

Housing the Homeless Davis County

September, 2006

Prepared by Jon Allred for the Wasatch Front Regional Council

**Funding Provided by the
State of Utah Department of Community and Culture**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary1

Introduction 12

Estimates of Homeless13

Services for the Homeless21

Analysis – General Concerns..... 34

Appendices37

Housing the Homeless in Davis County

Executive Summary

A new national effort is underway to end all chronic homelessness within 10 years by placing these people in permanent housing with supportive care. The 'Housing First' concept is that putting homeless people in permanent housing is less expensive than leaving them on the street where they incur heavy costs to law enforcement, hospitals, shelters and social service agencies. Pilot projects for 'housing first' are underway in Ogden and Salt Lake City.

This report on homeless was prepared by the Wasatch Front Regional Council as a support to community development planning.

General Findings:

- All communities produce homeless people, visible or invisible;
- Homelessness in Davis County runs less than half the national average because:
 - counting methods miss people
 - strong religious networks assist many people
 - Utah's cold winters drive some homeless people elsewhere;
- Inadequate income is the primary cause of homelessness;
- There is a widening gap between income and housing cost;
- At present, about 250 people in Davis County are homeless;
- Several thousand additional people, mostly in families, are at risk for homelessness due to very low income and personal problems;
- Most people on the verge of homelessness are either working or available for work;
- The Davis County Housing Authority and other providers of low-cost housing meet shelter needs of approximately 1,500 households in the county;
- The vast majority of all housing assistance in Davis County depends upon Federal funds that are currently in decline;
- Recently, more than 1,000 qualified households were on waiting lists for public housing assistance in the County;
- Chronically homeless people are expensive for communities, sometimes incurring \$50,000 or more per year in social service costs, including law enforcement and uninsured health care;

- Family and neighborhood resources are the least expensive options for homelessness;
- Many homeless people from Utah and elsewhere go to Ogden and Salt Lake City for help, reducing opportunity for hometown solutions;
- Thousands of former jail and prison inmates live in the study area, most of whom experience severe housing problems, discrimination, mental health issues and substance addiction that lead them back to incarceration;
- Jail is the most expensive and least effective form of housing assistance and qualifying is easy;
- Many solutions to homelessness can be achieved by better planning rather than solely by additional funding for the usual services;
- Providing truly affordable housing will require a new look at codes, standards and public preferences.

Summary Issues and Recommendations

Issue 1: A policy for housing everyone. All communities produce homeless people. Trends in homelessness are an indicator of a community's overall health and outlook. **Recommendation:** Ensure that the study of homelessness is a regular topic in community planning.

Issue 2: The “Housing First” concept attempts to eliminate chronic homeless. The State of Utah has accepted the national 10-year goal of eliminating all chronically homelessness. People who are frequently homeless cause large financial burdens for communities, including public safety agencies and hospitals. Some social research in the United States indicates that providing immediate and permanent housing for such people is less expensive than responding to crises they cause by homelessness. **Recommendation:** Evaluate the “housing first” concept by first requesting that community medical and public safety agencies report estimates of the cost of serving indigent people, whether or not they can be labeled chronically homeless.

Issue 3: Land use planning may need more support for special housing needs. This report found some evidence from housing providers that land use planning standards add complexity to housing projects for special groups, many of whom are prone to homelessness. Likewise, general plan maps may not provide for the diversity of housing choice that would best provide the types and locations for housing most needed by people at risk for homelessness. While “exclusionary zoning” may not be overt, various community factors may cumulatively hamper the provision of housing solutions for certain people, particularly those in stigmatized social groups such as convicted criminals and the mentally ill. **Recommendation:** Ensure that community comprehensive plans evaluate and report on the effects of plan standards on the opportunity for specialized housing in all neighborhoods. Plans should review the national literature on successful models for ensuring diversity of housing opportunity.

Issue 4: Housing affordability is a key to resolving homelessness Some people believe that *a rising tide lifts all ships*. The best way to resolve homelessness is by making sure that housing is affordable for the general community. **Recommendation:** Elected officials should ensure that the best-known set of policies is in place to keep housing affordable.

Issue 5: Resolving homelessness requires direct funds to the poor. In contrast to Issue 4 above, some people believe that funds must be targeted directly to homeless people: shelters, transition housing, permanent supportive housing. Overall housing affordability has little effect on chronic homelessness. **Recommendation:** Elected officials should adopt a goal to ensure financing and development support specifically for housing homeless people.

Issue 6: Communities lack specialized skill for treating the homeless. This report found evidence that assisted housing is expensive and complicated. Housing providers are often short-handed and few offices

have the full range of financing, construction and management skills needed for building and maintaining complicated and risky low-income housing. **Recommendation:** Communities can arrange for cooperation between housing experts to jointly design and build housing for homeless people.

Issue 7: Housing funds go un-used. Funding for housing very low-income people always falls short of need. However, this report found that there are community resources, including public funding sources and private sector tax advantages that are not fully utilized. **Recommendation:** Communities can request periodic reports from state and federal housing agencies that describe under-utilized funding sources and missed opportunities for better use of available funds and program resources.

Issue 8: There may be more homeless people than we thought. Estimates of homeless people are probably too low. If true, then the cost of homelessness to communities is also under-estimated. Methods of counting homeless people are hampered by many factors, including lack of funding, mis-understanding about who qualifies as homeless and the fact that homeless people are typically disconnected from the community and may even avoid contact. Better counts of homeless people can help decide, one way or another, the importance of homelessness compared to other community issues. In some cases, clients do not disclose homeless status for fear of jeopardizing access to public services that require a fixed address. **Recommendation:** Communities should actively support at least four ways of counting homeless people:

- provide that local housing authorities and service providers gather information from clients and applicants regarding their housing status.
 - support full use of the “Homeless Management Information System” (HMIS) that is being promulgated nationally and in Utah.
 - Support the state-sponsored annual homeless ‘point-in-time’ counts.
 - Provide that the Utah Department of Workforce Services develop ways of gathering housing status data from clients without threatening client confidence in services.
-

Issue 9: Inadequate transportation is a key factor in homelessness. The working poor are a vital and growing sector of the Utah economy. Housing service providers frequently report that transportation problems among poor people contribute to homelessness and hamper solutions. Many low-income workers cannot afford to drive or are unable to drive. Such people may also be hampered in their use of public transit by distance to service and by bus schedules that do not fit their work schedule or family needs. Classically, a poverty-level single woman with children may find it impossible to use public transit for work, shopping, day care and medical care. Meanwhile, social service agencies report that rising motor fuel costs in 2006 have immediate effects on client needs for other services. Unlike many white-collar workers who are given UTA passes but don’t use them, many people at risk for homelessness get no free passes. For them, daily transit fares can amount to as large a fraction of personal income as driving costs are for other people. **Recommendation:** Community master plan maps should focus carefully on transit-oriented development options for low and very low-income workers. Community land use plans would also do well to consider how employee housing may be allowed in commercial and

industrial zones that historically exclude residential uses. The working poor may greatly appreciate the opportunity to live close to work. Likewise, many industrial parks and commercial neighborhoods can offer more amenities than do single family neighborhoods.

Issue 10: Homelessness could be considered a regional issue with regional solutions. Homeless people, and those at risk, tend to migrate toward larger cities for the availability of specialized services. This phenomenon places un-due burden on central cities and likewise reduces the sense of obligation for how homelessness has its roots in outlying municipalities. Communities and regional agencies could choose either of two paths for dealing with this situation:

Option A. On a regional basis, communities could agree to support Ogden and Salt Lake City as legitimate nodes for collecting and serving the region's homeless people. There are certain cost advantages to providing services on a large scale and many small communities cannot afford an initial start-up facility even though additional increments of service later on would be relatively inexpensive. At present, financial contributions from Davis County support homeless-related services in Salt Lake City, on the basis of acknowledging the Davis County origin of clients.

Option B. In contrast to Option A above, many practitioners believe that homeless people should be dispersed rather than concentrated and that every community should shoulder responsibility for homeless people who originate with them. This emphasis is often applied to convicted criminals who are eventually released from incarceration: the argument goes that each community should ensure that housing, employment and other essential needs of former prisoners are met by the convict's community-of-origin, rather than leaving such people unwelcome and hampered in meeting obligations that are required for avoiding a return to prison.

Issue 11: Homelessness among immigrants. This report found very little information about the specific housing needs of immigrants other than from Catholic Community Services that sponsors the resettlement of foreign refugees in Utah. In particular, there is widespread belief, but insufficient facts to illustrate the extent to which illegal immigration is accompanied by homelessness. In fact, measuring homelessness among immigrants is complicated by the fact that many such people are willing to endure inadequate housing conditions and limited tenant rights, particularly when illegal status is a factor. Either way, extended family and close-knit social relationships among recent immigrants may encourage and provide reasonably well for people in transition to life in the United States, regardless of legal status or compliance with local laws. **Recommendation:** Illegal immigration is an important national political issue. Individual communities can decide to evaluate the extent to which undocumented workers are a local factor and what policies should be adopted.

Issue 12: Extremely economical housing may be a useful option. Land use policies already exist for promoting "affordable housing" and "inclusionary zoning" is no longer a new idea. Meanwhile, there continues to be a widening gap between incomes of the working poor and housing cost. In fact, under current building codes, an increasing portion of all new jobs in the United States are at wages that will support only very, very small dwelling units. At current average residential construction costs, minimum wage employment will support a dwelling unit no larger than a few hundred square feet. There may be a market for very basic, utilitarian housing that is aimed directly at the working poor. If so, then promoting such housing as a legitimate element in the community could resolve some homelessness and support business investment by easing burdens on employees. **Recommendation:** It may be possible for economic development agencies to support housing development that directly matches wages actually paid by businesses that are being recruited. The availability of *highly* affordable housing (not just

“moderate income” housing) for the working poor may be an attraction for business investment. Drawing such people into legitimate forms of very cost-effective shelter may reduce pressure on single-family neighborhoods and apartment complexes that are often plagued by sub-leasing, over-crowding and lack of maintenance.

Issue 13: The existing housing stock could be better utilized. With historic decline in family size, much of the housing stock in Utah is under-utilized. Municipal zoning ordinances vary widely in their allowance for “mother-in-law” apartments that could provide affordable housing. Likewise, “mixed-use” zoning provisions vary widely in their allowance for housing in non-residential zones. **Recommendation.** More careful treatment of both options could create a great deal of new affordable housing opportunity for people at risk for homelessness.

Issue 14: Convicted criminals fail to recover. Prison may be the most expensive and least effective means of housing people who perform poorly in society. Yet, the lack of effective tactics for returning such people to normal community life people almost ensures that they will return to incarceration. Practitioner reports indicate that thousands of former prisoners in Utah lack adequate housing and many qualify as homeless. This report found widespread evidence that released prisoners are not equipped for a self-sustaining life in society in part because their criminal record excludes them from many housing and employment options. **Recommendation.** For the sake of community cost and mercy to convicts, it may be helpful to view their disadvantaged condition as an explicit handicap for which a tailored housing strategy may be helpful. It would also be helpful for the Utah Department of Corrections to produce an up-to-date and comprehensive profile of prisoner status in terms of housing and employment.

