Welcome!

Housing Best Practices Forum
Housing Best Practices Forum: Housing Overview
Logistics
(boring yet necessary)

• Audio can be done over your computer OR conference call line

• Conference call number:
  • 888-742-5095
  • Meeting ID: 282-843-9565

• Conference call lines will be muted. You can ask questions through the WebEx chat feature.

• Follow up evaluation
Format of Forums

• Every other month (evens), third Monday, 1:30-3:30

• Taped presentation and materials available post-session on mn.HB101.org (partners tab)

• Steering Committee to oversee agenda and topics
Housing Access Resource Team
HART
Housing Best Practices Forum
April 17, 2017
Dakota County
Rental Screening Project
Phase I

Project Goal: Develop an inventory of owners and managers who express willingness to rent to tenants who have one or more housing barriers.
Funded: by Dakota County
Three Part Approach:

1. Case Management Survey
2. Municipal Restrictions Review
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey
1. Case Management Survey

Conduct a housing survey with case managers to identify complexes that are willing to lease to the targeted population.

- Information regarding client housing crises.
- Information regarding challenges faced by case managers.
- Information regarding flexible owners and property managers.
1. Case Management Survey

As of July 2014, 145 case management clients in an immediate or imminent housing crisis.
1. Case Management Survey

Survey explored the frequency of experiencing barriers reported by case managers.
## 1. Case Management Survey

List of current flexible owners and property managers also included in report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner or Property Manager Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Previous Evictions</th>
<th>Income Guidelines</th>
<th>Poor Credit</th>
<th>Non-Felony Criminal History</th>
<th>Felony Criminal History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Manor</td>
<td>Burnsville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pines of Burnsville</td>
<td>Burnsville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Valley</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewood Apartments</td>
<td>IGH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashra Property Management</td>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Acres</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carousel Apartments</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Court</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakdale Terrace</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailand Management</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Wobbe</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westveiw Park Apartments</td>
<td>WSP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Cushman</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Case Management Survey

Other comments from Case Managers

- Owners and property managers evicting or not renting to clients based on past or present behaviors related to mental health condition
- Virtually non-existent placements for clients with any sort of criminal sexual conduct in history.
- Current flexible owners and property managers becoming weary of being so flexible.
2. Municipal Restrictions Review

Contact target cities to identify requirements placed on leasing of housing apartments.

- There are no specific ordinances in place in any of the target cities that explicitly restrict owners or property managers from renting to any tenant based on their background.
2. Municipal Restrictions Review

Owners and property managers are minimally influenced by municipal policy.
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

To develop an inventory of landlords who express a willingness to rent to clients who have one or more housing barriers such as felony/non-felony criminal history, past evictions, low income, unemployment, and poor credit.

• Email surveys to 1736 contacts from municipal rental registration in 6 of 7 target cities
• 10.7% response rate (186 respondents)
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Breakdown of 186 respondents
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:
Most frequent reasons for denial of rental applications

- Felony Criminal History: 2.62
- Unsatisfactory Personal History: 2.53
- Poor References: 2.48
- Unemployment: 2.43
- Failure To Meet Income Requirements: 2.40
- Unsatisfactory Credit History: 2.23
- Non-Felony Criminal History: 2.16
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:

Which specific criminal activity always disqualifies an applicant?
Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:

Top three owner and property manager concerns about renting to tenants who do not meet their rental criteria:
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:
Working with subsidies and housing support programs

- 23% of all respondents
- 41% of respondents willing to have further contact
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:

Reasons for not working with subsidies and housing support programs
3. Owner/Property Manager Survey

Snapshot of Survey Data:
Influence of possible tools or interventions over owner and landlord decision making

- Supported Personal Interview
- Documented Tenant Training
- Ongoing Housing Support
- Third Party Fund

Total Respondents
Owners
Property Manager
Where did we go from here?

