workgroup sought to answer the following questions in our needs assessment efforts:

- WHO is facing homelessness and housing stability in CLIK-FHPAP? What are their characteristics, needs, etc?
- What are the primary PERSONAL barriers for people experiencing homelessness & housing instability in CLIK-FHPAP?
- What are the primary SYSTEM barriers for people experiencing homelessness & housing instability in CLIK-FHPAP?
- What are the primary/recurring themes among the data sources we review?
- Recognizing we cannot meet the needs of all households in CLIK-FHPAP with the limited resources of FHPAP, what is does the data tell us about the target population best served by FHPAP funds? What eligibility will help us reach this population?
- What strategies might best address the barriers identified above and help promote housing stability?

Data Sources / Reports Reviewed

The workgroup collected and reviewed data from the following sources[1]:

- HUD Point in Time Annual Count of Homeless Persons (January 2017)
- CLIK-FHPAP Community Connect Participant Survey Data (October 2018)
- Kootasca Community Action Needs Assessment (2015)
- Wilder Research Triennial Study on Homelessness in Minnesota (October 2015)
- CLIK-FHPAP Needs Assessment Survey (February-March 2018)
- CLIK-FHPAP Client Survey (April 2018)
- CLIK-FHPAP Turnaway data (January-April 2018)

Definitions

As part of the assessment process, the Workgroup reviewed and refined our definitions of Homeless and At-Risk of Homelessness in effort to inform review of each population's barriers and recommended strategies for homeless prevention and rapid rehousing.

Homeless is defined as:

- Currently without housing and staying in an emergency shelter, domestic violence shelter, or in a place not intended for human habitation; or
- Frequently moving to live with other households in housing to which they have no legal claim and from which they have been notified they will have to move within 30 days for adult households or within 45 for unaccompanied youth (up to age 22); and
- Lacking the resources and support networks needed to obtain immediate housing.

At imminent risk of homelessness is defined as:

- Eviction within 2 weeks from a private dwelling (including housing provided by family or friends); or
- Discharge within 2 weeks from an institution in which the person has been a resident for more than 180 days (including prisons, mental health institutions, and hospitals); or
- Residency in housing that has been, or is scheduled to be condemned by housing officials and is no longer safe for human habitation; or
- Facing other crisis (health, trauma, dramatic loss of income, other) that is immediately compromising their ability to retain housing; or
- High overcrowding (the number of persons exceeds health and/or safety standards for the housing unit size and/or may result in a lease violation or loss of subsidy); and
- Lacking the resources and support networks needed to retain or immediately relocate to safe, affordable housing.

Observations / Recommendations

Based upon review of the data listed above and workgroup discussion, the Workgroup made the following observations and recommendations. Observations were made about the populations/sub-populations facing housing instability in CLIK-FHPAP and about the primary systemic and personal barriers that inhibit housing stability. Based upon these observations, the Workgroup developed recommendations for eligibility criteria and program strategies to best target and serve appropriate households in CLIK-FHPAP.

It should be noted that the Workgroup recognized in our discussions that FHPAP resources are not intended nor able to meet the needs of all households facing homelessness and housing instability in CLIK-FHPAP. As noted in CLIK-FHPAP

---

[1] Summaries of these data sources are included in the appendixes of this document.

Prepared by MESH

Advisory Committee Charter & Bylaws Document, FHPAP is not intended to serve the entire continuum of care response to homelessness. While FHPAP funds are distributed to regions with great flexibility; it is the responsibility of each FHPAP region to design and implement program activities that target specific populations at-risk/currently homeless who can be stabilized with limited/short-term assistance. Thus, the workgroup recognizes that there are other parts of our continuum who will need resources and assistance that are not being addressed in this document.

