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Summary

To assess the status of hunger and homelessness in America's cities during 1998, the U.S. Conference of Mayors surveyed 30 major cities whose mayors were members of its Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness. The survey sought information and estimates from each city on 1) the demand for emergency food assistance and emergency shelter and the capacity of local agencies to meet that demand; 2) the causes of hunger and homelessness and the demographics of the populations experiencing these problems; 3) exemplary programs or efforts in the cities to respond to hunger and homelessness; 4) the availability of affordable housing for low income people; 5) the outlook for the future and the impact of the economy on hunger and homelessness.

Among the findings of the 30-city survey:

HUNGER

- Officials in the survey cities estimate that during the past year requests for emergency food assistance increased by an average of 14 percent, with 78 percent of the cities registering an increase. Requests for food assistance by families with children increased by an average of 14 percent. Requests for emergency food assistance by elderly persons increased by an average six percent during the last year, with 67 percent of the cities reporting an increase.

- On average, 21 percent of the requests for emergency food assistance are estimated to have gone unmet during the last year. For families alone, 18 percent of the requests for assistance are estimated to have gone unmet. In 47 percent of the cities, emergency food assistance facilities may have to turn away people in need due to lack of resources.

- Sixty-one percent of the people requesting emergency food assistance were members of families -- children and their parents. Thirty-seven percent of the adults requesting food assistance were employed.

- The overall level of resources available to emergency food assistance facilities increased by 24 percent during the last year. Forty-seven percent of the survey cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities are able to provide an adequate quantity of food. In 60 percent of the cities emergency food assistance facilities have had to decrease the number of bags of food provided and/or the number of times people can receive food. Of these cities, 50 percent have had to increase the limit on food provided. Seventy-seven percent of the survey cities reported that the food provided is nutritionally balanced.

- In 92 percent of the cities, emergency food assistance facilities were relied on by families and individuals both in emergencies and as a steady source of food over long periods of time.

- Low-paying jobs lead the list of causes of hunger identified by the city officials. Other causes cited, in order of frequency, include high housing costs, unemployment and other employment-
related problems, food stamp cuts, poverty or lack of income, low benefits in public assistance programs and substance abuse.

During the last year, 67 percent of the survey cities supported local emergency food assistance efforts. Twenty-three percent used locally generated revenues; two percent used Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act funds; 14 percent used state grants; four percent used Community Services Block Grant Funds and 27 percent used Community Development Block Grant funds.

**HOMELESSNESS**

During the past year requests for emergency shelter increased in the survey cities by an average of 11 percent, with 72 percent of the cities registering an increase. Requests for shelter by homeless families alone increased by 15 percent, with 64 percent of the cities reporting an increase.

An average of 26 percent of the requests for emergency shelter by homeless people overall and 30 percent of the requests by homeless families alone are estimated to have gone unmet during the last year. In 67 percent of the cities, emergency shelters may have to turn away homeless families due to lack of resources; in 67 percent they may also have to turn away other homeless people.

People remain homeless an average of 10 months in the survey cities. Fifty-four percent of the cities said that the length of time people are homeless increased during the last year.

Lack of affordable housing lead the list of causes of homelessness identified by the city officials. Other causes cited, in order of frequency, include substance abuse and the lack of needed services, mental illness and the lack of needed services, low paying jobs, domestic violence, changes and cuts in public assistance, poverty and the lack of access to affordable health care.

Officials estimate that, on average, single men comprise 45 percent of the homeless population, families with children 38 percent, single women 14 percent and unaccompanied minors three percent. Children account for one-fourth of the homeless population. The homeless population is estimated to be 53 percent African-American, 35 percent white, 12 percent Hispanic, four percent Native American and three percent Asian. An average of 24 percent of homeless people in the cities are considered mentally ill; 38 percent are substance abusers; eight percent have AIDS or HIV-related illness. Twenty-two percent are employed; 22 percent are veterans.

During the last year the number of emergency shelter beds remained approximately the same in the survey cities. Transitional housing units increased by an average of 11 percent. Single Room Occupancy units increased by seven percent.

In 53 percent of the cities, families may have to break up in order to be sheltered. In 50 percent of the cities families may have to spend their daytime hours outside of the shelter they use at night.
Officials in the survey cities report that the Federal Government’s Continuum of Care policy has made a difference in their community’s effort to address homelessness, and that the increase in HUD funding to address homelessness has resulted in more homeless families and individuals accessing transitional and permanent housing and reaching self-sufficiency in their cities.

Ninety percent of the survey cities used city government funds during the last year to support shelters or other services for homeless people. Thirty percent used Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act funds; 23 percent used locally generated revenues; 19 percent used Community Development Block Grant funds; 15 percent used state grants; and 12 percent used Community Services Block Grant funds and other sources of federal funds.

HOUSING

Requests for assisted housing by low income families and individuals increased in 74 percent of the cities during the last year. Twenty-seven percent of eligible low income households are currently served by assisted housing programs. City officials estimate that low income households spend an average of 47 percent of their income on housing.

Applicants must wait an average of 24 months for public housing in the survey cities. The wait for Section 8 Certificates is 33 months, for Section 8 Vouchers, 34 months. Seventy-six percent of the cities have stopped accepting applications for at least one assisted housing program due to the excessive length of the waiting list.

Many of the city officials say that the elimination of Section 8 incremental certificates will mean a longer wait for assisted housing, more overcrowding and increased homelessness.

THE OUTLOOK

Officials in 96 percent of the responding cities expect requests for emergency food assistance to increase during 1999. Ninety-six percent expect that requests for emergency food assistance by families with children will increase during 1999. Officials in 93 percent of the cities expect that requests for emergency shelter will increase next year. Eighty-eight percent expect that requests by homeless families will increase.

The city officials report that the strong economy has had very little positive impact on hunger and homelessness. In many cities, conditions are likely to decline further next year. Low paying jobs that cannot support a household continues to be a very troublesome problem. Many cities report that welfare reform has had a negative impact on hunger and homelessness. Moreover, several cities expect a downturn in the economy which will further increase the number of homeless and requests for food.
Introduction

In October 1982, The U.S. Conference of Mayors and The U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials brought the shortage of emergency services -- food, shelter, medical care, income assistance, energy assistance – to national attention through a 55-city survey. That survey showed that the demand for emergency services had increased in cities across the nation, and that on average only 43 percent of that demand was being met.