**Connect**
Invite willing partners from survey to next step

**Collaborate**
Provide a format to discuss what works

**Create**
Develop a position to fund and execute
Dakota County Landlord Development & Housing Services: Phase II

**Project Goal:** Gain additional information to support and create an organizational structure to implement recommendations of Phase I

**Funded by:** Dakota County
Phase II Scope

• Facilitate more in depth conversations with landlords
  – Breakfast meetings, phone calls, in person meetings
• Review feed back from both phases looking for consistent themes
• Develop these themes into an organizational structure with recommendations for grant funding
Phase II Findings

• Landlords value consistent communication and relationships
  – Pro-active, relationship based
  – Information about potential tenant’s barriers
  – Assist tenants with housing stability plan
  – Who to call if there is difficulty or a crisis
Phase II Findings

• **Landlords are open to creative, mutually beneficial projects**
  – Partnerships work when the arrangement is financially sound and not likely to result in early termination of lease
  – Need ongoing engagement regarding housing access issues
  – Development of best practices/housings support tools
Funding Announcement

• BlueCross Blue Shield of Minnesota
  – $200,000

• Otto Bremer Trust
  – $40,000
Implementation: HART Phase III

• Staff
  – Housing Partnership Manager
    • Develop and maintain relationships with landlords to increase housing access for clients
    • Develop and maintain relationships with social service providers, community providers and county staff.
    • Increase visibility and awareness of housing issues and barriers in Dakota County
    • Develop and maintain reporting
Implementation:  HART Phase III

• Staffing
  – Tenant Navigators
    • Prepare, coordinate and oversee the completion of tasks related to client housing and other related activities
    • Coordinate services with partners and providers.
    • Develop housing access and stability plans
    • Provide short-term intensive services as needed
Purpose and Goals

1. To meet the goals of the Housing Access Resource Team (HART) as outlined in the job descriptions for the Housing Partnership Manager and Tenant Navigator.
2. To develop and maintain new landlord relationships for households with high barriers to rental housing.
3. To reduce the length of time from housing referral to lease up.
4. Connecting to other needed services (medical, mental health, etc.) to implement overall health and well-being as demonstrated in reporting measures.
5. Connect prospective tenants to landlords.
6. Create a sustainable funding plan for HART program.
Evaluation Questions.

1. To what extent are relationships developed and maintained with landlords for households with high barriers to rental housing?
2. To what extent are tenants connected with landlords?
3. To what extent is the length of time from housing referral to lease up reduced for participating tenants?
4. To what extent are tenants connected to needed services to increase overall health?
5. To what extent is the overall health and well-being of tenants improves as demonstrated in reporting measures?
2016 Landlord Relationships

Jan to June
- New Landlords: 140
- Engaged Landlords: 20

July to Dec
- New Landlords: 40
- Engaged Landlords: 30
Client Demographics

Household Composition

- Singles: 61%
- Families: 39%

N=35
Average VI-SPDAT scores of referrals

• For both singles and families the average score was 8.
• The higher the score indicates a higher need for services.
  – For families and singles, a score of 0-3 indicates a low level of service need;
  – for families a score of 4-8 indicates a need for rapid re-housing and for singles, a score of 4-7;
  – for families, a score of 9 or over, indicates a need for the most services and for singles, a score of 8 or higher.
Households who have leased up

• Twenty one lease ups occurred
• The average VI-SPDAT score for these households is 8.
• The average length of time from referral to lease up is 71 days or just over two months.
• The longest time between referral and lease up was 135 days or 4.5 months.
Connection to needed services

• Referral activities
  – 353 referrals from April to December for:
    • Vocational-rehab, public housing, Common Bond, UD expungement, Open Arms MN, a child care subsidy, Veterans Services, emergency assistance, MA, health care, assistance getting an ID, targeted case management, other behavioral health services, driver’s license assistance, other financial services
Health and well-being improvement

• Self-sufficiency Matrix:
  – Self-sufficiency Matrix scores for the singles who exited the program increased on average from 51 to 61 showing an improvement in self-sufficiency. (Maximum score is 80.)
  – Scores for the families who exited increase on average from 54 to 60. (Maximum score is 95)
Status at Housing Entry

- Other: 23%
- Temporary-Hotel: 8%
- Temporary-Staying with friends: 17%
- Temporary-Staying with family: 26%
- Temporary-Emergency Shelter: 9%
- Temporary-Safe Haven: 4%
- Unknown: 15%
Housing Status at Exit

- Permanent-with family: 25%
- Permanent-with subsidy: 21%
- Permanent-no subsidy: 15%
- Permanent-outside of Dakota Cty: 15%
- Temporary settings: 5%
- Institutional settings: 5%
- Don't know: 8%

Legend:
- Permanent-with family
- Permanent-with subsidy
- Permanent-no subsidy
- Permanent-outside of Dakota Cty
- Temporary settings
- Institutional settings
- Don't know
Other Findings

• Insurance status—Entry
  – 30 households out of 41 reported being insured, 5 were not, 6 were other
• Insurance status—Exit
  – 19 households out of 25 reported being insured, 4 were not, 2 were other
Other Findings