Personal Barriers

The CLIK-FHPAP Workgroup identified the following as the PERSONAL barriers inhibiting housing stability for households in our region:

Sufficient income / Ability to pay for housing • *Direct correlation between income and housing stability* • *53% of renters are cost-burdened (using more than 30% of income on housing)—many served are paying more than 50% on housing at program exit*	TOP
Access to employment • *Only 7% of households on the Coordinated Entry (CES) priority list are employed*	TOP
Access to affordable housing • *Limited stock of affordable units* • *Needing assistance working with landlords (especially households with barriers)*	TOP
Mental Health • *50% of those in shelter are disabled*	HIGH
Family Issues • *Losing custody due to CD* • *Timing/logistics with reunification*	HIGH
Client follow thru • *Low compliance households are often denied service*	HIGH
Life skills/financial management • *A higher priority for youth and households returning after previously been served by FHPAP resources. Need for financial management support*	OTHER
Transportation	OTHER
Ability to afford childcare	OTHER
Criminal history	OTHER

System Barriers

The CLIK-FHPAP Workgroup identified the following as the SYSTEM barriers inhibiting housing stability for households in our region:

Lack of Affordable Housing • *Extremely low vacancy rate (2.6%, .3% for affordable housing, 5% is healthy)* • *Limited funding to develop new/needed housing* • *Demand for 426 senior housing units*	TOP
High unemployment • *High unemployment rate 7% vs 5.1%. This was prior to recent rounds of layoffs—sawmill, mine, etc* • *Lack of employment/decrease in hours*	TOP
Landlord Engagement • *Limited pool of landlords willing to work with homeless clients* • *Unwillingness to rent to those with criminal records*	HIGH
Eligibility criteria / turnaways • *Turnaways—high amount due to lack of income, insufficient income* • *Eligibility criteria (HUD)*	HIGH
Staff capacity to serve those who don't follow thru	HIGH

- *What can you do with those that don't comply? How do you identify barriers/strategies? How do you set limits? When? Don't want to continue to give money if not working—still, these HHs are still homeless in the community.*

CES priority list management/process is too slow • *How to address delays in CES/case conferences*	HIGH
Population growth • *Projected growth--66% growth of those over 65.*	OTHER
Lack of shelter • *Turning away 34% from shelter* • *Low sheltered #s for YOUTH. Due to absence of available resources*	OTHER
Shortage of PSH • *49/105 on CES score PSH* • *Need PSH for youth*	OTHER

Populations Facing Homelessness/Housing Instability in CLIK-FHPAP

The Workgroup reviewed the distribution of populations (families, singles, youth) facing homelessness and housing instability in CLIK-FHPAP. Based upon the review of the data, the Workgroup has recommended funds be distributed by the following percentages to each population.

Population	2017 Point in Time Count				Coordinated Entry Priority List		Wilder (2015)		Housing Inventory Count (HIC) Resources Available			Rec'd %
	HHs	*%*	*#*	*%*	*#*	*%*	*#*	*%*	*RRH*	*TH*	*PSH*	
Youth Families	4	6	11	11	n/a	n/a	5	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	**5%**
Youth Singles	16	25	16	16	25	19	16	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	**20%**
Families	8	12	25	25	12	9	37	42	42	23	79	**35%**
Singles	37	57	47	47	88	66	31	35	4	15	91	**40%**
Notes	The number/percentage of FAMILIES reduced drastically in most recent data while data for SINGLES increased. Since most resource is also dedicated to families, CLIK FHPAP opted to shift more FHPAP resources to singles adults. This shift is still less than current data might suggest since we are not yet clear if recent data is an anomaly or if it is a long-term trend. The CLIK FHPAP Advisory will closely monitor this with turnaways to ensure that we adjust the shift as needed to align with households in need in our community.											

CLIK-FHPAP Strategies to Address Needs

Based upon the needs identified in this report, the CLIK-FHPAP Advisory developed program, administrative, and system-wide strategies to best address the needs of our community.

CLIK-FHPAP Program Strategies

CLIK-HIAC developed and adopted the following service models to meet needs of homeless and precariously housed families and individuals in our community.