Housing the Homeless in Davis County

Introduction

Homeless people are a persistent feature of community life in the United States. The costs of homelessness are more severe than generally recognized and are expected to grow. In fact, the gap between household income and housing cost is widening more quickly for people who are already the most at risk for homeless. Most homeless people are either among the working poor or from families in temporary distress.

Research for this plan found that homelessness, by its nature, is difficult to classify. Housing problems are so interwoven with other social ills that placing homeless people into crisp social categories is not practically impossible and sometimes unhelpful. A far greater number of people are functionally homeless in the plan area than the annual ‘point-in-time’ counts for all categories of traditionally defined homeless people. Even small changes in housing finance interest rates, community rates of unemployment or other macro-economic trends can quickly produce far more technically qualified homeless people than are being treated in all programs combined.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides national standards for defining homelessness that include these descriptions:

“ . . . the lack of a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence. Shelters and other institutions for temporary residence do not count as ‘home’, nor do places that are not designed for ordinary use for human habitation¹⁻²

The definition of ‘chronic homeless’ bears special emphasis in this report:

“. . . An unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more, or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years. In order to be considered chronically homeless, a person must have been sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation (e.g., living on the streets) and/or in an emergency homeless shelter. A disabling condition is defined as a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions. A disabling condition limits an individual’s ability to work or perform one or more activities of daily living³.”

By definition, only single individuals, rather than families, can meet the definition of ‘chronic⁴.’ In addition, HUD makes a distinction between ‘sheltered’ and ‘unsheltered’ homeless people: an *unsheltered* person resides in a place not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, abandoned buildings. A *sheltered homeless* person is someone who now spends the night in a bonafide shelter or a transitional housing or supportive housing situation.

¹ See also note 2 above.

² Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, 42, USC 11301 et seq. (1994)

⁴ Among other sources cited here, see also <http://www.hmis.info/documents/countingguide.pdf>, accessed May 22, 2006.

Estimates of Homelessness in Davis County

(Note – due to the large number of footnotes, Table 1 won't display until the next page. I am making a comprehensive list of all caveats and arithmetic methods I used for Table 1. Some of them are in the footnotes below, others in Appendix A and the rest are in my head - - I'll keep writing them down).

Table 1 below is highlighted for Davis County - - I'll do the same for the other county reports.

Table 1					
Comparative Estimates of Homelessness in Wasatch Front Counties⁵					
(See Appendix A for additional data limitations)	Davis	Morgan	Tooele	Salt Lake	Weber
Total Homeless People ⁶	450 ⁷	10 ⁸	65	3800 ⁹	520
Single Adult Men	140	2	20	2100	320
Single Adult Women	30	0	5	500	90
Total People in Families ¹⁰	220	8	35	500	150
Total Children in Families	80	6	25	450	125
Children Alone – Girls	30	0	8 ¹¹	200	70
Children Alone – Boys	35	0	10	400	90
Chronic Homeless Women	25	0	2	250	80
Chronic Homeless Men	90	1	4	600	120
Mentally Ill	120	1	35 ¹²	1500 ¹³	300
Substance Addicts ¹⁴	260	2	45 ¹⁵	2200	650
Total Sheltered ¹⁶	160	0 ¹⁷	0	1900 ¹⁸	250
Unsheltered ¹⁹	230	10	65 ²⁰	1900	270

Homeless people are both 'nowhere and everywhere.' Estimates of homelessness in the planning area are based upon a wide variety of data sources, none of which is particularly reliable. In fact, available data and anecdotes by social service workers can be used to support an argument that actual homeless numbers for each category shown in Table 1 are at least twice, if not four to 10 times higher than shown. The likelihood of systematic under-counting may be especially true for children (school age youth). For instance, point-in-time counts (melded with some other 'hard numbers' suggest that, state wide, there are less than 100 unaccompanied homeless children total less than 100 state-wide. Social service agency estimates together suggest a total

⁵ Categories may not be reliably added due to the large number of homeless persons who fall into multiple categories.

Individual numbers are reasonable for general comparisons.

⁶ Total counts would be much higher if undocumented aliens, released prisoners and others were fully counted according to full "McKinney" definitions. As such, more confident estimates for sub-categories (from social service agencies) will not add to total counts for that, and a variety of additional reasons, including widely bases for reports by social service providers on service capacity and turn-over of clients.

⁷ Interagency agreement exists between Davis and Salt Lake area homeless-related service providers, resulting in significant differences between data indicating the 'commencement' of homeless condition in Davis County and the appearance of such people in homeless counts in the Salt Lake area.

⁸ It is widely accepted that single women with children persistently appear for public services in Morgan County when such services are available. Meanwhile, additional families are served by Weber and Davis County agencies. Concurrently, Weber County shelters report a substantial number of single men from Morgan County. Together, these sources suggest a much greater amount of homelessness arising from Morgan County than indicated by Table 1. However, any estimate of that total and assignment to Morgan County would create an immediately unrealistic picture of homeless as an element of daily life in Morgan County.

⁹ This report did not closely evaluate Salt Lake County homelessness. The numbers in Table 1 are for comparison purposes only. The Table 1 estimated total homeless in Salt Lake County greatly exceeds point-in-time counts for 2006 because of substantial evidence of under-counting that is greatly being resolved as annual counting processes improve. This difference is

of more than 1,000, not counting hundreds, or even thousands of ‘aging-out’ foster children who are ‘lost in the cracks’ as they move through a highly variable and almost un-trackable pathway to adulthood. For In any case, even the conservative estimates shown in the table are one sure indicator of substantial housing problems along the Wasatch Front and Davis County and help explain rising social service costs for homeless-related public services. There is every reason to believe that the ranks of homeless people are growing due to overall population growth and rapidly rising housing costs.

As a further illustration of the vagaries in counting the homeless, the current (conservative) estimate of homeless persons in Davis County in 2006 of 366 persons compares to 720 people that were believed to be homeless in the County in 1998 when the Family Connection Center was first developing. Yet, not one agency in Davis County, or anywhere along the Wasatch Front would agree that homeless needs have dropped by half since 1998. Certainly, two trends in Davis County are clear:

1. The apparent rate of homelessness is less than half the national average;

partially accounted for ‘point-in-time’ use of multipliers to estimate the total number of people who passed through any homeless condition during the year.

¹⁰ There is some question as to what constitutes a family for homeless counting purposes. Census counts discriminate between households and families and do not require children for family designation. In comparison, homeless estimates by service providers tend to focus on whether or not children are present.

¹¹ Several sources indicate that dozens of young adults, including many foster children, leave home prematurely due to conflict. The vast majority travel to the Salt Lake area before appearing in any Tooele-area agency counts.

¹² A variety of questions arise regarding the housing status of Valley Mental Health clients: a significant number can technically be counted as homeless, even though they are in the process of moving to or from some form of housing assistance related to VMH. The same is true for other services in other counties.

¹³ Differences in count ratios between Salt Lake County and other Wasatch Front counties are accounted for in large part by the fact that specialized services for mental illness and substance abuse are well developed in Salt Lake City. Concurrently, suburban counties have more family-driven demographics and more young children that are not associated (yet) with substance abuse and diagnoses for mental illness.

¹⁴ For all five Wasatch Front Counties the estimated number of substance abusers, *as homeless people*, is subject to great debate, owing to lifestyle conditions and transiency and their concurrent presence in counts of mentally ill persons. This picture is further complicated by the status of many such people in any one or more of the following categories: family members (as either children, parents or both). Thus, for Tooele County, where substance abuse is reported as a rising trend, a teenage girl may be counted simultaneously in up to five categories in Table 1.

¹⁵ See note 9.

¹⁶ There is little shelter space in Davis County, compared to Weber County and Salt Lake County. With small numbers, the result of differences in opinion as to how to convert a highly variable, repetitive sequence of ‘filled beds’ into ‘people sheltered.’ Point-in-time counts use a multiplier of 5.0 to indicate a rough average of how many times a shelter space is filled each year. However, only recently has a more reasonable multiplier of 2.0 been applied for chronic homeless.

¹⁷ For Morgan and Tooele counties, traditional homeless shelter services do not exist; however, shelter is provided in a variety of ways, as described in the narrative.

¹⁸ This is only a cursory estimate for comparison purposes with other counties. Official point-in-time counts straddle this number (point-in-time and multiplier results for annual cumulative total sheltered) and the overall state counts, compared to national estimates of homeless trends suggest the general validity of the number for simple comparison purposes. As always, such numbers tend to be conservatively low but still useful.

¹⁹ The ‘unsheltered count’ is almost an arbitrary figure that is impossible to estimate accurately due to the nature of homelessness and the highly variable status of people who qualify at any given time. Information for this report suggests that unsheltered homeless are consistently much more numerous than the sheltered homeless but for reasonableness, the total of unsheltered persons is set to equal the difference between total estimated homeless and ‘sheltered homeless.’ In many ways, this estimate is unworkable. For one thing, just because a homeless person was served for a day, week or month does not mean that the homeless condition was resolved, but only that the person is not counted at any given time.

²⁰ This report did not resolve the question of whether or not people receiving any of several forms of housing assistance should be counted as *not homeless* during periods of assistance. For corrections, the recognition that homeless status persists during periods of incarceration recognizes that prison and jail do not resolve the issue of homelessness for such people, particularly upon release.

2. Homeless people migrate to services. This tendency obscures the origins of homelessness and complicates the process of building effective arguments for sensible community response to causes and effects.

Homeless Single People

The ranks of unaccompanied single individuals among the homeless is characterized by chronic homelessness. In fact, chronic homeless are limited, by definition, to single individuals. Serious mental illness, usually with multiple sets of symptoms, and chronic substance abuse are endemic in this population. The Veterans Administration (VA) acknowledges chronic homelessness among those treated at VA facilities but also admits to a lack of good longitudinal tracking for clients after treatment. As with other groups, the itineracy of many veterans defies easy characterization. Point-in-time counts for 2006 indicated few veterans among the homeless, highlighting the difficulty that most general-purpose relief agencies have in collecting reliable information on clients. For planning purposes, the only meaningful service-related feature of homeless veterans is the opportunity to increase the numbers of such people who are assisted in obtaining federal benefits to assist their stabilization.

Families with Children

Households that contain children are believed to be going homelessness at a rate than is increasing faster than that for the general population²¹. Nationally, persons in households with children account for more than one third of all homeless and may be approaching 40 percent. In rural areas, households with children may account for as much as 50 percent of total homelessness.

Davis County has a relatively large fraction of homeless persons in families. In Utah, about 80 percent of homeless households with children are headed by single parents, most of whom are women. A best estimate for rural areas indicates that 95 of homeless households are headed by women, consistent with national research on rural life in the United States. Interestingly, even though Utah is known for its large families the number of children associated with homeless households is estimated to be just 25 percent of all homeless persons, a somewhat lower rate than for the United States as a whole. For the portion of Utah covering most of Utah's rural communities, children account for almost 29 percent of homeless persons, still lower than estimates at the national level, but consistent with the belief that children are frequently seen among the rural homeless. It is possible that reporting of rural homelessness is relatively weaker in Utah, due to a lack of social services agencies or that social service systems in Utah do a slightly better job of keeping children out of homeless condition.