Since that time the Conference has done numerous reports on hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities. These reports have documented the causes and the magnitude of the problems, how cities were responding to them and what national responses were required. They include:

- Hunger in American Cities, June, 1983
- Responses to Urban Hunger, October, 1983
- Homelessness in America's Cities: Ten Case Studies, June, 1984
- Housing Needs and Conditions in America's Cities, June, 1984
- The Urban Poor and the Economic Recovery, September, 1984
- The Status of Hunger in Cities, April, 1985
- Health Care for the Homeless: A 40-City Review, April 1985
- Responding to Homelessness in America's Cities, June 1986
- Local Responses to the Needs of Homeless Mentally Ill Persons, May, 1987
- Partnerships for Affordable Housing an Annotated Listing of City Programs, September, 1989
- A City Assessment of the 1990 Shelter and Street Night count. A 21-City Survey, June 1991
- Mentally Ill and Homeless. A 22-City Survey, November 1991
- Addressing Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities, June 1993
To spearhead the Conference's efforts to respond to the emergency services crisis in cities, the President of The Conference of Mayors appointed 20 mayors to a Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness in September, 1983. That Task Force was chaired by New Orleans Mayor Ernest "Dutch" Morial. It is now chaired by Burlington Mayor Peter Clavelle and has 30 members.

**Methodology**

This report provides information on the current status of hunger, homelessness and the conditions which have affected them in the 30 cities whose mayors serve on the Task Force. A copy of the survey instrument sent to the cities is contained in the Appendix.

To respond to the survey, the city officials consult with and collect data from community-based provider and government agencies. The data is compiled by the individual or agency in the city government designated to be the Conference of Mayors' contact for the survey and it is reviewed by a senior-level manager before it is submitted to the Conference of Mayors.

The data was collected from the cities for the period of November 1, 1997 to October 31, 1998 during November and December, 1998. It was supplemented with data on population, poverty and unemployment available from the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The reader should note that in no case do the percentages reported for a survey question include a city unable to respond to that question. In a few instances percentages do not total 100 due to rounding. Tables, which provide city-specific data, appear at the back of chapters on Hunger, Homelessness and Housing.
Hunger

The Problem

Emergency Food Assistance Requests

During the last year, requests for emergency food assistance increased in 78 percent (21) of the survey cities. They decreased in Cleveland, St. Louis and St. Paul-- and remained the same in Charleston, Minneapolis, and Providence. Across the cities, requests increased by an average of 14 percent. Increases ranged from 33 percent in Salt Lake City, 25 percent in Alexandria, 21 percent in Boston, 20 percent in Phoenix and 19 percent in San Antonio to five percent in Santa Monica and three percent in Trenton. They declined by one percent in St. Paul.

Among the comments from the city officials on emergency food requests during the last year:

Alexandria: The percentage is based upon reports by the food providers in the City. Even though some of the households receive Food Stamps, the providers indicate that many low-income families must use a high percentage of income toward household costs including rent, utilities, medical needs, transportation.

Boston: Demand for emergency food services continues to increase. For 1998, Project Bread's FoodSource Hotline projects an 11 percent increase in the total number of calls. This measure is probably the most accurate gauge of whether demand has increased. Additionally, the number of meals served by Project Bread funded emergency food providers (soup kitchens) increased 31 percent. Seventy-five percent of food pantries and soup kitchens in Boston reported serving more people this year.

Burlington: The Salvation Army saw a decrease of 20 percent. Service at its soup kitchen decreased because other soup kitchens offered meals on the same days each week. The Emergency Food Shelf saw no change.

Charlotte: Referrals have increased over the past year.

Chicago: Data provided by the Chicago Anti-Hunger Federation and the Greater Chicago Food Depository, reflects recorded requests to the City's Emergency Food Assistance System.

Cleveland: While an improved economy has reduced the demand for emergency food from the pantries, hot meals programs and soup kitchens had a 32 percent increase in demand.
Detroit: Information gleaned from the Department's computer database reflects an average of 120 customers that are processed daily by the Emergency Food Program. Decentralization of this program whereby emergency food is available at three community Seville centers has provided greater accessibility to our customer population who often have transportation limitations. During peak periods such as before holidays, more than 175 customers are accommodated.

Kansas City: In Kansas City, an increase of 4.5 percent has been tracked by Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC), a local agency that collects information provided by homeless shelters and food pantries. According to MAAC, 137 reporting pantries indicated that the number of requests between November 1, 1997 and October 31, 1998 was 73,432. For the same period in 1996 and 1997, they reported 65,684 and 70,261, respectively from a survey of 75 organizations and churches. The numbers of emergency food requests increased by 50 percent.

Louisville: Direct service food pantry statistics document an increase in demand of 10 percent, beginning in 1997. In recent months, pantries have reported another increase in families seeking help during summer months.

Miami: The request for food assistance is either filled to capacity or exceeds availability.

Nashville: Second Harvest Food Bank says that its emergency food box program has seen an increase, and that when weather extremes hit, people usually pay their utility bills first and then buy food. Also, many people have high utility and medical bills, and are feeling the impact of Tennessee's welfare reform plan, called Families First. There has also been an increase in Hispanic and Asian immigrants requesting assistance.

Norfolk: FoodBank of Southeastern Virginia reports that with welfare cutbacks their agencies have reported an increase need.

Philadelphia: Due to changes in the welfare system and inadequate wage rates for the working poor, food cupboard requests have increased 20 percent. Reports on the increase in requests at soup kitchens vary from 8 percent to 46 percent.

Portland: Data collected represents the number served only. The number of emergency food boxes distributed by Oregon Food Bank member agencies increased: 8.6 percent to 83,286. The number of meals at emergency meal sites also increased significantly: 25 percent to 894,470. Agencies report an increase this fall in the number of working families and legal immigrants seeking assistance.

Providence: Annual totals indicate little change although we are presently monitoring need based upon the new EBT (Electronic Benefit Transfer) system which was introduced to the city FIP and Food Stamp clients as of 9/98.

Salt Lake City: Welfare reform, specifically cuts in food stamps, has resulted in increased demand especially among able-bodied adults without dependents.
San Antonio: Based on a survey of agencies who provide emergency food assistance, the requests for food increased primarily as a result of changes in welfare eligibility and time limitations imposed by welfare reform.