FHPAP Model #1—Light Touch (for Homeless Prevention ONLY)

Description of Model	Light touch services accompanied at times with very minimal financial assistance to help resolve housing crisis.	
	At Risk of Homelessness	Homeless
Client Eligibility	• At risk of homelessness • Low income (less than 200% poverty level) • Employed or starting a job within the current month, or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable. • Likely to stabilize with minimal assistance (one-time guidance/assistance) • Homeless Prevention Targeting Tool score of 0-12	• Not eligible under FHPAP
	Service Set (very short-term—less than one month)	Assistance Set (1 time)
Program Strategies Offered	• Light Case Management including: 　○ Basic budget awareness (where you can save, where you can add income) 　○ Problem solving 　○ Tenant education • Referrals 　○ Housing list, applications 　○ Legal Aid, Homeline 　○ Employment services 　○ MH/CD (ARMHS) 　○ Mainstream resources 　○ Immigrant resources • Light advocacy on behalf of client	One-time financial assistance, as needed (no more than $100) may include: • Transportation assistance (gas, minor assistance) • Other material and financial assistance
Performance Standards	• 80% of households will not return to homeless prevention programs within next 3 months (immediate crisis resolved)	

FHPAP Model #2—One-Time Assistance (for Prevention and Homeless)

Description of Model	One-time financial assistance accompanied with light touch services to help resolve housing crisis.	
	At Risk of Homelessness	Homeless
Client Eligibility	• At imminent risk of homelessness • Low income (less than 200% poverty level) • Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 1 month. • No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. • Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 1 month) • Prevention Targeting Tool score of 13-15	• Homeless (including doubled up) • VISPDAT score less than 8 • Low income (less than 200% poverty level) • Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 1 month. • No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. • Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 1 month)
	Service Set (one-time or one month)	Assistance Set (one-time)

Program Strategies Offered[2]	• Case Management including:
	  o Budgeting
	  o Problem solving
	  o Tenant education
	• Referrals
	  o Housing list, applications
	  o Legal Aid, Homeline
	  o Employment services
	  o MH/CD (ARMHS)
	  o Mainstream resources
	  o Immigrant resources
	• Advocacy on behalf of client
	  o Landlord engagement
		One-time financial assistance may include (target <$750 single, <$1,000 family):
		• Rental Assistance
		  o 1st/Last rent
		  o Deposit
		  o Housing application fees (no more than 2 per household)
		• Utility assistance (including past due)
		• Transportation assistance (when directly connected to housing stability services/assistance)
		• Other material and financial assistance (only upon approval of Grantee)

Performance Standards	• **90%** of households will be housed at program exit • **85%** of households will not become homeless. • **75%** of households will not return to homeless prevention programs within the next year.	

---

[2] Services and Assistance listed need not be PROVIDED to each household, but must be AVAILABLE to households as needed/requested (directly through the provider or by close access to partner organizations).

Prepared by MESH

FHPAP Model #3—Short-term Assistance (for Prevention or Homeless)

Description of Model	Short-term financial assistance (including a portion or all of rent) with light-touch support services provided on a short-term basis (less than 6 months)	
Priority populations	• Returning to FHPAP • Less than 100% poverty level • Extreme high cost burden for rent (60%+)	
Client Eligibility	**At Risk of Homelessness**	**Homeless**
	• At imminent risk of homelessness • Low income (less than 150% poverty level) • Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 3 months. • No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. • Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 6 months) • Homeless Prevention Targeting Tool score of 16-20	• Homeless • VISPDAT—singles 4-8 or higher • Low income (less than 150% poverty level) • Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 3 months. • No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. • Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 6 months)
Program Strategies Offered[3]	**Service Set (less than 6 months)**	**Assistance Set (less than 6 months)**

	• Case Management and referrals that (define frequency in P&P) include:
	  o Wrap-around services
	  o WRAP team participation (for those exiting institutions)
	  o Financial management, budgeting—rent wise[4]
	  o Employment training and support (referrals and review resumes, interview prep, clothing for interviews, etc)
	  o Transportation assistance
	  o Tenant education
	  o Connections to MH/CD services, diagnostics/assessments
	  o Connections to mainstream resources—SNAP, SSI, SOAR, etc.
	• Housing search and placement
	• Landlord mediation, education & engagement
	• Connections to legal assistance—escrow, habitability, UD prevention, expungement, outstanding warrants
		Short-term financial assistance may include:
		• Rental Assistance
		  o 1st/Last rent
		  o Deposit
		  o Housing application fees (no more than 2 per household)
		• Utility assistance (including past due)
		• Transportation assistance (when directly connected to housing stability services/assistance)
		• Other material and financial assistance (only upon approval of Grantee OR all expenses must be approved by program manager and reported to advisory committee at next scheduled meeting)

Performance Standards	• **85%** of households will be housed at program exit • **80%** of households will not become homeless. • **75%** of households will not return to homeless prevention programs within the next year.	