In Utah, about 80 percent of homeless households with children are headed by single parents, most of whom are women. A best estimate for rural areas indicates that 95 of homeless households are headed by women, consistent with national research on rural life in the United States. Interestingly, even though Utah is known for its large families the number of children associated with homeless households is estimated to be just 25 percent of all homeless persons, a somewhat lower rate than for the United States as a whole. For the portion of Utah covering most of Utah's rural communities, children account for almost 29 percent of homeless persons, still lower than estimates at the national level, but consistent with the belief that children are frequently seen among the rural homeless. It is possible that reporting of rural homelessness is relatively weaker in Utah, due to a lack of social services agencies or that social service systems in Utah do a slightly better job of keeping children out of homeless condition.

²¹ "Homeless Families With Children," Fact Sheet #12, National Coalition for the Homeless, cited at <http://www.nationalhomeless.org>, accessed June 21, 2006.

Other Important Groups

Mental Illness and Substance Abuse. Nationally, it is estimated that up to 25 percent of homeless people are hampered by at least one major mental illness (NCH, Fact Sheet #5). In Utah, the 2006 'point-in-time' counts suggest that rates of mental illness roughly match the national rate only for chronically mentally ill persons, reaching 28 percent. The estimated prevalence of mental illness in the general population of homeless persons in Utah is only half that, at 15 percent. While Utah point-in-time figures are reasonably comparable to national estimates, several important factors suggest that further study would demonstrate that conditions in Utah are even closer to national averages:

- It is highly likely that many homeless person experience symptoms of mental illness but have not been diagnosed as such;
- It is generally known that many indigent persons, including the homeless prefer to avoid disclosing health conditions, particularly mental illness;
- The homeless population is widely acknowledged to be under-counted by the 'point-in-time' process for all the reasons that illustrate their homelessness;
- National statistics, in conjunction with local knowledge, indicate that mental illness is prevalent among former prisoners and is a major factor in their difficulties returning to functional citizenship;
- a large fraction of homeless persons encountered by service agencies in Utah were recorded as "unknown" or "other." Even a cursory pro-ration of these additional persons to known categories would bring Utah estimates of mental illness among the homeless much closer to national estimates;

Altogether, readily available information suggests that mental health is a compelling factor in characterizing homelessness in Utah.

This report estimates that about 40 homeless persons with mental illness originate in Davis County. From social service agencies it is believed that a number are served by intervention programs in the Salt Lake County area. Research indicates that most mentally ill people can live independently, particularly with case management or other support; however, housing costs almost certainly exceed the earning capacity of many mentally ill people, and by an increasing margin. As such, the best intervention strategy for resolving homelessness among the mentally ill may be to augment existing social and health services and provide relatively small cash subsidies.

As noted above, symptoms of poor mental health and substance abuse frequently co-occur and their causes are often interwoven. This condition creates a confusing picture for homeless people and those who approach them. In any case, treatment pathways for both sets of maladies have many common features. Therefore, this plan may not yet need to make deep distinctions between mental illness and substance abuse in order to make recommendations that point in the right direction.

This report estimates that in Davis County at least 100 homeless people are substance abusers. A substantial portion are also mentally ill. Of course, that number is a small fraction of the total population of addicts, of one sort or another, who are probably at risk for loss of housing. For Morgan and Tooele

counties, this report believes that substance abuse is common, but co-occurs with homelessness for only very few people at any given time. The most obvious recommended intervention would be to improve coordination between existing programs that treat substance abuse among the general population. For Weber County, this report expects that while a substantial number of addicts experience homelessness, many are provided at least some form of intervention in the Ogden area. A useful strategy for Weber County would be to reduce the burden of chronically homeless on shelters and other emergency services by providing a larger and more dependable pathway to permanent housing, particularly single room occupancy.

Former Prisoners. It is a well-accepted fact that difficult social conditions in the United States result in a large fraction of all criminal convictions and the world’s largest proportionate share of people in prisons and jails. This trend is true in Utah. What is less well-known is the recidivism is the largest source of prisoner entries - - former convicts who are unable to succeed in society after previous incarceration. In fact, at least two-thirds of released prisoners will return to jail.

Across the United States, more 630,000 prisoners are released each year from correctional institutions for re-entry into community life²². To this number must be added those persons convicted of crimes but not incarcerated. It is widely known that persons with criminal records tend to face daunting challenges with employment and housing. For many of them, trouble with the law may also have originated in some way with living conditions, including housing cost and quality

During 2006, the Utah state prison system will release more than 3,000 people for community re-entry, including an estimated 530 to Weber County, 440 to Davis County and 105 to Tooele County. In the absence of fulltime corrections staff in Morgan County, this report estimates that five or more prison releases will have a Morgan County origin or destination during the year.

Table 2 – Gross Estimates of Former Prisoner Population

		Davis		Morgan		Tooele		Weber	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Age	Under 18	52	4	1	0	15	1	34	3
	18-64	419	36	10	1	82	11	273	23
	>64	52	4	1	0	5	1	34	3
Terms of Release	Probation	331	28	8	1	66	7	183	6
	Parole	111	9	3	0	21	3	111	22
	Expired	82	7	2	0	16	4	47	1
Total Released by Period	Past decade	3406	290	111	9	721	98	2899	247
	2005	524	45	13	1	103	14	341	29
	2006-08	1729	151	43	4	350	49	1125	96

To these numbers can be added several thousand annual prisoner releases from jails in Davis County before release. Typically, parole requires continuing monitoring for employment and residency. Clearly, not only is criminal history widespread among single homeless men, but the presence of convicts in ‘point-in-time’ counts made by social service agencies is certainly lower than otherwise due to prohibitions against serving such clients by housing authorities and disincentives for associating such people with other homeless service recipients. For these reasons, it is almost certain that former inmates may tend to under-report their status, particularly if participation in homeless-related services might also

²² See further notes on Commission on Prisons (Commission on Prisons, 2006).

draw attention to possible parole or probations violations, including previous loss of housing.

Empirical evidence exists that inadequate re-entry practices are associated with a rates of post-incarceration performance than when no support is provided at all. In any case, even the limited information available for this plan indicates that homelessness among former convicts is more widespread than indicated by official counts and contacts with service providers. To these numbers could be added persons at risk for homelessness or otherwise hampered by housing problems among the population of people convicted of crimes but not jailed, people who may not be provided any support or supervision and administration staff.

State of Utah corrections officers report that housing problems are severe among parolees and probationers, for two primary reasons:

- difficulties with employment that existed prior to incarceration, and which in many cases contributed to convictions, are worsened after re-entry;
- convicted status isolates former prisoners in the community, and denies them most forms of housing assistance at the most crucial point in their lives.

Approximately 91 percent of all persons with a criminal record are men and boys, with 87 percent being between the ages 18 and 64 at the time of conviction. There are few other important distinctions across age and gender that apply to this report, except for the fact that approximately 41 percent of all criminal convictions relate in some way to substance abuse. That fact suggests not only the importance of substance abuse treatment in supportive and transitional housing but also the role of adequate housing as a broader preventive measure for social ills, including criminal activity.

The Utah Department of Corrections estimates that as much as five percent of former state prison inmates are homeless at any given time²³. Technically, that number is much higher under the full definition of homeless that includes unsuitable living arrangements. In any case, the smaller estimate, if valid, translates to a total of more than 1,400 homeless persons. On face value that amounts to almost half of Utah's 2006 point-in-time count. Considering that official point-in-time counts identify only a small portion of the homeless as former prisoners, two assertions can be made that bear further study:

- it is likely that former prisoners have at least some tendency to less than fully report their criminal status;
- a significant number of former prisoners may not be approaching social services agencies for assistance.

The Utah Department of Corrections indicates that adequate housing is a critically important problem for former state prisoners; however, criminal status not only hampers employment options and ability to meet financial burdens, but disqualifies them for government housing assistance or even acceptance as tenants in market-rate housing. Thus, former inmates are caught in a dual bind over what may be their most important need: adequate shelter.

In Weber County, a recent study on the re-entry of prisoners to community life reached the same conclusion with added emphasis upon the fact that corrections programs in the United States have not yet

²³ Interview with Dale Schipaanboord, Utah Department of Corrections, May 19, 2006).

worked out effective means of criminal re-entry into communities²⁴. The study also found strong, though not universal support from local elected officials for building a recognized that parole reentry was a community problem and were willing to meet with stakeholders to develop a coordinated plan to assist in the reentry initiative.

Parolees will have at least some case management, including verification of a known place of residence. For those on probation or released without restriction (“expired”) support for ensuring adequate housing may amount to little or nothing. Even with current parole standards a majority of former state prisoners return to prison. There is every reason to trust Department of Corrections reports that lack of affordable housing may be the most serious problem confronting former prisoners. This plan will recommend intervention that trades the huge cost of prison housing for the fractional cost of subsidies for private community housing. The value of doing so includes a bonus: even the most modest employment in the community, rather than prison, ought to be larger than the cost of subsidizing SRO housing on the same terms provided to anyone else who qualifies for HUD assistance.

Foster Children. The fate of foster children in Utah is frequently associated with homeless issues. At present, about 2,100 Utah children are in foster care, with about 200 ‘aging-out’ of foster homes and state supervision each year²⁵. While there is no indication that Utah has a more or less different proportion of foster children than other states, these numbers are a relatively small group for which a homeless profile may be attempted. Like other categories of persons at risk for homelessness, this report sought data on the fate of foster children as they age out of foster care. Such data is generally lacking, beyond general totals and effort is underway to improve access to data and conduct follow-up research

Several important conditions apply: first, foster children are not placed voluntarily in foster care, so they tend to bolt quickly from foster homes at age 18. That tendency, combined with typical teenage impulsivity, over-confidence and other psycho-emotional factors, tends to work against the stability and continuity that were goals of foster care. Second, foster children, by virtue of childhood stresses, tend to have more medical and psychological problems than do most children. Third, foster children have fewer rooted connections to family and community, reducing the resources available for adjustment to adult life. Altogether, state agencies have difficulty staying connected to ‘aged-out’ foster children for the purpose working-out transition plans to adult life.

Recognizing the crucial transition period of age 18 to 21, the State of Utah offers a package of referral services and direct services that include educational scholarships, counseling, cash for establishing a household and three additional years of Medicaid coverage for those foster children who complete foster care to age 18. Aid can include small amounts of cash for car repair and assistance in making use of all 211 community services as well as specialized counseling by the Utah Department of Human Services.

Having medical care, particularly for prescribed psychoactive medications, is vital to the ability of foster children to merge successfully with adult life responsibilities. As noted, however, maintaining connections to foster children after age 18 is difficult and the State of Utah is doing more marketing to overcome the variety of resistance often encountered with people in that age group.

The result of these factors is that a substantial, but unknowable number of former foster care children are believed to qualify, technically, as homeless. Often they return to biological families, where previous

²⁴ Note 4 below. And Ogden, Utah Weed & Seed Steering Committee Parole Re-entry Research Project

²⁵ Interview with Pam Russell, Utah Department of Child and Family Services, July 3, 2006. Also Web information from the Child Welfare League of America, www.cwla.org/ndas.htm, accessed July 3, 2006. Also Web information from the Utah Department of Human Services, www.dhs.state.ut.us, and www.dcf.utah.gov/foster_care.htm, both accessed July 3, 2006.

problems have not changed. From there, these new adults tend to do a lot of ‘sofa surfing’ at friends’ homes. These conditions are hinder their ability to maintain employment and make other adjustments to adult responsibilities. Difficulties with substance abuse and the need for medications and therapy often result.