San Diego: It has been reported that welfare reform may be influencing the demand for food.

Santa Monica: Despite improvements in the economy, requests for emergency food have increased due to changes in General Relief and dislocations of welfare reform.

Seattle: A report called "Conversations with 65 Families" by the City of Seattle notes in the key findings that most families use multiple agencies to meet their needs: 34 percent of them use food banks and 15 percent receive assistance from their local churches. The most immediate impact of welfare reform for a majority of these families has been the decrease in food stamp allotments. As a result, many have run out of food at the end of the month.

At about the same time last year, the demand for emergency food assistance remains the same. However, total numbers of requests for food assistance varied from month-to-month. Over the years, data supports the trend of increased demand for food assistance during summer months.

St. Louis: For agencies which report strictly city limits, there has been a 25 percent decrease. Many agencies, however, do not necessarily break numbers down by city vs. suburb. Those agencies report as much as a 40 percent increase in request. One agency also speculated that the reason why emergency food requests decreased somewhat in the city is that city dwellers "network more in the neighborhood" and share resources and information among churches. Urban sprawl has also spread the problem to the suburbs.

St. Paul: The decline in requests is based on statewide data.

Trenton: The number of requests for emergency food vouchers has increased.

Emergency Food Assistance Requests by Families

The number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance increased in 84 percent of the cities. The number remained the same in Burlington, Charlotte, Minneapolis, and St. Paul. Across the cities the average estimated increase was 14 percent. Increases ranged from 36 percent in Detroit, 30 percent in Alexandria and Norfolk, 25 percent in Nashville and San Antonio, 9 percent in Boston and one percent in Seattle.

Among the comments from the city officials on the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance:

Alexandria: This response is based on estimates made by the food providers.
**Boston:** The number of children in households served by the FoodSource Hotline increased by 9 percent.

**Burlington:** Both the Salvation Army and the Food Shelf saw no change.

**Chicago:** Families are continuing to request emergency food assistance at a high rate of frequency. The ability to meet the rising cost of living remains one of the contributing factors.

**Cleveland:** Use of pantries by families with children remained about the same. Children served by hot meals programs increased by 20 percent.

**Denver:** Many food pantries have seen an increase in the number of single parent families whose incomes are below the poverty level.

**Detroit:** Data continue to reflect an increase in family with children (30 percent in 1996-97; 36 percent in 1997-98) seeking emergency food. There are many instances of grandparents caring for younger children in situations where the parents are absent or are transient for one reason or another.

**Kansas City:** Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC), a data collection resource, reported a 3 percent increase in the number of requests for assistance by families with children, 8,184 requests for 1998. According to their records for 1996 and 1997, the number of families requesting assistance totaled 6,974 and 7,946. The data reflect responses received from approximately 137 agencies.

**Louisville:** Food pantries are serving an increasing number of low-income, predominantly young families with children. The food bank’s Kids Café program is seeing a rapidly ascending number of children needing evening meals.

**Miami:** The Salvation Army has experienced 25 percent increase. The Community Partnership for the Homeless experienced a five percent increase.

**Nashville:** Our Kids Café, a feeding program for children in low-income areas, now feeds over 1,000 children a meal one night a week. Nashville CARES has also seen an increase of 10 percent. Current trends in HIV disease have brought about a marked increase in the number of females and females with children requesting food assistance.

**Norfolk:** These numbers are reported through FoodBank of Southeastern Virginia’s quarterly agency surveys.

**Philadelphia:** Food cupboard requests from families with children have increased 11 percent. Soup kitchens are also seeing more families with children, especially during the time that school is not in session.
Portland: We do not track this information at the service level. Our most recent survey (April 1998) indicates that about 55 percent of the households receiving food assistance are families with children. The percentage has remained steady at least and probably increased based on reports from pantries. Also, numbers have greatly increased at the largest family soup kitchens.

Providence: Families with children information is not collected by our agency.

San Antonio: Because of the changes in eligibility and the time limitations imposed by welfare reform, many people no longer receive food stamps or TANF. In addition, the Great Flood of 1998 destroyed the homes of many people, increasing the need for food.

San Diego: More families are seeking emergency shelters than ever before. Families are also seeking food assistance in larger numbers.

Seattle: Data for the first nine months show that there is a slight decrease by about 0.54 percent of the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance.

St. Louis: As many as 50,657 children aged (0-17) in the city are eligible for free/reduced lunches (up to 185 percent of poverty). As many as 40,000 children in the city live below poverty.

St. Paul: Based on statewide data collection.

Emergency Food Assistance Requests by the Elderly

The number of elderly persons requesting emergency food assistance increased in 67 percent (16) of the cities. The number remained the same in 29 percent -- Boston, Burlington, Charleston, Minneapolis, Portland, San Diego and Trenton-- and declined in St Louis. Across the cities requests for emergency food assistance by elderly persons increased by and average of six percent. The increased ranged from 10 percent in Chicago, Detroit, Norfolk and Philadelphia to five percent in Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, and Santa Monica. The increase was two percent in St. Paul. They decreased by 26 percent in St. Louis.

Among the comments from the city officials on the number of elderly persons requesting emergency food assistance:

Alexandria: According to the Agency on Aging, there has been a significant increase and shift in need from congregate meal programs at the Senior Centers to home-based programs such as Meals on Wheels, the Hot Meal Programs in senior housing sites, and the Liquid Supplement Program. There is a perpetual waiting list of approximately ten individuals for the home-bound programs.

Boston: The number of seniors requesting assistance has stayed the same.
Charleston: The majority of feeding programs reported no change from last year's report except for the East Cooper Community Outreach which reported a 15 percent increase in elderly persons requesting food assistance.

Chicago: The information reflects requests to the City's Emergency Food Assistance System and is provided by the Chicago Anti-Hunger Federation and the Greater Chicago Food Depository. Additionally, the elderly who live on fixed incomes have been increasingly forced to choose between housing (other basic living expenses) and food. As a result, they are turning to emergency food assistance programs to sustain them.

Cleveland: Seniors with low incomes and high prescription drug or medical costs often have insufficient income to meet their other basic needs, including food. This situation is unaffected by an improved economy and is increasing.