---

[3] Services and Assistance listed need not be PROVIDED to each household, but must be AVAILABLE to households as needed/requested (directly through the provider or by close access to partner organizations).
[4] Financial management services/support will be an expected service component for all households who have previously been served by FHPAP

Prepared by MESH
MESH

FHPAP Model #4—Medium-term Assistance (Prevention) / Rapid Rehousing (Homeless)

Description of Model	Medium-term financial assistance (including a portion or all of rent) with light-touch support services provided on a medium-term basis (up to 24 months)	
Priority populations	- No income - HHs served by short-term that reveal higher barriers (thru reassessment), need ongoing support - HHs with disabilities - Literally homeless households?	
Client Eligibility	**At Risk of Homelessness** - At imminent risk of homelessness - No or Low income (less than 100% poverty level) - Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 1 month. - No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. - Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 1 month) - Homeless Prevention Targeting Tool score of 21 or more - Households that entered Short-term Assistance who are later identified to need Medium-term Assistance (must have approval from Grantee)	**Homeless** - Homeless (including doubled up) - VISPDAT—singles 9 or higher; families - Low income (less than 150% poverty level) - Employed, likely to be employed or connected to other income (SSI, etc.) that will likely be sustainable within 3 months. - No other means to resolve crisis, likely to become homeless but for this assistance. - Likely to stabilize with limited assistance (within 3 months)
Program Strategies Offered[5]	**Service Set (up to 24 months)** - Case Management including: - Wrap around services - WRAP team participation (for those exiting institutions) - Financial management, budgeting—rent wise - Lifeskills - Employment training and support (referrals and review resumes, interview prep, clothing for interviews, etc) - Connections to MH/CD services, diagnostics/assessments - Connections to mainstream resources—SNAP, SSI, SOAR, etc. - Tenant education - Housing search and placement - Landlord mediation, education & engagement - Family Reunification - Connections to legal assistance—escrow, habitability, UD prevention, expungement, outstanding warrants	**Assistance Set (up to 24 months)** - Medium-term Rental Assistance (including) - Monthly rent 1st/Last rent - Deposit - Housing application fees (no more than 2 per household) - Utility assistance (including past due) - Furniture, Household items - Transportation assistance (when directly connected to housing stability services/assistance) - Other material and financial assistance (only upon approval of Grantee)
Performance Standards	**85%** of households will be housed at program exit **80%** of households will not become homeless. **75%** of households will not return to homeless prevention programs within the next year.	

---

[5] Services and Assistance listed as OFFERED need not be PROVIDED to each household, but must be AVAILABLE to households as needed/requested (directly through the provider or by close access to partner organizations)

CLIK-FHPAP Administrative Strategies

CLIK-HIAC developed and adopted the following administrative strategies to help ensure that grant management and monitoring help to create an efficient and effective homeless response system. CLIK FHPAP Advisory Committee will develop a workplan to accomplish these strategies by December 2018.

Administrative Strategy #1: Align Process for Tracking Turnaways
- Develop tracking sheet of recording contacts with households seeking help with housing/homelessness.
  - Ensure that all FHPAP subgrantees utilize the tool.
  - Review data collected at least every 6 months.
- Request tracking of turnaways and exits from shelter (Grace House).

Administrative Strategy #2: Develop, Adopt, and Closely Follow Policies & Procedures Document
- Build off existing policies and procedures (Minnesota Tribal Collaborative, Dakota).
- Once adopted, Advisory should identify how to monitor (set calendar to track periodically in committee meetings)

Administrative Strategy #3: Enhance Reporting and Evaluation by Utilizing Adapted LSS Reports
- Begin tracking data and building reports July 2018 (first report to Advisory October 2018)
- Start small and build based upon areas where Advisory wants to know more

CLIK-FHPAP System Improvement Strategies

CLIK-HIAC developed and adopted the following System Improvement strategies to help address system-wide issues impacting homelessness and housing instability in the CLIK region. CLIK FHPAP Advisory Committee will develop a workplan to devote time and energy to these strategies and will report progress/accomplishments by December 2019.