The State of Utah is in the fourth year of the “Transition to Adult Living Initiative” intended to create a bridge from age 18 to 21. This initiative is also connected to the State’s ‘homeless housing committees’ and various state departments. Progress to date has been gratifying, with a general sense that various programs are much better coordinated. In the State’s ‘homeless committee’ rubric foster care is aligned with prisoner re-entry as a ‘discharge planning’ topic, in recognition of the problematic circumstances from which foster children come.

A number of additional conditions help characterize former foster children in terms of homelessness. Foster children tend to be transient in adult life. It is important to differentiate between homeless people who were foster children in Utah and the homeless from other states. Effort is underway to promote research that will help better characterize homelessness for children from Utah foster homes. Available data on Utah foster children is difficult to interpret correctly, further adding to the value of research.

Utah facts include “national studies indicate that foster children are more likely to go homeless.²⁶ A DCFS transition task force identified rent, emergency rent and housing utility costs as primary needs of aged-out foster kids. This report will recommend that such information be amplified by further research. In this regard, Davis Behavioral Health and the Davis County School District have both emphasized that homelessness among school-age young adults is much more prevalent than generally recognized²⁷.

Race and Ethnicity. Persons of indicated African American descent appear among counts of Utah homeless in numbers that exceed their representation in the general Utah population. So, while their numbers may still be few, their housing difficulties are disproportionate.

Surprisingly, persons of indicated Hispanic ethnicity appear in homeless counts in only slightly larger proportion to their apparent presence in Utah communities. It is estimated that Hispanics account for about 11 percent of the Utah population but account for about 15 percent of the homeless. By itself that disproportion may be serious enough to warrant additional consideration; however, the case becomes sharper for Hispanic children: the 2006 point-in-time count found more than 27 percent of children in homeless families to be of Hispanic origin. To these statistics may be add some interpretations that encourage further investigation:

- recent national statistics indicate that Hispanics account for a growing disproportion of all U.S. births;
- un-documented immigrants and their children account for a larger-than-reported portion of the Utah population;
- documented and un-documented Hispanic households may have to accept long-term housing conditions, including over-crowding, that would qualify them as homeless under the inclusive definitions governing this plan;

²⁶ http://www.dcfh.utah.gov/foster_care.htm.

²⁷ See interview notes on Davis Behavioral Health below.

- for social and family reasons, Hispanic households, particularly un-documented persons, may have a relatively greater tendency to deal with problems privately, rather than through social service agencies;
- Undocumented aliens, most of whom are Hispanic, do not technically qualify for federal housing assistance, such as Section 8 vouchers and public housing, provided primarily through local housing authorities;
- Levels of income, wealth and education are generally lower than average for Hispanic households, leading to relatively less ability to deal with rising housing costs in Utah.

Considering these factors, it is surprising that Hispanics do not account for an even larger share of counted homeless persons. A broader study of housing would, under the fullest definition of homeless, very likely reveal housing problems that are certain to grow as Hispanics in Utah grow in numbers in the midst of declining housing affordability.

The overall disproportion of racial and ethnic minorities in Utah's homeless population may reflect the general state of social and economic disenfranchisement traditionally experienced by such groups. As such, housing problems are both a cause and a result of their condition and recommendations in this plan will apply at both ends of the housing support system.

The relatively small populations of Morgan and Tooele counties yield homeless-related numbers that do not merit deep analysis; in fact, these statistics are consistent with national trends, suggesting their general validity for planning purposes, as follows:

- domestic violence is more likely to be a factor among the homeless in Morgan and Tooele than in Davis and Weber counties;
- Documented cases of AIDS/HIV among the homeless are very few, even rare;
- Children in families contain both genders and all age groups in roughly equal portions;
- Un-accompanied children (such as 'runaways') are all almost all older than 13. Interestingly, nearly all of those being reported are found in the Salt Lake area, suggesting that youth-related attractions and specialized services are also there. This trend also helps illustrate the general tendency for homeless people to migrate from rural areas;
- Military veterans account for more than 10 percent of the homeless. It is highly likely that they also account for a substantial fraction of substance abusers and the mentally ill;
- Statewide, almost 60 percent of homeless single individuals are men, affirming the common knowledge that men may fare relatively better on the streets and women cope more often by other means. This assertion should not be construed to indicate that women are better served in terms of housing; indeed, the prevalence of domestic violence and other coercive relationships are known to be associated with inadequate housing alternatives for women.
- people with developmental disabilities apparently comprise nearly 10 percent of the homeless population, a surprisingly high figure considering the plethora of alternative programs that

support such people and the tendency for families to care for their own. If this figure is verifiable, then it suggests an opportunity for improving social service network connections so that shelters may be relieved of burdens that are best carried by agencies with specialized capability.

Social service agencies in Davis County report substantial evidence of domestic violence among clients, indicating the value of treating such problems before homelessness can follow.

Domestic Violence. All family-related social service agencies in Davis, Tooele and Weber counties report substantial evidence of domestic violence among clients, indicating the value of treating such problems before homelessness can follow. Agency reports indicate that more than 95 percent of domestic violence clients are women and about 75 percent have children under age 18 in the household. Almost universally, agency contact with domestic violence clients involves income problems. Likewise, agency intervention tends not to focus on homeless status, but on services that promote housing stability and income self-sufficiency.

Veterans Among the Homeless. Evidence everywhere indicates a large number of veterans among the homeless. However, it is also evident that the large majority of veterans are housed in some manner nearly all of the time and so tend to be un-counted in demographic profiles of the homeless. A variety of sources together indicate that at least 30 percent of chronic homeless people previously served in the military. Investigation for this report found universal belief that homeless veterans are found in all communities in the four-county area of this report. The U.S. Veterans Administration (VA) hospital in Salt Lake City indicated that many of their residential clients technically qualify as homeless on the basis of housing conditions that existed at the time of their entry to the Valor House or conditions that may prevail at the end of their two-year tenure at the 'VA'²⁸. The VA was unable to provide specific counts of clients from each of the four counties spanned by this report; however, all VA staff consulted for this report indicated a strong tendency on the part of veterans to migrate to the Salt Lake City area for access to the more broad range of services available.

In most cases, veterans either come from or return to shared housing with family. That tendency illustrates the eclectic and sometimes effective way in which homeless people work out their after-military service lives, particularly in old age. However, that pattern also complicates the production of an accurate profile. Regardless, several facts are clear, and sufficient for service planning purposes: veterans frequently experience post-service mental health and substance abuse and many, if not most of them go largely un-treated in a systematic way that leads to resolution. Not surprisingly, service providers indicate the need for substantial expansion of substance abuse treatment for veterans; however, they are either unwilling or unable to gather or divulge demographic information that effectively apportion their numbers by county.

Importantly, rural areas report a greater tendency to deal with distressed community members in eclectic, relatively un-structured ways as local resources are insufficient to provide specialized services that are available in the Salt Lake Valley. The VA staff state that methamphetamine use is very high in Tooele City, so estimates of homelessness should be boosted, compared to other rural communities. He said that, in any case, intervention would result in a large number of clients going to the Salt Lake area in any case, due to sophistication of services.

²⁸ Interview with Richard Landward, U.S. Veterans Administration Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah, March 22, 2006.

Services for the Homeless

State and Federal Assistance

The foundation for homeless assistance derives from the U.S. Departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Health and Human Services (HHS). Competitive application for, and distribution of federal funds requires cooperation between local continua-of-care, homeless housing committees and the Utah Department of Community and Culture.

Under the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program qualified tenants select their own private, market-rate housing for which they pay 30 percent of their adjusted gross income toward rent and utilities. The housing authority pays the landlord for the difference between the tenant's rent and the full rent. The number of vouchers available depends upon HUD allocations each year and upon choices made by the authority as to the mix of tenant incomes and voucher terms. Typically, there is a long waiting period for qualified households to receive vouchers.

In addition to Section 8 funding, millions of American households also live in federally subsidized public housing, managed by local housing authorities. This is a form of permanent housing that helps prevent or resolve homelessness; however, there is not enough federal funding for all qualified applicants and waiting lists typically include qualified people who have been waiting for several years.

Other HUD programs promote either rehabilitation of existing buildings or new construction to provide lower-than-market cost housing for qualified tenants. The federal subsidy can take several pathways but the end effect is reduced rent burden for approved tenants who chose to reside there. Among others, the HOME Investment Partnership program provides block grants to states for promoting both homeownership and rental housing.

Of perhaps greatest value for the majority of homeless persons, Section 8 also provides money for rehabilitating existing buildings to provide 'single room occupancy' (SRO) for very low-income individuals. Federally sponsored SRO housing provides small private rooms and shared bathrooms, kitchens and other space at rental prices that are not to exceed 75 percent of fair market rent for efficiency/studio apartments. As such, SRO housing provides a very affordable solution to the problem of homelessness, including a fixed address and other elements of stability that are crucial to prevention.

State of Utah. The State of Utah has a goal of assembling a portfolio of assisted housing units that is worth at least \$100 million²⁹. Ideally, all such housing would be permanent, with supportive care provided to tenants. The State views that as more effective than transitional housing which intends, but may not succeed in moving people from shelter to permanent housing. At present, all of the State's portfolio serves people with household incomes no greater than 60 percent of the area median income (AMI) and the majority houses people with incomes at 30 to 40 percent of AMI.

Grants and loans provided by the Utah Department of Community and Culture (DCC) require leverage of some kind, and it is axiomatic that all successful projects are a blend of several different funding sources, including federal tax credits available to third party investors with no other affiliation to the project than the financial benefit. Review and approval of tax credits are handled by the Utah Housing Corporation. Community Development Block Grant money (CDBG) is also frequently applied for infrastructure, including street improvements and some direct building construction costs. Typically, such project

²⁹ Interview with Mike Glenn, Utah Department of Community and Culture, June 22, 2006.

requires years of development lead time and the State of Utah emphasizes the importance of having zoning and other approvals in place before its share of funding is approved. Most such projects are sponsored by non-profit corporations although Kier Corporation and Cowboy Partners are among the active for-profit developers in the Weber County area. At present, none of DCC investments are attached to Section 8 vouchers.

For the current pilot project for chronic homeless \$529,000 was provided by the Olene Walker Trust Fund along with \$221 in additional direct funding from the State of Utah. The Eccles Foundation and Crusade for the Homeless contributed \$600,000 and \$500,000, respectively, in addition to CDBG money, tax credits and cash from the Olene Walker Trust. The pilot project also benefited from deferral of developer fees and a grant from the U.S. Veteran's Administration.

At present, annual legislative appropriations to the Olene Walker Trust typically total \$2.2 million as a line item and in 2006 was supplemented by an additional \$1.0 million for supportive housing. Most Trust funds are funneled through housing authorities for deployment. In 2005, DCC arranged construction funding for a total of 540 assisted housing apartment units in multi-family buildings and an additional 160 single-family homes for which down payment assistance was provided. In 2005, a total of 210 dwelling units were funded in Weber County and 70 in Tooele County. Davis and Morgan Counties saw no additional units in 2005. For projects that ultimately produce cash flow, any net positive cash flow that may occur becomes payable toward loan balance.