Denver: Fixed incomes and higher housing costs results in seniors needing more food assistance than in previous years.

Detroit: Decreases/reduction in food stamp eligibility. Elderly customers who are on fixed or limited incomes. Most are high fuel users, SSI, AFDC and SS recipients.

Kansas City: During the 1996-1997 period, MAAC recorded 3,204 elderly persons requesting assistance. This number increased in 1997-1998 to 3,360.

Louisville: Pantries and mission kitchens report an increasing number of elderly clients on fixed incomes who are experiencing difficulties with increasing food costs, which rose 2-3 percent in the last year.

Nashville: Applications are up, as are requests from the elderly service agencies. Many of the Second Harvest agencies that feed the elderly (especially the Meals on Wheels program) have seen an increase in food usage. A big obstacle for elderly people getting food boxes is transportation, and the heavy weight of the boxes (each one weighs about 37 pounds).

Norfolk: The data is reported through FoodBank of Southeastern Virginia’s quarterly surveys.

Philadelphia: The increase in elderly food requests is a result of changes in the welfare system and the fact that their fixed income does not meet all of their needs.

Portland: We do not track the age of clients at service level. However, based on the 1998 survey, we estimate the percentage of elderly to be five to nine percent. Senior meal site numbers are up five to ten percent.

San Antonio: Based on a survey of agencies who provide emergency assistance, an increased cost of living, a decrease in federal funded programs for immigrants, and changes in eligibility for SSI and TANF, the number of elderly requesting food increased.
San Diego: San Diego has an extensive noon-time Senior Meals Program which provides nutritionally balanced meals. Access to these meals may reduce the demand for emergency assistance. There is a need to increase the number of home delivered meals. But, sufficient resources are not available to satisfy this need.

Seattle: Data for the first nine months in 1998 show that seniors 55 years of age and older make up 25 percent of food bank clients. This number represents approximately a 3 percent increase from last year.

St. Louis: This number is based strictly on documented requests for HDM (Home Delivered Meals). Numerous agencies report that the numbers of elderly have increased slightly but the elderly people are not "as needy" because more women are getting Social Security benefits.

St. Paul: Based on statewide data collection.

The People Requesting Food Assistance

Across the survey cities it is estimated that 61 percent of those requesting emergency food assistance were either children or their parents. In Charlotte, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Providence and St. Louis three-fourths or more of those requesting emergency food assistance were members of families with children.

Officials in the survey cities reported that 37 percent of adults requesting emergency food assistance were employed. The percentage of employed adults requesting food assistance ranges from 71 percent in Nashville, 70 percent in Salt Lake City, 53 percent in Kansas City, 50 percent in Alexandria and Louisville, 15 percent in Trenton and five percent in Detroit.

Causes Of Hunger

Officials in the survey cities say hunger is due to a number of factors, many of them interrelated. Those most frequently identified by the survey cities in response to an open-ended question, are low-paying jobs, high housing costs, unemployment and other employment-related problems, food stamps cuts, poverty or lack of income and low benefit levels in public assistance programs. Substance abuse was also mentioned.

• Twenty-four cities cited low paying jobs as one of the main causes of hunger. They are Alexandria, Boston, Burlington, Charleston, Charlotte, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Providence, San Diego, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Santa Monica, Seattle and St. Louis.

• Thirteen cities identified high housing costs: Alexandria, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Portland, Providence, Salt Lake City, San Diego, Seattle and Trenton.
• Twelve cities cited unemployment and other employment-related problems as one of the main causes of hunger. They are Alexandria, Chicago, Kansas City, Miami, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Providence, San Antonio, Santa Monica and Seattle.

• Nine cities identified food stamps cuts: Boston, Cleveland, Louisville, Nashville, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Santa Monica, Seattle and Trenton.

• Eight cities also identified poverty or lack of income: Alexandria, Kansas City, Louisville, Miami, Nashville, Santa Monica, St. Louis, Trenton.

• Seven cities identified low benefit levels in public assistance programs as a main cause of hunger. They are Cleveland, Louisville, Portland, San Diego, Santa Monica, Seattle, Trenton and Philadelphia.

• Six cities identified substance abuse: Louisville, Kansas City, Miami, Philadelphia, Detroit and Nashville.

Other causes of hunger cited by cities include homelessness by Miami, Norfolk and Santa Monica, mental illness, by Louisville, Miami, and Santa Monica; rising food costs, by Charleston and Chicago; lack of affordable child care, by Louisville and Minneapolis; and inability to budget money by Chicago, Nashville and San Antonio.

Capacity to Meet the Need

Emergency Food Assistance Facilities

During the last year the number of emergency food assistance facilities increased in 48 percent of the cities, remained the same in 48 percent of the cities and decreased in only one city, Detroit. Cities in which they increased are Boston, Burlington, Charlotte, Chicago, Denver, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, San Antonio, and Seattle.

Among the officials’ comments on the number of emergency food assistance facilities in their cities:

Alexandria: The number of programs has remained the same, but the awareness and use of some of the newer programs has increased. The Emergency Needs Task Force and Human Services’ staff have held informational panel discussions and written materials focusing on existing food banks and their dates and hours of availability.
Boston: This year's Summer Food Grants provided by the City of Boston went to 91 food pantries as opposed to 79 the year before.

Burlington: The Salvation Army offers supper on Fridays. The Emergency Food Shelf has two additional programs: Homebound Grocery Delivery Program and Food Rescue.

Charlotte: Loaves & Fishes has opened 4 new pantries in Mecklenburg County this year.

Chicago: An increased number of churches are opening soup kitchens and food pantries. In general, however, the number of emergency food facilities fluctuates.

Denver: There are 3 new food pantries in Denver.

Detroit: The number has decreased because of lack of funding.

Kansas City: No change. Source: Harvesters

Louisville: New pantries open each month.

Minneapolis: Two new facilities opened to meet the growing Latino and HIV population need.

Nashville: Second Harvest has added two distribution sites to its emergency food box programs in the past 3 months.

Norfolk: The FoodBank of Southeastern Virginia receives in excess of ten inquiries per month for membership.

Philadelphia: Food cupboards up 9 percent.

Phoenix: Some have closed while about an equal number have opened.

San Antonio: Thirty-three percent of agencies surveyed indicated that they increased their emergency food assistance facilities.