System Improvement Strategy #1: Build an Equity Plan
- Strengthen partnerships with Tribal Reservations.
- Create a plan for how to use data to better understand issues of disparities. This plan may include demographics data that reveals:
  - Who seeks assistance,
  - Characteristics of needs,
  - Who is served/turned away,
  - Who is successfully/unsuccessfully assisted by FHPAP
- Identify and schedule trainings for subgrantees and advisories on topics like:
  - Tribal sovereignty and government
  - Historical trauma
  - Serving LGBTQ populations
  - Racial Equity
  - Cultural Competency

System Improvement Strategy #2: Improve CLIK's ability to serve "hard to serve" clients
- Establish schedule to review and improve program eligibility to ensure we are not screening out clients with higher barriers.

- Review documentation and steps required for clients to access CLIK FHPAP and remove and/or improve any steps that are unnecessary or common hurdles for clients.
- Schedule trainings for CLIK FHPAP subgrantees and Advisory members on topics that will help enhance program design and service delivery to hard to serve clients. Topics may include:
  - Harm reduction
  - Housing First principles
  - Trauma-informed care
  - Etc.
- Pilot strategies to target hard to serve clients.
  - Consider removing income requirements or "likely to stabilize" from eligibility criteria in pilot approach
  - Identify how staff time and skills might need to adapt to serve these clients successfully
- Review and assess Kootasca's historic connection to treatment-based shelter program. How do you continue to utilize the great asset of Grace House while ensuring that sobriety is not required to access to shelter, housing, and supports.

System Improvement Strategy #3: Enhance Landlord Engagement Efforts

- Continued primary system barrier is access to affordable housing. Essential that Advisory time and energy is devoted to growing pool of landlords/property owners.
- Try to replicate what is working in other FHPAP regions.

System Improvement Strategy #4: Identify Workflow Solutions with CES Tools

- CLIK FHPAP subgrantees have many tools and demands for data collection (Tracking Turnaways, MN Homeless Prevention Tool, VISPDAT, Agency Intake Forms)
- Devote Advisory time to identify how to streamline the multiple demands of these tools.
  - Create baseline to determine time required for steps, track over time to document improvements
  - Identify steamline options
    - What steps could be combined?
    - How could any of the tools be simplified?
    - Etc

System Improvement Strategy #5: Leverage services and training for FHPAP activities

- Identify partners that could help CLIK FHPAP subgrantees to serve people better
  - Circles of Support
  - Hope House
  - Northlander
  - Affinity
  - Elder Circle
  - Train the trainer mentors
  - Peer supports

Data Source Reports

DATA SOURCE SUMMARY REPORT—FHPAP Turnaway Data

DATE   *2/20/2018*

NAME   *FHPAP Itasca County Last 50 Turn Aways*

DATA/REPORT SOURCE   *FHPAP Turnaway Data*

WHEN WAS THE DATA/REPORT CONDUCTED?   *2017*

GEOGRAPHIC AREA INCLUDED IN DATA/REPORT (check all that apply)

Cook County ☐   Grand Rapids Area   ☐
Lake County ☐   Beyond Regions Listed   ☒
Itasca County ☒
Koochiching County   ☐

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF THE DATA/REPORT
Identify any patterns in clients turned away- develop strategies for RFP FHPAP Planning

WHAT DO YOU IDENTIFY AS THE PRIMARY (TOP 2-4) TAKEAWAYS FROM THE DATA/REPORT?
People seek out assistance and not considered a Crisis scenario-staff provide information and referrals
Lack of income or insufficient income
Majority of turn-aways due to lack of funding
Only 5 of the 50 seeking funding that had already accessed
21 singles and 28 families – evenly divided

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT CLIK-HIAC FHPAP'S SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO HOUSING (HOUSING, JOBS, ETC)?
Lack of income and or low income. Not affordable housing available to low income households,
Homeless Response system cannot meet needs of all the homeless- GAP

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOMELESSNESS** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
Homeless and zero income. Direct correlation between income level and housing

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOUSING INSTABILITY** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
If get behind no savings to fall back on
Rent burdened

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT **WHO** IS FACING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP (PLEASE THINK ABOUT AGE, GENDER, HOUSEHOLD TYPE, RACE, ETC)?
Current tool does not track gender, race
Only 2 HH were youth, Majority were middle aged

DOES THE REPORT IDENTIFY STRATEGIES THAT MIGHT ADDRESS GAPS FOR THOSE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY?