Emergency Shelter Grant. The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) is HUD money for the first line of support to move homeless people toward independent living. Funding is provided to the State of Utah on a formula basis. ESG is HUD money allocated through the State of Utah DCC on a competitive grant request-for-proposal basis, available to any homeless-related agency. Generally applicants must have incomes at or below 125 percent of the area poverty level.

ESG is entirely for the services or 'soft cost' side of homeless housing and has four elements, three of which are purely for services to the homeless:

1. Prevention of homelessness, with most funds to CAP agencies going for emergency rent and utility payments;
2. Essential services, including counseling for substance abuse, employment related services and general case management;
3. Renovation and rehabilitation funds. It is noteworthy that the State of Utah receives only a few applications for these funds, which otherwise are a real opportunity for converting existing buildings to shelter space. The only two such grants in the past year were both in the four-county planning area;
4. Operations costs for homeless shelters and other service buildings.

Generally, competition for scarce funds is a vital concern and agencies ought to be innovative and get results. HUD money for the homeless has been growing for the past five years possibly a reflection of Federal emphasis on a do-able goal – eliminating homelessness at the expense of Section 8 that is essentially an open-term housing subsidy.

The Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) program is a creature of the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD)³⁰. The ESG is designed to be the first step in a continuum of assistance to prevent homelessness and to enable homeless individuals and families to move toward independent living. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee allocates funds as part of a competitive application process into the four categories above.

Agencies receiving ESG funds must match the grant dollar-for-dollar, either with other funds or the value of in-kind donations. This match must be within the same program as the grant award. Several restrictions on ESG funding exist.

Homeless Coordinating Committees. After more than a decade of service, in 2004 Utah homeless coordinating committees were re-organized to better direct state and federal funds to homeless and housing service providers. Responsibilities include an annual count of homeless persons and management of an allocation plan for distributing funds to homeless-related local service agencies. Among others, funds include the Emergency Shelter Program, Homeless Trust Fund, Critical Needs Housing and other sources. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee approves allocations for homeless services on a competitive application process for categories described above. Generally, agencies receiving these funds must match the grant dollar-for-dollar, either with other funds or the value of in-kind donations.

Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund. The recently-renamed Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund (PAHTF) has been in operation for more than 20 years. This Trust fund is crucial to the State's 10-Year goal because of an emerging Federal requirement that states and local governments carry more of the burden of providing vital case management services. The Utah Department of Community and Culture is the main conduit by which federal funds are guided by homeless coordinating committees to service providers.

For the current fiscal year, the PAHTF received a more-or-less regular state legislative appropriation of about \$1.4 million, plus a special allocation of 500,000. The allocation committee distributes that money along with ESG and 'critical needs' allocations.

Another aspect of PAHTF is the Emergency Food Network whereby emergency food pantries are stocked throughout Utah. From discussions with service providers, the inter-locking network of housing-related providers in the planning area use food pantries for homeless people as well as those at risk. Trends in demand for pantry food are rising along with general caseloads in the plethora of housing-related services that directly and indirectly address homelessness. State funds augment local and private food donations to these same outlets as well as a total of almost 40,000 volunteer hours in 2005.

Davis, Morgan and Weber counties belong to the 'balance of state' while Tooele County has been invited, but has not yet chosen to join Salt Lake County. The CofC funding cycle may be deemed 'formulae' money in the sense of being roughly dependable, based upon confident annual plans for specific projects that have had substantial gestation from previous year practice. The joint Utah funding application submitted for 2006 expects to receive approximately \$3.9 million from HUD, of which the 'balance of state' will probably receive \$1.1 million.

³⁰ Application forms and program support information available through the State of Utah Department of Community and Culture, information cited at http://community.utah.gov/housing_and_community_development/SCSO/esg.html, accessed June 25, 2006.

Federal priorities for Continuum money are for construction rather than operations or ‘soft costs.’ This increasing emphasis results in a corresponding shift of local matching resources:

A good model for the plan area is the cooperative venture known as the CofC.t present, Salt Lake City is building the Sunrise apartments, 100 units of permanent housing for the chronic homeless; Salt Lake County will add 85 further units in the Gregson. That total will go a long way toward the 10-year goal for resolving chronic homelessness. Full construction cost requires the addition of tax credits for the private developer, other private donations, HUD ‘Home’ program funds and other sources, including money from the Olene Walker Trust Fund.

An increasing share of operational, or ‘soft costs’ may need to be covered by tenant-based funds, including Section 8 vouchers, Shelter Plus Care money, funds from the Pamela Atkinson Trust Fund and additional tenant-based funds such as Medicare/SSI/SSDI.

Community Services Block Grant. In contrast, the Community Services Block Grant is a formula-based appropriation from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to help communities address poverty issues. Of the nine agencies in Utah receiving CSBG money, two are in the four-county planning area. Use of CSBG is flexible, based on the amount of local needs that fall into six national goals that all revolve around local capability to assist low-income households in becoming more self-sufficient. CSBG funds are generally distributed to CAP agencies, and the FCC in Davis County. Tooele is served by the Salt Lake CAP and Morgan County has access to both the Davis and Weber CAP agencies.

Continuum-of-Care. As its name implies, the ‘Continuum of Care’ (Continuum) process is a national effort that operates in Utah and other states in the form state and local committees and associated staff that administer three competitive programs emanating from the McKinney - Vento Homeless Assistance Act. The Continuum concept recognizes that homeless needs vary along a scale: For the study area, this plan explores and makes recommendations that support all elements in the Continuum of Care but don’t always fit neatly into one or another continuum category: prevention, outreach and assessment, emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent support housing, permanent affordable housing, and supportive services. Clients may enter or leave housing assistance at any point between minimal, low-cost intervention and intensive, expensive and long-term services at the other end of the scale. A key factor is the intention that homelessness be dealt with in a comprehensive manner by the plethora of federal agencies and their local counterparts³¹ described below.

The Supportive Housing Program (SHP) applies services in such a way to move homeless clients toward independent living, focusing on household stability while promoting skills, income and client control over life conditions. Service agencies can be states, local governments and other government agencies and private profit and non-profit organizations. Project proposals must be consistent with adopted Consolidated Plans.

Shelter Plus Care (SPC) is permanent, supportive housing that provides direct cash assistance for rental housing in combination with case management that is intended to include funding from other sources as well. Indeed, increasingly, HUD requires that supportive services come from non-HUD sources. In fact, projects must match their receipt of HUD resources with supportive services (soft costs) that are at least equal in value to the amount of HUD’s rental assistance (more-or-less hard costs). States, local governments, and public housing agencies may apply for Shelter Plus Care grants.

³¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning & Development, cited at <http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/programs/cont/index.cfm>, accessed June 28, 2006.

Critical Needs Housing. Critical Needs Housing (CNH) is money from the Utah State Legislature for such things as emergency home repair, disabled-access facilities, down-payment assistance, technical assistance grant-writing and other similar endeavors aimed at households with incomes at or below 125 percent of the official poverty level. Clearly, CNH money addresses homelessness primarily as prevention. As such, it is difficult to determine how many people receiving CNH assistance may be counted toward any goal or assessment of progress in resolving homelessness.

In any case, ‘critical needs’ include such things as dwelling modifications for disabled people, emergency home repair, such as furnace repair and similar actions that help prevent loss of housing or the need for institutionalization. As noted elsewhere, keeping people in their current housing prevents a host of issues that relate to qualifying for the range of available assistance once people are clients in the system and have no definite, long-term shelter of their own. The case of nursing homes is particularly acute because, once people surrender housing for institutional care they may be able to predict how their condition will eventually define their qualification for service. Nor will such people be able to confidently predict how much of that very expensive care they may eventually have to cover and where they will go once they are expected to leave that care.

Ten-Year Goal. The current Federal administration has established a goal of ending chronic homelessness by the year 2014. The U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness coordinates effort between states and 20 federal agencies. The State of Utah commitment to that Federal goal devolves to the State’s Homeless Coordinating Committee. Utah’s 10-year plan includes funding priorities, re-orientation of agency efforts and better reporting of homelessness and program results. The 10-year plan is based on the belief that current funding for homeless solutions are insufficient to meet that goal and new resources, particularly in supportive care, will be needed.

Housing First. The ‘Housing First’ concept is explained in the Utah 10-Year Plan, in national literature and elsewhere in this plan. For the purpose of this four-county plan it is important to recognize that ‘housing first’ is still in the experimental stage. A long-term research project will help determine the extent to which getting the chronic homeless into more-or-less permanent shelter will best ensure long-term avoidance of further homelessness. At present, Weber County is hosting one of two initial ‘housing first’ pilot projects in Utah. A total of \$85,000 has been provided by IHC and the State of Utah to fund the placement of five chronic homeless individuals in four existing, scattered-site apartments. Clients and case management are being selected from the existing service net. The Salt Lake Pilot project involves 17 placements and includes a University of Utah cost-monitoring component. In addition to a full funding package for the two pilot projects, the Utah legislature has appropriated \$250,000 in additional funds for use by homeless coordinating committees to produce innovative projects. The ‘housing first’ concept for resolving chronic homelessness is under evaluation by the State of Utah with pilot projects of 4 and 17 dwelling units underway in Salt Lake City and Ogden areas, respectively. Interestingly, the Salt Lake City ‘housing first’ pilot project is set for each of Utah’s 10 regions using a homeless coordination committee. Overall Utah goal of 4,000 units by 2014. Lloyd believes that 3,000 is possible with existing money.

Regional Services

The realm of policy and program contemplated by this report for a homeless housing plan included reference to ‘support-based disabilities.’ However, discussion and research in the course of this work suggest that classical disabilities are generally outside the realm of intervention for the homeless, except as supportive services and housing design help prevent homelessness or assist in self-sufficiency.

Housing assistance for the development disabled is a broad realm in the community that runs parallel but generally outside homeless programs and is worth reviewing briefly in this report. Along the Wasatch Front more than 20 agencies provide housing-related services for the developmentally disabled, of which TURN Community Services is a major provider and linkage to the others³². In contrast to homeless people, who may be highly intelligent, services for the developmental is generally limited to people with an IQ no higher than 70. TURN provides “support-enhanced housing” for people who are disabled, either by birth or by injury, leaving them at a relatively fixed mental age somewhere short of normal adulthood.

This distinction is an important contrast with homeless people who are adults in mental ‘age’ but who are often addled by mental illness or substance addictions. TURN helps arrange vocational rehabilitation services, and “shadow” services for client self-management and employment. Most TURN housing units are in duplexes, for ease of roommate arrangements and monitoring services. Importantly, mentally ill people are generally excluded which is, again, a distinction that separates them from homeless people. TURN services, like Avatar, Rise, Chrysallis and many others, provides for permanent structured work and living arrangements that will always be somewhat sheltered, with no goal for independent living and self-sufficiency that is so characteristic of homeless-related education and job skill-building. Not surprisingly. TURN services rarely encounter homeless people and developmentally disabled people rarely exhibit the resistance behaviors that are often exhibited by the homeless. Homeless people are more characterized by personality problems that are treatable by cognitive therapy and medication, but to which the homeless are often resistant. Homeless are not typically part of the “medical model” except where illness or injury may require acute or sometimes chronic treatment.