Seattle: Last year, there were 29 food banks in the city of Seattle; this year there are 31. No new formal emergency meal programs have been established. However, many faith-based and grassroots organizations provide meal service to those who are hungry.

St. Louis: Most churches are fairly permanent and food pantries are fairly strategically placed.

During the last year the level of resources, such as food, funds or volunteers, available to emergency food assistance facilities is estimated to have increased by 24 percent. The level of resources increased in 39 percent of the cities, decreased in 21 percent and
stayed the same in 39 percent of the cities. Among the city officials’ comments on the level of resources available.

**Alexandria:** The ALIVE! Organization's Last Saturday of the Month program has received increased commodities from the Capital Area Food Bank because of its increased demand for assistance. Churches in the area have also reported an increase in food donations made by their parishioners. They attribute some of the increase to greater awareness and publicity about hunger.

**Boston:** The resources available to emergency feeding programs in Boston has increased this year. The Massachusetts Emergency Food Assistance Program funding has been increased statewide from $3.5 million to $7 million in an attempt to respond to increasing demand. The City of Boston continues to support 91 Boston pantries with a summer grant program of $115,000, as well as a $12,000 grant to Boston Soup kitchens from the Can Share Food Drive.

**Charlotte:** Pantries in the Loaves & Fishes network have expanded from 11 to 15. Volunteer support, food, and financial support has increased correspondingly.

**Chicago:** Although, the level of funds dedicated to emergency food service provision has remained relatively the same, the level of resources such as food and volunteers has not. A greater number of companies are willing to donate surplus food products.

**Denver:** An increase in the number of volunteers and massive food drives have helped.

**Detroit:** Funding limitation on federal, state and local levels have had the effect of lowering the level of all resources available to emergency food facilities.

**Kansas City:** Sixty-seven (67) percent of the agencies that responded to our survey reported that the level of resources stayed the same. This result corresponds with Harvesters' response.

**Louisville:** More competition for special event money. FEMA money declining over years and more agencies in need. National food donations from major companies down 10-20 percent.

**Nashville:** Second Harvest donations from corporations are down 15 percent from levels a year ago. National Food Donations are down 20 percent from a year ago. Fundraising efforts at Second Harvest have reaped 10 percent more than last year. The number of volunteers has increased.

**Philadelphia:** These food providers are doing a better job with purchased products. Also, donations of fresh produce have increased.

**Phoenix:** EFSP funds: decreased 15 percent; State Admin. Funds: stayed the same; State food purchasing monies for Maricopa County (including food vouchers): increased 63 percent; Private food purchasing dollars: increased $30,000.
**Portland:** There is one new meal site in the community and one new food box site.

**Salt Lake City:** Because more than 4,000 food stamp recipients have lost their benefits, demand has become much heavier upon food banks. This results in less food available although the amount may not be different from the previous year.

**San Antonio:** Approximately one-third of agencies surveyed experienced an increase in resources.

**San Diego:** It appears resources are equaling demand.

**Santa Monica:** The Westside Food Bank, which provides the bulk of emergency food assistance to Santa Monica, has increased the efficiency of perishable food distribution and doubled its number of volunteer hours in the last year and a half.

**Seattle:** There has been a slight increase in City Human Services Programs for the next biennium; however, the need for transportation of the food resources and cold and dry storage continue to be a challenge. There seems to be a good source of food donations from grocery stores, food growers and distributors; however, meal programs and food banks have reported a shortage of fresh fruits and vegetables and dairy products.

**St. Louis:** Restaurants and small community food drives have generated much of the food given out in pantries. Grocery stores are donating less as they become more efficient in inventory control. Other community businesses (i.e. restaurants, small food companies) are becoming more involved as they realize the benefits of tax writeoffs.

**Trenton:** Less corporate donations.

**Emergency Food Assistance Facilities: For Emergencies Only or a Steady Source of Food?**

Ninety-two percent of the cities reported that emergency food assistance facilities were used both for emergencies and as a steady source of food over long periods of time. Alexandria and St. Louis were used for emergencies only. Among the city officials’ comments on the use of emergency food facilities:

**Alexandria:** The majority of food providers indicate that the food which they provide is on an emergency basis, usually a 3-5 day supply. The Christ House and Senior Nutrition Centers offer congregate meals on a daily basis. The Meals on Wheels, Hot Meals, and Liquid Supplement Programs are ongoing sources of food/nutrition for seniors.

**Boston:** Twenty-four percent of callers to the FoodSource Hotline are repeat callers. The Second Harvest study released in 1998 and sponsored locally by the Greater Boston Food Bank reported that 38 percent of agency clients have received food for more than one year.
**Burlington:** The Salvation Army soup kitchen is used by individual for emergency needs and also longer term basis to supplement low-income need.

**Charleston:** The people who use both, the elderly and people whose Food Stamps have been cut, are considered to be people for whom things will not get better.

**Charlotte:** Loaves & Fishes pantries serve individuals and families in emergency situations. There are several programs that provide continuing help.

**Chicago:** The City of Chicago's Emergency Food Program is funded and operated for emergency use only. However, Chicago Not-for-Profit Food Programs can and sometimes do become a regular source of food.

**Denver:** People living with incomes below the federal poverty level depend on food pantries at least once a month. People who find themselves in emergency situations may access them at any time.

**Detroit:** Some food resources such as the DHS Emergency Food Program (EFP) are used to meet household emergencies while others such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus food commodity distribution program are used to supplement personal food supplies and reduce budget expenditure for food.

**Kansas City:** According to Harvesters, a supplier of a network of over 500 pantries and soup kitchens, emergency food assistance facilities are used for both emergencies and on an ongoing basis. Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC), reported that of all households that received food, 20.3 percent received food assistance 6 times or more. There are some facilities that make weekly food allocation available for the elderly population.

**Louisville:** The food bank operates an emergency pantry system for crisis intervention, while many churches and community organization help on an ongoing, localized basis, providing both food supplies and meals to the poor.

**Miami:** The Miami Rescue Mission and Camillus House are two of the facilities that conduct daily feedings. There are also local churches and other organizations that provide such services. Some emergency shelters also provide food for extended periods of time.

**Minneapolis:** Agencies serve both facilities and individuals in transition over time as well as meet emergency situations.