YES   ☒   NO   ☐

IF YES, WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED? *Please separate by population (homeless/at-risk, family, youth, single) as appropriate.*
Strategies additional services for homeless
Affordable housing
Jobs and living wage jobs

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Turn away tool could gather more or less data

Prepared by MESH

DATA SOURCE SUMMARY REPORT—Caper Report Data

DATE   *3/6/2018*

NAME   *Jessyca Bardzel*

DATA/REPORT SOURCE   *Other*

WHEN WAS THE DATA/REPORT CONDUCTED?   *2017*

GEOGRAPHIC AREA INCLUDED IN DATA/REPORT (check all that apply)

Cook County	☐	Koochiching County	☐
Lake County	☐	Grand Rapids Area	☒
Itasca County	☒	Beyond Regions Listed	☐

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF THE DATA/REPORT
The Caper identifies who we serve, demographics, disabilities, outcomes

WHAT DO YOU IDENTIFY AS THE PRIMARY (TOP 2-4) TAKEAWAYS FROM THE DATA/REPORT?
We have served approximately the same number of people each year, so the need is staying the same. We see mostly singles at the shelter.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT CLIK-HIAC FHPAP'S SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO HOUSING (HOUSING, JOBS, ETC)?
20% of participants needed extensions past the standard length of stay due to needing additional time to find or get into housing

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOMELESSNESS** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
At least 50% identify a disability of some sort

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOUSING INSTABILITY** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
Click here to enter text.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT **WHO** IS FACING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP (PLEASE THINK ABOUT AGE, GENDER, HOUSEHOLD TYPE, RACE, ETC)?
140 adults, 26 children, 15 families, 83 females, 83 males, 4 veterans, 75% Caucasian, 14% American Indian, 5% African American, and 6% multiple races.

DOES THE REPORT IDENTIFY STRATEGIES THAT MIGHT ADDRESS GAPS FOR THOSE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY?
                        YES   ☐   NO   ☒

IF YES, WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED? *Please separate by population (homeless/at-risk, family, youth, single) as appropriate.*

Click here to enter text.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Click here to enter text.

Prepared by MESH

DATA SOURCE SUMMARY REPORT—Community Connect Data

DATE   *3/14/2018*

NAME   *Jennifer Mulligan*

DATA/REPORT SOURCE   *Other*

WHEN WAS THE DATA/REPORT CONDUCTED?   *2017*

GEOGRAPHIC AREA INCLUDED IN DATA/REPORT (check all that apply)

Cook County	☐	Koochiching County	☐
Lake County	☐	Grand Rapids Area	☒
Itasca County	☒	Beyond Regions Listed	☐

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF THE DATA/REPORT
Itasca Community Connect " Connecting people to the services they need"

WHAT DO YOU IDENTIFY AS THE PRIMARY (TOP 2-4) TAKEAWAYS FROM THE DATA/REPORT?
Click here to enter text.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT CLIK-HIAC FHPAP'S SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO HOUSING (HOUSING, JOBS, ETC)?
Employment , Affordable Housing

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOMELESSNESS** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
Click here to enter text.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOUSING INSTABILITY** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
Transportation, Child Care

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT **WHO** IS FACING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP (PLEASE THINK ABOUT AGE, GENDER, HOUSEHOLD TYPE, RACE, ETC)?
Click here to enter text.

DOES THE REPORT IDENTIFY STRATEGIES THAT MIGHT ADDRESS GAPS FOR THOSE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY?

YES   ☐   NO   ☒

IF YES, WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED? *Please separate by population (homeless/at-risk, family, youth, single) as appropriate.*
There were 24 household that were indicted as homeless
6 – one parent household with children
6- Two parent households with children
12- single adults

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Click here to enter text.