Regional Homeless Services. It is well-accepted that Salt Lake City is a regional hub for the homeless. Salt Lake City and Ogden both have Rescue Mission centers; however, with The Road Home, 4th Street Clinic and other major homeless providers in close proximity, Salt Lake will continue to be a major support to homeless people coming from Davis, Morgan and Tooele Counties. The Rescue Mission serves two groups: a highly variable group of un-recorded hungry people who come for food and shelter and who occupy the dormitory and even the chapel during over-flow conditions; and, a group of about 30 single men for whom a program of religious instruction and substance abuse therapy combine to prepare them for employment and self-sufficiency. Like most other providers of homeless service, the Rescue Mission is seriously limited in its interest and ability to track homeless clients for reporting purposes.

As such, there is no way to estimate how many clients hail from the four Counties addressed in this report. Importantly, however, those who successfully ‘graduate’ from the Rescue Mission’s faith-based program tend to stay in the Salt Lake area. To the extent that other homeless groups migrate to, and then remain in the Salt Lake City area, there is no ‘feedback’ to counties of origin as to how local policies may contribute to, but not resolve homelessness locally. To this group of single men may be added an unknowable number of families coming from Davis, Morgan, Tooele or even Weber Counties whose situation is a reflection of local conditions that are largely acted-out elsewhere³³.

Habitat for Humanity. Unlike some Habitat locations, Salt Lake Habitat does all new construction in batches of 4-5. Habitat is a lender, targeting the market that 99.9 percent of lenders avoid – people with incomes at 30 to 60 percent of area median income (AMI). Typical subsidized housing service providers go up to 80 percent of AMI. Typically, recipients go through a “clean-up” process in which credit is

³² Interview with Jan Ericson, Director of Housing and Development, TURN Community Services, April 16, 2006.

³³ Interview with Eileen Dwyer, at The Road Home, who re-iterates that poor understanding of homelessness includes a substantial number of doubled-up families for whom no tracking mechanism exists but who still qualify as homeless by one standard or another. Additionally, substance abuse problems may disguise underlying mental illness, for which addiction has been an unsuccessful coping strategy.

repaired, etc. to meet qualifying standard through standard FNMA/FHLMC applications, interest free for 20 to 30 years, with payments of \$400-500 per month. Comparable two bedroom rents are at \$700/mo. The great majority of recipients are single mothers with children. Many recipients have been on Section 8 during that prep time. Some recipients have passed through the Road Home and similar services. It is likely that recipients were homeless at some point. At the least, recipients of Habitat support will free-up Section 8 certificates for others, so Habitat serves as a pressure relief point or exit point for people moving through the homeless service system. Most CDBG money going to Habitat is for infrastructure – curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc.

In light of Utah’s recent embrasure of the ‘housing first’ model and focus on resolving homelessness, it is worth noting that for developmental services Utah does not operate on the “perpetual” care model that ensures life-long response to needs. For instance, when the parents or other caretakers of developmentally disabled people quit or decline by growing-old or otherwise old or die there may be no way to ensure proper transition of a disabled child. Likewise, high schools eventually turn away mentally retarded students who have long-since ‘graduated’ even though their condition may have resulted from being children of drug-addicted or alcoholic mothers. Without some form of health insurance, such people face an uncertain future in the community but did not turn-up as a significant category of people within the ranks of the homeless or other groups receiving homeless-related services. It is estimated that as many as 69,000 developmentally disabled people may be vulnerable to loss of program support, and as many as 10,000 are currently under-served. In Utah, there is a waiting list of about 2,000 such people for services provided by TURN and similar agencies. It is possible that overall population growth and limited Federal budgets may result in some of these under-served, developmentally disabled people appearing for homeless services³⁴.

In this regard, agencies providing homeless-related services often report a goal of assisting clients in qualifying for SSI and SSDI and their associated Medicare/Medicaid resources. It is unclear if such goals, if successful, would collide with the reality of projected overall demands by an aging society and Federal budget strains.

Local Services

Services for the homeless in the four-county planning area are almost entirely dependent upon State of Utah and Federal program resources. The State of Utah Office of Community Services provides general guidance and funding to help communities bolster the self-sufficiency of residents and thereby prevent homeless as well as resolve it for those who lack housing. Housing authorities provide a variety of services and resources and are especially equipped to assist in helping clients find affordable housing units. Most housing authorities provide the following services and programs: Section 8 vouchers, multiple-family housing construction, acquisition and rehabilitation of substandard multiple family housing units, and counseling to assist clients with issues related to housing. The following identify the housing authorities that are located in the Wasatch Front Region.

Davis County Homeless-Related Services

³⁴ Federal Medicaid chips-in at 3 to 1 for each Utah dollar. A disabled person may be qualified under a parent’s social security earnings (SSDI), without diminishing the parents’ eligibility. Or, a person can qualify on the basis of his or her own social security participation (SSI), amounting to a flat \$600 per month.

Housing Authority. The Housing Authority of Davis County currently HUD 936 Section 8 housing vouchers, down from about 1,030 that were available until recently. The Housing Authority also has 352 additional vouchers that run with the housing units, 186 of which are owned by the Authority.

During the difficult economic conditions in 2001 to 2003, a back-log of more than 2,600 applications for housing assistance resulted in closure of the Housing Authority waiting list. Since 2005 the waiting list has eased but is still closed to new applicants for housing assistance. At present, the back-log of unfilled applications for housing assistance results in a wait of two to five years for service, a condition that is typical of most housing authorities. Voucher recipients are required to pay 30 percent of adjusted gross income toward rent, with the remainder paid by the housing authority. In some case, tenants may arrange to pay more than 30 percent. The Davis County Authority also provides 158 public housing units in widely scattered apartment buildings. Unlike tenant-based Section 8 vouchers, Public Housing subsidies are attached to the structure. Understandably, there is a longer waiting list for tenant-based vouchers due to their flexibility in location.

Housing for the elderly is increasingly in demand. Meanwhile, the need for large apartments with three or more bedrooms is not nearly as critical in 2006 as was true in the 1980s when family sizes were apparently larger. In fact, some subsidized four-bedroom apartments have been vacant briefly. It is believed that while large apartments are useful, people with such need also need yard space that subsidized single family would offer. Technically, the Housing Authority cannot under-fill units by assigning units that are larger than needed. Oddly, since 2003 demand has shifted somewhat away from larger units. The waiting list for one and two-bedroom units totals more than 400 families while just 17 families await four bedroom units.

The Davis County Housing Authority provides a variety of smaller housing services, mostly on behalf of the elderly and in support of homeownership. This report recognizes that such interventions not only prevent homelessness but also preserve existing housing stock, indirectly taking pressure off housing resources available to renters and low-income households. However, this report necessarily avoids full discussion of such support on the basis that they are not a mainstream part of the solution to the vast amounts of working poor people who increasingly cannot afford market-rate housing³⁵.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development published calculated fair market rents (FMR) for each market for use in guiding housing assistance. The Davis County Housing Authority reports that HUD FMR for Davis County has gone down. This change is opposed by the Housing Authority on the basis of substantial local information regarding escalating housing cost in Utah. The average income of Housing Authority clients is about \$10,000 per year. Based on the 30 percent of income rule, clients would have to pay well above the maximum standard for market rate rents in Davis County that, with utilities, can run well above \$600 for typical apartments. Surprisingly, elderly housing needs are high in some suburban areas of Davis County where most housing is relatively new and families predominate. More than 80 elderly households await vouchers.

In contrast to past years, homeless people are no longer given preference on waiting lists for service. Likewise, preference is no longer given to very low-income people who are paying more than 50 percent

³⁵The Housing Authority coordinates the use of CDBG funds owner-occupied rehabilitation. Low income families can receive support for bringing their dwelling up to code, including furnace repair, roof repair and so on. Average grant is about \$2,000 per unit. Low interest loans are available, including for the 'American Dream Down Payment' program, supplying up to \$2,000 for home ownership. The Housing Authority also owns 25 single family homes that are not attached to any HUD subsidy. While there is demand for such service, the waiting list is far smaller than for Section 8 vouchers and Public Housing. Still funding outlook is for relative decline in funds available for such work, consistent with the outlook for housing vouchers.

of income toward housing or who live in substandard conditions. Homeless status is not part of application process.

The Housing Authority has some discretion, with its HUD budget allocation, to decide how many vouchers to provide and how what percentage of tenant income to charge tenants. For new clients, the Authority can negotiate to charge more than 30 percent of income, up to 40%, as a means of maximizing the number of vouchers that are provided. Alternatively, the Authority can expect tenants to pay up to 110 percent of HUD's calculated fair market rent. Approximately 30 clients move out of the system each year, ostensibly freeing those units for access by those on the waiting list.

The Davis County Housing Authority uses CDBG money for the rehabilitation of privately owned dwelling, mostly through loans to low-income homeowners. Grants for emergency home repair under the State of Utah Critical Needs Housing program are used for repairing broken furnaces, installing wheelchair ramps and so on for qualified householders. There is a relatively small waiting list for such services, even though advertising is done to alert potential clients. This condition, compared to Weber and Salt Lake Counties, may reflect the relatively young age of most housing in Davis County. For households within incomes no greater than 80 percent of area median, the Housing Authority also provides up to \$2,000 in loans toward home purchase under the American Dream down payment assistance program. That income limit compares to the 50 percent of median income limit for Section 8 vouchers and similar assistance.

Safe Haven Shelter. The Davis Citizen's Against Violence/Safe Harbor (DCCAV) provides temporary shelter in Kaysville for women and female-headed families who are victims of domestic violence. More than 5,000 women and children have been served. Annually, hundreds of others are served by referral to related programs. In 2005, a transitional housing facility for victims of domestic violence became operational. The Kay Card Domestic Violence Shelter is the only homeless shelter in Davis County, catering only to women and children. The shelter provides an important transition housing service back to self-sufficiency in private market housing. Annually, the shelter and its related services reach about 5,000 people in about 2,600 households. Referral services are particularly important, as most clients can rebound quickly from family difficulties when provided immediate, precisely focused counseling and other intervention.

The Safe Harbor domestic violence shelter in Kaysville is a joint facility that provides both emergency shelter and transition housing at one location. Sponsored by the private non-profit Davis County Citizens Against Violence, the shelter accepts up to 45 domestic violence victims for stays lasting up to 30 days. The Safe Harbor shelter typically holds 35 persons, 20 or more being children, for a total of more than 250 persons sheltered during 2005.

Safe Harbor also provides nine private apartment units of transition housing that come with case management and a typical tenancy period of 18 to 24 months. However, unlike many transition-housing facilities there is no concurrent requirement for clients to build toward eventual self-sufficiency. Safe Harbor is funded from Continuum-of-Care money and private donations. There is some consideration to add a Shelter-Plus-Care facility to this site that would serve men as well as women.