**Nashville:** Many people utilize the Emergency Food Box program as a supplement at the end of the month when other assistance runs short. Many families are paid minimum wage and find it difficult to pay rent, utilities, medical bills, etc. and have enough left over for food. Many elderly people are on small fixed incomes. There is not an adequate supply of affordable housing. More and more folks need some food assistance on a fairly regular basis.
Norfolk: Some families and individuals are served on a regular basis due to financial situations. Facilities are used for emergencies most of the time, some facilities provide food to families on a monthly basis.

Philadelphia: More individuals and families are struggling to get through each month on their limited income and depend on food cupboards for support.

Phoenix: A household can usually obtain 3-6 boxes a year, but food banks are consistently expanding their programs to include cooperative food buying programs (Pay $15 for $30 worth of food purchased by the food bank); Kid's Café -- after-school program; Food Plus -- commodities, which low-income people can access year round as appropriate.

Portland: For many low income people, the "emergency" need for food assistance has become "chronic" and is a basic component in their efforts to survive. On average, those in need access emergency food three times a year.

Providence: All food closet facilities provide emergency assistance. Based upon regulations set forth by the funding source(s) and the situation, the assistance provided may be short- or long-term.

San Antonio: Agencies surveyed indicated they provide food due to household crises as well as those who cannot feed their households nutritionally balanced meals on a regular basis. Most of those who receive food as a steady source are elderly persons.

San Diego: Some distribution programs focus on emergency allocations and may limit the number of orders to a given family. Distribution centers do experience more demand toward the end of the month. It appears that some clients may be stretching their income to offset the high cost of rent in San Diego.

Seattle: Some people use emergency food programs for a limited period of time. However, most people rely on food banks and emergency meal programs on a regular basis.

St. Louis: At one time as many as one-third of the metropolitan population may be relying upon emergency food pantries.

St. Paul: Both emergency and supplemental requests are responses to the demand.

Trenton: The Trenton Area Soup Kitchen sees both types.

The Quantity of Food Provided
Forty-seven percent of the cities reported that emergency food assistance programs are able to provide an adequate quantity of food; 53 percent of the cities said they are not. Among the officials’ comments:

Alexandria: Most food providers attempt to provide a 3-5 day supply of food.

Boston: Emergency food assistance facilities are not able to provide an adequate quantity of food to those requesting assistance. The FoodSource Hotline limits referrals to once per 30 days. Boston food pantries report that they supply an average of 4 days of food. This is not adequate especially when emergency food stamps can take up to seven days before receipt. The Second Harvest study for Boston reported that 29 percent of clients report that adults in their households have missed meals in the past month because they did not have enough food or money to buy food.

Burlington: Adequate quantity: Yes - Food Shelf. No - Salvation Army received most cases whose needs are not met by the Food Shelf because they require specialty items for their diets or medical needs.

Charleston: Most report that they are usually able to provide an adequate amount but it depends on donations. If donations are down, then less is given.

Charlotte: Loaves & Fishes provides a seven-day supply of food pro-rated by family size.

Chicago: The quantity, as well as the nutritional value of each City of Chicago food package/bag, is evaluated by a Chicago Department of Human Services nutritionist. Additionally, emergency feeding facilities are providing case management in conjunction with food distribution. This factor addresses the specific and long-term needs of each client.

Cleveland: Pantries can provide a 3 to 5 day supply of food each month. Many persons, particularly those who have lost food stamps, now need a larger supply.

Detroit: The DHS's EFP emergency food box is a 45-lb. pantry pac and is designed to provide about 15 nutritionally balanced meals to assist the household during emergencies.

Kansas City: According to Harvesters, many facilities have to close their doors, and some provide food only to certain categories (families with children and elderly populations). Fifty (50) percent of the agencies that responded to our survey said that they do not have an adequate quantity of food.

Louisville: In general, clients receive a basic minimum of staple items to last for a few days.

Minneapolis: Cash assistance is used as a supplement.
**Nashville:** This year, Second Harvest had to raise money and food after the tornado disaster in April. This effort took away from the needs the agency experienced routinely. Due to a food shortage, some 500 holiday food boxes may not be prepared as planned. Ladies of Charity gives out an excellent food order which lasts at least five days. Most agencies describe their assistance as supplemental to client income and resources. While the food is nutritionally balanced, it may not meet daily needs.

**Norfolk:** A three-day supply of food is provided by most facilities. Some facilities are able to provide a larger supply.

**Philadelphia:** Food cupboards limit the amount of food they give to people when they are running low on food.

**Phoenix:** Forty-six percent of the food banks reported having to stretch food supplies; 33 percent reported having to turn away clients; 29 percent of these due to lack of food (Second Harvest 1997 Study; Hunger the Faces and Facts).

**Portland:** Agencies must limit the number of times households can access food and they are not always able to offer food that is currently appropriate or sensitive to health restrictions.

**Providence:** Assistance is dependent upon the availability of food when approached. If a site is low on products, linkages established within each community complement one another with food assistance.

**Salt Lake City:** Increase in demand and decrease in amount available results in inadequate amounts. When supplies are exhausted people are turned away.

**San Antonio:** Based on the survey of emergency food providers, most are able to provide adequate quantities of food. There have been requests for special dietary food, and agencies have been unable to meet the demand of such assistance due to a lack of such products.

**San Diego:** Even though there appears to be an adequate quantity of food, there is not always the variety which may be requested or desired.

**Santa Monica:** Although food resources have increased, the available supply is still insufficient to meet the demand.

**Seattle:** Most emergency meal programs are unable to provide three meals a day, seven days a week, and many only provide a meal once or twice a week. Food banks are only able to provide enough food to feed a family or individual for one or two days a week.

**St. Louis:** Pantries tend to be low on protein and produce (especially fresh fruits and vegetables). A typical sack of groceries might include: hot dogs, yogurt, lettuce and chips (items that do not necessarily go together to make an adequate meal).
Sixty percent of the survey cities report that emergency food assistance facilities have had to decrease the quantity of food provided and/or the number of times families or individuals can come to get food. Those cities in which facilities have not had to decrease the food provided are Boston, Burlington, Charlotte, Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, New Orleans, Portland, Providence, San Diego, San Francisco, St. Paul and Trenton.