DATA SOURCE SUMMARY REPORT—Kootasca Community Action Needs AssmData

DATE   *3/15/2018*

NAME   *Isaac Meyer*

DATA/REPORT SOURCE   *Kootasca Community Action Needs Assessment/Report*

WHEN WAS THE DATA/REPORT CONDUCTED?   *2016*

GEOGRAPHIC AREA INCLUDED IN DATA/REPORT (check all that apply)

Cook County   ☐
Lake County   ☐
Itasca County   ☒
Koochiching County   ☒
Grand Rapids Area   ☒
Beyond Regions Listed   ☐

PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF THE DATA/REPORT

As a Community Action Agency, KOOTASCA Community Action is responsible for understanding the changing needs of the communities and peoples it serves and to ensure the voice of low-income peoples in its leadership and service design. To do such, 150 one-on-one interviews with low-income (<80% AMI) households were conducted by KOOTASCA staff, 106 social service professionals were surveyed, and analysis of other state and local data sources- particularly Minnesota Department of Education, Department of Health, Department of Employment and Economic Development, Office of Labor, Minnesota Demographics, MN Compass- were conducted.

WHAT DO YOU IDENTIFY AS THE PRIMARY (TOP 2-4) TAKEAWAYS FROM THE DATA/REPORT?

Regarding FHPAP and as the author,

1. 15% of participants were living with relatives or friends. Of the 77% of participants who rented or owned their own home, 16% had friends or relatives living with them on a temporary basis.
2. 28% of participants were homeless during the previous 2 years, and 5% of participants were homeless during the assessment. For those who were homeless for less than a year the median length of homelessness was approximately 3 weeks. For those who were homeless for less than a year the average length of homelessness was 1.7 months.
3. 52% of participant households were cost burdened and spending 30% or more of their monthly income on rent or mortgage payments.
4. 49% of participant households moved within the past 2 years, with 22% moving more than once. Single female headed households were particularly susceptible to housing stability with 61% of single female headed households reporting that moving within the past 2 years was a problem.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT CLIK-HIAC FHPAP'S SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO HOUSING (HOUSING, JOBS, ETC)?

There is a growing employment access and skills gap between the poor and working poor; households in poverty (48%) were significantly more likely to report a problem experiencing difficulty finding a job in the past 2 years than low-income households not in poverty (26%).

As well, householders and renters are increasingly cost burdened as rental prices have risen while both the employment rate and take home wages of the poor and low-income has fallen.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOMELESSNESS** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?

While I did not disambiguate my original report by homelessness or recent experience of homelessness, for this I briefly revisited the dataset to skim the following. 95% of participants who had recently experienced homelessness but were not currently homeless were cost burdened (compared to 52% of all participants). Further, safe housing was a problem for 41% of participants who were homeless or had recently experienced homelessness (compared to 25% of all participants).

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT THE PERSONAL BARRIERS OF PEOPLE EXPERIENCING **HOUSING INSTABILITY** IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP REGIONS?
The report provides 7 pages of tables regarding the personal barriers facing participant households. While several demographic measures were used to disambiguate these results housing instability was not among them. However, given the answer to the next question, it is likely that information disambiguated by poverty status might provide a usable proxy.

WHAT DOES THE DATA/REPORT TELL US ABOUT **WHO** IS FACING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY IN CLIK-HIAC FHPAP (PLEASE THINK ABOUT AGE, GENDER, HOUSEHOLD TYPE, RACE, ETC)?
If households that are "living with relatives or friends on a temporary basis" and/or are cost burdened is the measure for housing instability, the demography of homeless and unstable households appears to be significantly similar to the population under 65 years of age living below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level in Itasca and Koochiching Counties. That is to say the population experiencing homelessness and housing instability earning less than 80% of area median income, is significantly similar to the population under age 65 living below 100% FPL.

DOES THE REPORT IDENTIFY STRATEGIES THAT MIGHT ADDRESS GAPS FOR THOSE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING INSTABILITY?

YES   ☐   NO   ☒

IF YES, WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED? *Please separate by population (homeless/at-risk, family, youth, single) as appropriate.*
Click here to enter text.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
The Survey of Social Service Providers on pages 62 and 63, should likely be examined as an independent source as the 106 participants provided 3,973 responses competitively ranking challenges faced by low-income people.