Family Connection Center. The Family Connection Center (FCC) is Davis County's primary service agency for families in distress. Service centers are located in Clearfield, Layton and Bountiful. Annually, FCC services reach almost 18,000 people, most of whom are in families about 80 percent of which have incomes below the poverty line. Services include the range of useful assistance to resolving family

trouble, including small amounts of emergency assistance for typical domestic problems, including child care during crisis situations, food, parenting education, and crisis-related child care service.

The Family Connection Center (FCC) provides a hybrid shelter and transitional housing arrangement by which about 50 homeless single parent households are rotated each year through 25 scattered-site apartments³⁶. Clients are nearly always women with children, in reflection of the demographic category that is most often found homeless in Davis County. Clients pay about 30 percent of their income toward rent, with the FCC paying the remainder, including all of the first month's rent. Income qualification for tenants is based on tenant income compared to the area's established 'fair market rent' for the number of bedrooms needed by the family³⁷.

Unlike Safe Harbor and many typical transition-housing facilities, FCC transition housing tenancy is intended to last between 12 to 18 months. Substantial case management is provided to ensure that formerly homeless clients follow an education plan for acquiring job skills that meet the household's income requirements by the end of the transition period. Transition housing rent requirements are deliberately set to prevent complacency by tenants who are otherwise hard-pressed to meet family demands while also building employment skills. The success rate for households moving from homelessness to self-sufficiency is about 60 percent. The transition-housing lease is arranged between tenant and landlord with a letter of support from the FCC for its share of rent subsidy during the transition period.

In addition to the Clearfield office, FCC services are provided in Layton and in Bountiful, all aimed at ensuring the transition from homelessness or near-homelessness to self-sufficiency. Services include a food bank, counseling, life skills classes and other education support and 'respite' day care to allow parents to run errands for up to two hours per week³⁸. Day care may also be available for up to 72-hours during family crises³⁹. Most case management is accompanied by contract requirement for client performance

Funds for transitional housing units came from State of Utah "Critical Needs Housing" funds and homeless prevention shelter/housing was funded by a State of Utah Emergency Shelter grant, both administered by the Utah Department of Community and Culture after passing through State of Utah Homeless Trust funds. The extensive case management provided by FCC toward client job readiness illustrates the issue of HUD-required local match and emerging additional pressure to provide an increasing share of case management and other 'soft costs' from sources other than HUD. At present, few local organizations are in a position to shoulder case management and operations costs that are essential for transition housing success. The FCC also receives United Way funding, though not for direct homeless support.

The Davis County Continuum-of-Care (Continuum) group has joined the State of Utah commitment to meeting the Federal Interagency Task Force 10-year goal of eliminating chronic homelessness. However, the County has relatively few chronic homeless and is appropriately focused on meeting the needs of single parents and their children.

³⁶ Interview with Ken Adamson and Tara McFadden at Davis County Family Connection Center, June 27, 2006.

³⁷ 'Fair Market Rents' are established by surveys of regional rental housing costs done periodically by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

³⁸ Interview with Valerie Larkin, Family Connection Center in Bountiful, Utah, June 27, 2006.

³⁹ Analysis section explores issues with FCC day care licensing.

The FCC has extended its homeless services to Morgan County, as has Weber County. Davis County provides sporadic family services to Morgan County residents and can provide funding for 'scattered site' housing in Morgan County for homeless people who apply to Davis County from there. Weber County provides a small amount of human services and environmental services to Morgan County for which it receives reimbursement from Morgan County. This report found no evidence that such cross-county service is leading to any conflicts or inefficiencies.

FCC services are closely linked to State of Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS) offices in Clearfield. Physically located next door to each other, these agencies help ensure that clients are cross-connected for mainstream welfare services, including Medicaid qualification, food stamps, employment services and other TANF⁴⁰. In this regard, the FCC has more recently been assisting the development of MORE, for "Member Organization Resource Exchange." This initiative seeks the trading of skills and resources between individuals at the neighborhood level, including automobile repair, day care and home maintenance. Likewise, the FCC is also involved in developing a "Client Advisory Board" that aims to link area churches on behalf of homeless-related services. Both of these groups have been slow to develop for the same variety of reasons that limit all grass-roots associations: there is uncertainty, lack of funding and a certain natural shyness about people opening to each other, particularly across religious lines.

At present, the FCC reports a typical current waiting list of approximately 10 applications for assistance from people who qualify as homeless. That back-log is much smaller than the hundreds, even thousands of people waiting for housing authority assistance because the nature of assistance is different; however, that number does compare well with estimates made of homeless households in Davis County. A few chronically homeless people, including some families, appear from time-to-time⁴¹.

The FCC also provides vouchers for motel stays using funds from the State of Utah Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG). In 2005, the FCC provided motel vouchers for 45 families that included more than 160 people, with a typical motel stay lasting 10 days. Altogether, more than 400 people received homeless-related services during the past year, including more than 200 receiving temporary shelter and a cumulative total of about 150 residing in transitional housing during at least part of the year. More than 20,000 referrals were made to related programs. The FCC estimates that more than 5.0 percent of all persons served were homeless at the time of service and more than half were members of single-parent families.

The FCC reports that transportation issues are an over-riding constraint to overcoming homelessness. Clients have great difficulty getting to and from work, particularly when day care pick-up and drop-off is involved. Carrying small children on UTA buses and working at job with odd schedules or late hours may accumulate to an impossible situation, particularly when buses are not running.

Davis Behavioral Health. An important adjunct to FCC and Safe Harbor services is Davis Behavioral Health (DBH), which owns and operates an expanding number of apartments for clients with SPMI, or "serious persistent mental illness"⁴². Homeless people are an important target group for DBH, although there is some question as to how well homeless definitions fit client cases and a number of otherwise well-suited DBH clients do not otherwise qualify for DBH support for temporary shelter at participating locations such as the Farwest Motel. In any case, DBH depends heavily upon HUD funding and currently

⁴⁰ TANF is "Temporary Aid to Need Families." Under current Federal welfare reform law, TANF is limited to three years, emphasizing the importance of case management to ensure successful transition to self-sufficiency.

⁴¹ See Analysis section on the issue of how 'chronic homeless' is defined.

⁴² Interview with Herman Hooten, staff at Davis Behavioral Health, September 13, 2006.

manages temporary, transitional housing associated with its mental health clinics for up to 26 clients who are Section 8 eligible. A total of 16 bed spaces are in 'rooming house' configuration while others, including the 10 units under construction, are in more traditional apartment format. In 2004, DBH received HUD funds for new construction of 10 additional units for Section 8 eligible clients to be completed in October of 2006. These new units are in needed in any case, but especially because subsidized use of local motels for temporary shelter, such as the Farwest Motel, are increasingly opposed by Davis County municipalities due to performance problems at such facilities. The gradual loss of such ad hoc housing due to municipal opposition comes at a time when HUD funding for more formal housing, particularly with supportive services, appears to be in decline.

Davis Behavioral Health is part of the Davis County Continuum-of-Care process and in the past received a recent grant for Emergency Services Grant (ESG) funding. Many DBH clients are referred from the Safe Harbor shelter and from the Utah State Hospital. A majority are single women, many of whom have a goal of re-establishing contact with custody of their children, or perhaps custody as well. More than 50 DBH clients are on a waiting list for housing services and the number could be much larger with extended outreach. Most clients are not homeless, however, DBH recognizes the concurrency of homelessness, mental illness and substance abuse. Importantly, DBH recognizes that many of its clients are not mentally well enough to succeed in mainstream society but are also not mentally ill enough to qualify for adequate intervention services. As such, a substantial number of households and individuals in Davis County are at risk for additional losses, including homelessness, that result from general inability to cope.

Aside from its close attention to single women, DBH also perceives that a large number of gay and lesbian young adults, some of whom are, or have been foster children, are homeless due to conflicts with family over gender issues. As an example, DBH believes that there are more than 400 homeless youth in the Salt Lake whose condition exists, in large part, because of gender conflicts.

Review of Affordable Housing. Most Davis County Housing Authority assistance is provided by Federal HUD funds that are passed to tenants in the form of vouchers for use in choosing market housing. Private investors provide a substantial share of affordable housing in Davis County. A variety of apartment complexes in Davis County meet the needs of low to moderate income households in a mixed setting with fully market rate units. Clearly, the affordable units in these facilities are in high demand, with waiting lists running generally from six months to two years or more. Among others, KIER Corporation is a major sponsor of such sites, along with Cowboy Properties and others.

In Clearfield, County Oaks makes eight two-bedroom units available to low-income tenants who qualify at 50 percent of area median income (AMI) and 64 additional units for households with incomes up to 80 percent of median. The Holly Haven I apartment complex provides 36 units for elderly persons while Holly Haven II provides 48 units for families. Fieldcrest provides 20 such units using public housing rather than Section 8 funds. Lakeview Heights provides 83 units of apartments that made available at the 50 percent of median income standard, but using HUD Section 8 funding for moderate rehabilitation. Heather Estates provides an additional 156 units of similar housing.

In Bountiful, Center Court apartments provide 32 units for tenants with incomes no greater than 50 percent of area median income. Also in Bountiful, Meadows West apartments can accept up to 48 elderly households. Thornwood Villa provides 28 units for families, all at the 50 percent rate.

In Layton, Rosewood Villa I and II provide 32 units for the elderly. In Kaysville, the Francis Peak apartment complex includes six highly prized handicap-accessible units among its total of 120 units for low-income households. Cyrus Park provides 28 apartments for clients with incomes up to 80 Percent of

AMI. In Centerville, Parrish Lane apartments provides two units of housing for households with incomes up to 50 percent of AMI. A number of additional apartment complexes may be providing subsidy for low income households but were not commonly listed in direct reports on this topic⁴³.

A number of additional apartment complexes in Davis County offer units at discount for qualified tenants based on project cost savings from either Federal Section 42 tax credits or HUD Section 236 financing. These include Clearfield Hills, with 49 units, Oakstone with some three and four-bedroom units, Rose Lane, 156 units in Stonehedge Apartments, Twin Tree Town Homes and Windsong I & II with 60 units. The waiting list for occupancy in these projects runs from six months to several years. Nearly all of these complexes are in northern Davis County, principally Layton and Clearfield and the large majority of units being having one and two bedrooms.

It is noteworthy that the majority of Davis County assisted housing is located in older areas, particularly Clearfield and that most of the demand for Housing Authority assistance also comes from that area. In fact, some reports indicate that political pressure is for pushing low-income housing services toward the north end of the County.

Salt Lake Interfaith Network. The Salt Lake Interfaith “Hospitality Network” of 16 Wasatch Front churches includes homeless housing services in Davis County as well. The Interfaith network is a national faith-based initiative that works with the Continuum of Care. Participating churches, including some in Davis County, host up to four homeless families (families only, as a general rule) for up to a week at a time before rotating them to a new location. This practice reflects the intended short-term nature of such intervention, but also reflects a way of dealing with zoning restrictions that would otherwise exclude such service from predominately residential areas where participating churches are located.

The Network, one of 130 nationwide, uses spare church building classroom space for “apartments” for participating families. The Network participates in HMIS, having recently reached “compliant” status. The Network did not, however, participate in ‘point-in-time’ counts for 2006. The program reports that single women with children are by far the fastest growing segment of the apparent homeless population.