Fifty percent of the cities which have had to decrease the quantity of food report that during the last year emergency food assistance facilities have had to increase further that on the number of food bags provided and/or decrease further the number of times families and/or individuals can come to get food. These cities which have had to increase the limit on the bags provided or the times people can get food are Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Santa Monica, Seattle, St. Paul.

Among the city officials’ comments on the limits on assistance provided:

**Alexandria:** The food assistance facilities report that they have not decreased the quantity of food provided to families and individuals. However, in order to serve the greatest number of persons and preserve food stocks, most providers establish eligibility criteria that limit the family/individual to one food order every 30 days.

**Boston:** Pantry policies have remained the same.

**Burlington:** Yes - The Salvation Army - The Food Shelf limits the number of visits a family can come. The Salvation Army supplements when this opportunity is expended yet the need is still relevant. The Food Shelf responded "no" to this question with the comment "very resourceful community."

**Charleston:** Feeding programs tend to deal with this in different ways. Some reduce the amount of food given out but not the number of times people can return for more, while others will reduce both.

**Charlotte:** Loaves & Fishes will provide a week's supply of food every 60 days.

**Chicago:** The City of Chicago's Food Program has a flexible limitation. This limitation is adjusted based upon actual client need, whereas Chicago Not-for-Profit Food Programs provide food strictly on a case-by-case basis.

**Cleveland:** Pantries limit households to one monthly visit for a 3 to 5 day supply of food.

**Denver:** Small food pantries depend on seasonal food donations. Donations are high in the winter, low in the summer.
Detroit: Resource availability, funding limitations and consideration of each individual request determine the number of bags/boxes that are distributed. Exceptions are always made for substantiated extreme emergencies.

Kansas City: Harvesters indicates that the facilities within their network impose a once-a-month limitation on families or individuals. In some cases the amount of food distributed may be decreased.

Louisville: All pantries dependent on donations of food and money must limit the number of times a client family can be served in order to maximize the number of clients helped.

Minneapolis: Generally, one visit per month. Special needs receive additional service.

Nashville: There is a limit at Second Harvest of 3 boxes every 6 months, or a total of 6 boxes per year. The limit exists due to the limit on resources. Certain food items may not be available for distribution.

Norfolk: The supply of food is not adequate; therefore, the agencies are decreasing the amount of food per family in order to serve more families.

Philadelphia: Most food cupboards limit the number of times people can come to the cupboard in a given period of time (for example, one a month or once every three months). The families receive three meals a day for three days.

Phoenix: Sixteen percent of the food banks that have to stretch their food find themselves doing so all year long.

Portland: Some local agencies have reduced numbers of times that families can access food boxes.

Providence: As mentioned above, a funding source may specify the number of times per month a client may receive assistance while other sources may come without restrictions. Diverse funds and linkages aid in providing what is necessary.

Salt Lake City: Efforts are underway to increase the amount of food donated.

San Antonio: The majority of agencies surveyed indicated that they do limit the number of times an individual or family can receive emergency food.

Santa Monica: When direct service providers experience heavy demand, they tend to impose longer intervals before families and individuals can get food.

Seattle: Families and individuals are limited to visiting a food bank to once per week.
Trenton: The Trenton Area Soup Kitchen no longer offers seconds.

Among the comments from the city officials on when city officials were asked if emergency food assistance facilities had to limit the quantity of food bags provided and/or the number of times families and/or individuals can come to get food:

Alexandria: The quantity of food provided remains constant. Limitations are based on eligibility criteria that limit how often a family/individual can return to the same resource.

Denver: Varies per pantry. Smaller ones are more likely to impose limits.

Detroit: An effort is made to limit customer participation to no more than once every 90 days; however, we try to respond to the circumstances of the individual household making the request for assistance if the need is determined to be greater.

Kansas City: Harvesters indicates that the facilities within their network impose a once a month limitation on families or individuals. In some cases the amount of food distributed may be decreased.

Louisville: The food pantry network of the food bank must limit service to 4-5 times each year. Subsidiary pantries often serve only on a month, and supply lesser amounts.

Minneapolis: Food shelves can provide up to nine pounds of food per person for each visit.

Nashville: Families come to Second Harvest on a regular basis for food. However, at this time, the supply at Second Harvest only allows them to give three food boxes every 6 months. Ladies of Charity limits as to number of times families can get food during the year.

Norfolk: FoodBank of Southeastern Virginia member agencies report there has been a great increase in the past year. Most facilities have to limit the amount of food distributed.

Philadelphia: The facilities must decrease the number of times people can come to the cupboard.

Phoenix: More strict screening, fewer walk-ins.

San Antonio: Agencies normally limit food assistance to one timer per month. Agencies, however, indicated that they have had to increase the limit on the number of times a household can receive food assistance.

Santa Monica: There is a decrease in the number of times people can get food.

Seattle: Because of declining food and monetary donations over the past few years, food banks have for some time limited the number of times a household is eligible to receive food to once per
week. Some food banks must tighten up on eligibility requirements, limiting assistance to only those household living within their designated service and/or be selective in the amount of items that are packed in the food bank bags.

**St. Paul:** Because of the variety of food sources - food bank, food drives, purchased food, special VAP projects, etc.

**The Quality of Food Provided**

Seventy-seven percent of the survey cities report that emergency food assistance facilities are able to provide nutritionally balanced food. Twenty-three percent of the cities are not able consistently to provide nutritionally balanced food. Among the city officials’ comments:

**Alexandria:** Emergency and congregate food providers report that they make every effort to provide wholesome, well-balanced food products that are safe for consumption. Some providers purchase food from the Capital Area Food Bank of USDA surplus commodities.

**Boston:** The Greater Boston Food Bank and Project Bread offer nutritional guidance to the various feeding programs.

**Charleston:** Sometimes, but it all depends on the type and volume of donations received.

**Chicago:** The contents of the food package/boxes which are provided, through the City of Chicago, are reviewed annually to ensure nutritional balance. The box content review is conducted by a City of Chicago, Department of Human Services nutritionist. Not-for-Profit Food Programs are encouraged to participate in the nutrition and food handling certification classes offered by the Chicago Anti-Hunger Federation.