• Tenant Satisfaction
  – Surveys were given to those exiting
    • 22% response rate
  – All had high ratings of services
    • Even if they didn’t find housing, they still felt the services were helpful
HART Phase III Challenges

• Continued tightening of housing market in Metro area
• Systemic issues that create barriers to housing
• Need for longer ongoing services
• Failure to budget for client assistance funds
• Referral systems
• Sustainable funding for services
HART: Phase IV

• Sustainable funding for ongoing implementation of project
• Considered a number of private foundations but many prefer only doing start-up funding
• Applied for a grant—Housing Supports for Adults with Serious Mental Illness (HSASMI)
  — Awarded in January 2017
HART: Phase IV

• **Similar structure:**
  – 1.0 FTE Housing Partnership Specialist
  – 1.0 FTE Tenant Navigator
  – 1.0 FTE Peer Specialist Tenant Navigator
  – 0.5 FTE Supervisor with clinical background
  – 0.5 FTE Program Assistant

• **Two counties**—Dakota & Ramsey
Coordinated Entry
- long-term homelessness
  - triggered by specific barriers, such as SMI

Other Providers
- GRH providers who need assistance with finding housing for clients

Other Providers
- Subsidy holders with barriers
  - referred when voucher is issued

Case Management
- clients with subsidies
  - exiting segregated settings
  - Needing ongoing supports

Housing Access Resource Team (H.A.R.T)

Housing Partnership Specialist
- Housing support plan with client preferences
- Assist w/ applications, etc
- Housing search
- Engage Landlords
- Identify resources needed
- Assist w/ move-in
- Housing support crisis plan

Tenancy Navigators
- Tenant education

Individual Housing Needs Assessment
- Housing Transition Services
- Tenancy Sustaining Services
- Engage client
- Housing support plan
- Housing support crisis plans
- Provide support services/referral
- Tenant education

Other Providers
- GRH providers who need assistance with finding housing for clients

Is issued

Needing ongoing supports

Tenancy Sustaining Services

Tenancy Sustaining Services

Tenant education
HART: Phase IV

- Tenancy sustaining services from Tenant Navigators to both scattered and single site projects
- Operating subsidy for client assistance
- Permanent Supportive Housing Evidence Based Practice fidelity reviews
HART: Phase IV

• Referrals
  – From Coordinated Entry, other homeless service providers, shelters, mental health Case Managers

• Eligibility
  – Adults with Serious Mental illness
    • Singles or families
HART: Phase IV

• Target Population
  – Long-term homelessness
  – Imminent risk of homelessness
  – Residing in an institution or other segregated setting who will be homeless upon discharge

• Other priorities
  – Emphasis on underserved populations: Latino, Native American, African American communities
  – Bridges RTC clients
Case Studies

• Single Adult male
  – no job, chemically dependent
  – No subsidy, finished treatment

• Single mother, with over 5 children
  – Medical issues, has social security benefits
  – Has voucher from the CDA
Julie Grothe
Director, Delancey Services
Guild Incorporated
130 Wabasha Street South, Suite 100
St. Paul MN 55107
651-925-8481
jgrothe@guildincorporated.org
Questions for the Future

• How can we further connect housing and mental health services?
  – What tools do we have, what do we need?
  – Landlord mitigation?
  – Educational pieces for landlord, mental health case manager, client?
  – Ways to enter from both doors—housing and mental health?
Questions for the Future

• How can greater collaboration occur across multiple counties?
  – How can we make it work regionally?
  – Metro wide cooperative agreements on housing?
  – Encourage multiple county projects? Assist with writing and needed information for applications
    • i.e. need in county for service, types of models,
Round 3 of the Housing with Supports for Adults with Serious Mental Illness (HSASMI) grant RFP has been released!

- Proposals are due May 12.

- The HSASMI grant provides funding to help people living with a serious mental illness who are:
  - in a hospital or other similar institution and will be homeless at discharge,
  - are experiencing homelessness, or
  - are at imminent risk of homelessness.

- The funding is for:
  - Services to help people find and stay in housing
  - One-time expenses like security deposits, culturally-specific programming, utility hook-ups, etc.
  - Outreach to find people who might benefit from this grant.

Thank you!

Comments or questions? DHS Housing Options email: dhs.housingoptions@state.mn.us

Presentation and materials available: http://mn.hb101.org/

Complete evaluation

Future sessions