A number of households units served by the Network included non-parent adults caring for one or more children. The Network provides meals, assistance with educational needs of minor children and administrative/technical support for a wide variety of issues experienced by the homeless: legal aid, minor transportation, counseling, assistance with contract negotiations for housing, public services and related dispute resolutions, and other “paperwork” and administrative needs. The Network reports that transportation problems represents the largest unmet need of clients: food, clothing, shelter and other needs may be met routinely while simply getting clients from place to place, such as to court events, doctor appointments, job interviews and so on present major obstacles to meeting client needs toward self-sufficiency. Rising fuel costs are an additional, growing burden for the Network as well.

The program is intended to move families into autonomy within a few weeks, serving as an example of non-governmental response to what is likely the largest and fastest moving segment of the state’s estimates of homelessness. The acquisition of a few vans or even small cars would aid the Network significantly in moving clients toward independence within the desired timeframe. More than 60 percent

⁴³This may include the following: Roselane Apartments. Layton, UT, 1 & 2 bedrooms units for families and the elderly; Stonehedge Apartments. Layton, UT 2 & 3 bedrooms. 156 units. Section 8- between 2 and 6 month waiting list; Twin Tree Town Homes. Layton, UT, with 3 bedroom units; Windsong I & II. Clearfield, UT, a total of 60 two and three bedroom units. Also participating are Kaysville Community apartments (with some three bedroom units) and Wad Square, with unknown characteristics.

of persons assisted are in families headed by single women with at least one child. About 23 percent are two-parent families.

A few clients are single men, and the remainder is in a variety of family types. A relatively small percentage of the total network are clients seeking refuge from domestic violence situations, contrasting substantially with overall homeless demographics for Davis County alone. Instead, about half of clients are simply in difficult financial straits, some arriving to the Network due to housing evictions, unemployment and the like. A few clients have actually been homeless, sleeping in cars, shelters or motels prior to Network services. Overall, the Network fills an important private sector niche that may be applicable to Morgan and Tooele Counties, particularly with involvement by the LDS church. Of primary importance is quick intervention, often catching families before they actually reach the street, and providing the tactical interventions that move them back to independence in the shortest time, at the least cost and ancillary loss along the way.

Analysis and Recommendations

General Concerns

The State of Utah 10-year plan aptly points-out that the most effective strategy for addressing homelessness for those at imminent risk is to prevent its occurrence⁴⁴. That plan calls for more effort at the transition points in the lives of vulnerable people: prisoners in re-entry, foster children ‘aging-out’ and families in dissolution. Routinely, housing program administrators point-out the need for more holistic, strategic and blended services that together ensure self-sufficiency. However, the ‘disconnects’ remain glaring. For instance, this report made assiduous effort to obtain baseline information on prisoner re-entry statistics and foster children but without significant success.

In light of apparent relative, if not absolute shrinkage of Housing Choice Vouchers, the Utah 10-year plan rightly intends to focus on better use of current resources, particularly for prevention, by percentage increases in program reach that range from 30 percent to more than 100 percent⁴⁵. Difficulties with implementing HMIS illustrate the street-level challenge that the 10-year encounters. Perhaps most challenging is that plan’s goal to prevent the loss of existing affordable housing: in the current housing market, prices and interest rates are both rising beyond any meaningful local means of influence. Likewise, goals for affordable, permanent supportive housing to increase in annual increments of more than five percent (with simple compounding) will, if successful, constitute a magnitude⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ “Utah’s 10-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness” page 12, cited at http://community.utah.gov/housing_and_community_development/SCSO/documents/THE10YRPlan3-05.doc

⁴⁵ Sample from State of Utah, 10 year plan

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Prisons	Base	50%	60%	70%	80%
Mental Health	Base	15%	25%	30%	35%
Foster Care	Base	10%	20%	25%	30%
Hospitals	Base	10%	15%	20%	30%

⁴⁶ Among other goals, the State plan calls for chronic homeless support to increase by five percent per year. To this goal are additional goals for similar housing for foster care ‘graduates’ and so on.

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS Church). The LDS Church may be the single most prolific support to homeless people in Utah, having assisted 7,773 persons in the past year, an increase of about 30 percent over the year before⁴⁷. Services include medical care, housing and utilities, food, clothing and other goods and a variety of counseling-related intervention. The Church also provides transportation in various forms, including cash for motor fuel.

Church services are distributed at the dispersed 'ward' and 'stake' level as well as at regional 'bishop's storehouses' and the Church's central 'Welfare Square' in Salt Lake City. Welfare Square has a broad reach in the community, working on behalf of clients to get concessions from public utility companies, local motels, providers of goods and services and providing referrals to its own 'Deseret Industries' thrift stores for clothing, furniture and so on.

Church officials observe that although the Utah economy is good, homeless-related needs are increasing, particularly when motor fuel prices increase sharply. There is, according to Church sources, a growing gap between wages of the working poor and basic costs of living. To these problems can be added a large number of clients with mental health issues and substance addictions.

A major strategy of the LDS Church is to assist clients in increasing their household income. A component of that is assisting qualified people to receive SSI/SSDI and associated Medicare. In fact, with even a modicum of regular incomes, the Church can usually place people in housing of some kind. One caveat to this helpful situation is that temporary placement in motels, with stays usually lasting up to two weeks, tends to include risks with illicit drug and other crime-related problems that are closely associated with motels or hostels that accept homeless people on their way to more permanent housing.

According to LDS officials, Utah is known to be 'homeless friendly' and there is evidence that homeless people are often referred to the Salt Lake area by bus drivers, shelter operators and care givers of all kinds in other regions.

Interestingly, the Church participates in point-in-time counts but is not among the users of the emerging HMIS reporting system, probably because the Church is obviously faith-based. In any case, officials note that demographic data on clients is very sparse, with no expectation of improvement. Church officials also share the view that defining homelessness is problematic and many clients try to abuse church welfare services by falsely representing their condition. Moreover, a substantial amount of Church assistance is directed toward acute financial distress among higher-income households who have fallen into difficulty. This group of clients falls outside the traditional service net of community-based agencies that serve the homeless, even though some of these higher-income households may actually be in danger of losing housing.

⁴⁷ Interview with Bishop David McQueen, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, June 27, 2006.

Appendix A - Limitations to Validity of Homeless Statistics

1. How can we account for the tendency for homeless to leave county of origin for the big city? Do I count the apparent “production” of homeless by subtracting the propensity to migrate, or do I under-count county ‘responsibility’ for production of homeless by adhering more closely to the apparent result of homeless migration? Neither method is internally consistent – instead the estimates rely easily on factors from both sides of the question coin, being neither fish nor fowl. Reasons on both sides are compelling and omitting any major factor for the sake of internal consistency wastes the value of either one information source/methodology or another. To not count the actual homeless in central cities is simply inaccurate – to not count the origin is misleading.
2. How can we tell much of anything about homeless people that are not served? There is no real reason to state that their demographics are reasonably similar to the served population, particularly given the certainty that single men are more adapted to and more frequently seen living without shelter.
3. Seasonal differences are substantial – given the January point-in-time, annual average is higher, summer probably somewhat higher.
4. Social service agencies unanimously opine that young adult homeless is much larger than reported, and particularly disparate between place of origin and choice of ‘residence.’ One estimate (third or fourth party reference from Davis Behavioral Health) suggested several hundred fully homeless young adults in the county, with a plurality caused by gender issues.
5. Widespread indication that ‘point in time’ counts not only miss large numbers, but also receives poor support from rural areas.
6. Formal definition of homeless is not very consistent with reality – a true count, by strict definition, would yield thousands more homeless than actual counts: “sofa surfing” and doubling-up and itinerate homeless (a night here or there in a motor vehicle) and family/quazi-family relationships meet one definition of homeless or another, and would, if fully counted, dwarf any estimates of homelessness made by point-in-time counts.
7. Social service agencies frequently ignore homeless definitions and, in fact, many functionally homeless are barred from services for reasons that relate to clunky definitions. Most social service agencies try hard not to discuss the details of how they measure and respond to program provisions regarding homelessness.
8. Historically, significant numbers of people are transient – at present, truck drivers and other transients, including deliberate nomads amount to hundreds in the planning area - - people who spend nights in places not intended for human habitation (truck sleepers, truck stops, etc).
9. Over-crowding counts as homeless in a number of possible ways, amounting to tens of thousands of people.
10. Migrant workers and illegal aliens amount to thousands of additional people who were rarely mentioned as a class by any social service agency.
11. Distinguishing between mental illness and substance abuse is essentially impossible as most people who have one characteristic also have the other, and perhaps intermittently. Definitions for those categories are as almost as problematic as various definitions of homeless. Any number whatsoever is unavoidably inaccurate as adding the two together results in substantial double-count while listing them separately suggests that one category is separate from the other when it is largely not.

12. Functional homelessness among prisoners is perhaps the most problematic category: persons behind bars may or may not qualify as homeless *during* incarceration depending on whether or not they were homeless at the time incarceration began and/or whether or not they have housing ready for use at the time when release is anticipated. For released prisoners the problem continues, particularly with regard to gaps in reporting, *even under parole conditions where supervision is technically required by law and where having verified, acceptable shelter is a requirement of parole*. Clearly, adding even a conservative view of functional homeless among the cumulative total of unassimilated released prisoners could swell the estimate of homeless persons by several magnitudes, obliterating finer distinctions between point-in-time counts and other sources of homeless estimates.
13. How do we define ‘young adults’ when most rotate frequently between family and non-family condition? How do we categorize young adults who have taken on family obligations, intermittently or permanently? What counts as a family versus a non-family household of more than one individual?
14. How do we count children who are in a variety of eclectic conditions that resemble foster care, but without the legitimization of state program participation?
15. How do we distinguish homelessness among the gray scale of social service supports: persons receiving some form of assistance for staying in motels (either cash or in-kind). Some agencies consider a sheltered person to be homeless if there is a threat of eviction from subsidized or supported hotel/motel and/or shelter of any kind. The same is true for private outreach, including churches that provide various forms of assistance for shelter or quazi-housing. What constitutes homeless condition for the purpose of estimating the number of homeless persons?
16. How do we determined the number of people sheltered: by the number of filled beds at any given time or the total cumulative number of people who were sheltered during a month or a year? Many people who were sheltered at any time were homeless before or after receiving shelter? Do they count as sheltered or unsheltered? It is fair to say that they count as both, which suggests that the numbers of people being counted is over-stated, because they are counted at least twice if not several times.
17. It is clear that an instantaneous increase in shelter, permanent or temporary, would NOT result in a sudden commensurate decrease in the number of homeless people because additional people will declare or convert to homeless status as shelter or other support becomes a better alternative to current status.
18. Across time, portions of various studies that include homeless counts in one form or another may be invalidated by later reports. As such, some *portions* of again reports may remain valid while other portions do not. This may be particularly true for relationships between count categories, if not, if not the counts themselves.
19. See also National Coalition for the Homeless, NCH Fact Sheet #3, “Who is Homeless” cited at www.nationalhomeless.org, accessed June 15, 2006
20. For homeless families, many apparently single women (and a few men) actually have children of their own but owing to circumstances are not with them at any given time. Along the highly changeable gray scale of parenting involvement it is impossible to fairly categorize any parent as part of a family or not. Such distinctions become even more difficult when parents *are* teenagers.