**Denver:** Not at all pantries.

**Detroit:** State nutritionists have assisted in determining the contents of the emergency food boxes (pantry pacs)

**Kansas City:** Harvesters emphasizes the importance of donating food that is nutritious in value.

**Louisville:** There is a shortage of meat, fish, and other protein, as well as juices and fruits.

**Miami:** The food that is provided in the shelters are nutritionally balanced, otherwise whatever is available is provided to walk in clients seeking food.

**Nashville:** Most places try to include foods from the four basic food groups. Perishable goods, such as meats, eggs, milk and fresh vegetables, are the hardest to come by; and, as meat is
expensive, substitute proteins (peanut butter, beans) are often used. Fresh bread is provided as available. In addition, nutritional supplements are provided, as available (such as Ensure), to frail elderly and to people with AIDS. The following were listed as included in food boxes distributed by Second Harvest: green and yellow vegetables, eggs, milk, canned meat products (if available), cereal, soup, pasta, peanut butter, beans and cheese (if available).

Norfolk: Every effort is made to provide nutritionally balanced food, however, meat protein fresh vegetables and fruit are not always available.

Philadelphia: The nutritional balance of the food varies. Food cupboards receive a base food package that includes breakfast, lunch and dinner items. These items are supplemented with donations.

Phoenix: Food box contents are planned in conjunction with the County Health Department and Cooperative Extension guidelines.

Portland: Pantries attempt to provide a basic and balanced mix of foods in the food parcels. Products accessed from Oregon Food Bank include canned meals, fruits, vegetables, soups and a large mixture of other grocery items such as bread, rice and beans.

Providence: Dependent upon available foods. There does appear to be a need for meats/protein.

Salt Lake City: As much as possible. Depends on items donated.

San Antonio: Although the majority of agencies reported that food provided is nutritionally balanced, many indicated a need for fresh fruit, vegetable, dairy products, and dietary foods.

Santa Monica: Nutritional balance is a top priority of the City's emergency food banks.

Seattle: For the most part, food programs have made a real effort to provide foods which can be used to prepare nutritionally-balanced meals. Many food banks and meal programs pool funds to make bulk purchases of nutritious foods such as chicken, ground turkey, fresh fruits and vegetable, and specific dairy products. Infant formula and baby food are also purchased, as are foods for people with special dietary needs.

St. Louis: Often protein foods are inadequate and fresh fruits and produce are limited. Through the network, clients will often seek food from more than one source for this reason.
Funding

City Government Spending Public Funds to Support Local Emergency Food Assistance Efforts

During the last year 67 percent of the survey cities report using city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts. Approximately $16 million was used by these city governments to support food efforts during the last year. Among the sources of funds use by city governments, locally generated revenues accounted for 23 percent, state funds for 44 percent, McKinney Homeless Assistance funds for two percent, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for 27 percent, the Community Services Block Grant for four percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>54,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>82,378.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>1,200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>329,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>139,167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1,364,427.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities that used state grants to support emergency food assistance efforts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>2,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>149,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>3,499,988.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>53,803.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities that used McKinney Act funds to support emergency food assistance efforts:
Charleston .................................................. 173,408.00
Nashville ..................................................... 92,106.00
San Diego .................................................... 78,850.00

Cities that used **Community Development Block Grant funds** to support emergency food assistance efforts:

- Alexandria .................................................. 30,247.00
- Burlington .................................................. 6,000.00
- Chicago ...................................................... 2,245,000.00
- Cleveland ................................................... 841,578.00
- Providence .................................................. 350,000.00
- Salt Lake City ................................................ 874,000.00

Cities that used **Community Services Block Grant funds** to support emergency food assistance efforts:

- Burlington .................................................. 8,000.00
- Denver ....................................................... 16,000.00
- Detroit ....................................................... 219,547.00
- Kansas City .................................................. 407,270.00
- San Antonio .................................................. 7,570.00
Unmet Need

Estimated Overall Demand for Emergency Food Assistance Which Goes Unmet

An average of 21 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance is estimated to have gone unmet in the survey cities during the last year. The unmet need ranges from 55 percent in Phoenix, 48 percent in St. Louis, 28 percent in Santa Monica, 25 percent in Nashville, 20 percent in Louisville, and 3 percent in Cleveland. Alexandria, Charleston, and Burlington report that none of the demand for emergency food assistance goes unmet.

For families alone, an average of 18 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance is estimated to have gone unmet in the survey cities during the last year. The unmet need for families range from 38 percent in Phoenix, 28 percent in Santa Monica, 25 percent in Nashville and St. Louis, 20 percent in Denver, Kansas City and Louisville, 15 percent in Boston, Norfolk and Philadelphia, and one percent in Cleveland.

Among the city officials’ comments on meeting the demand for emergency food assistance:

Alexandria: Through coordination and communication among the agencies we do not feel that need goes unmet.

Boston: Twenty-nine percent of clients in the Second Harvest study estimate that adults in their household have missed meals in the past month. Six percent of households with children report that children have missed meals in the past month.

Burlington: The Salvation Army does not turn anyone away coming for food. The Food Shelf reports 30 percent for overall demand and 202 percent for demand by families with children. Comment: Many potential families in need of assistance, but are too ashamed to come for food.

Charleston: None of the programs document the unmet need because they don't turn anyone away for food.

Chicago: Not-for-Profit emergency food facilities efficiently utilize available resources. They respond, to people in need, by either accommodating requests directly or by referring requests to other emergency food service facilities. In addition, the City of Chicago has established an emergency response food provision system. This system safe guards against depleted food supplies due to unforeseen natural disasters and/or an unexpected increase in requests.

Denver: Homeless families living in cars or motels often avoid social services due to dependency and neglect issues so they do not receive food stamps.
Detroit: This data is insufficiently tracked but our experience indicates that the problem continues to be severe.

Louisville: The food bank study has documented a steady growth in demand for service and frequency of the need. The number of children seeking food at Kids Cafes and other after school feeding programs has increased and there is a need for more sites. Emergency pantry clients has increased, including service to immigrant families.

Miami: Wages and foodstamps are being terminated or people are being temporarily sanctioned.

Minneapolis: Families use alternative resources including family and friends.

Norfolk: It is difficult to estimate these figures because some facilities do not keep this information or reduce the size of food boxes to meet all requests.

Philadelphia: Most soup kitchens serve only one meal a day and are not open every day. Most food cupboards are only open two days per week.

Phoenix: There are 377,000 people in Maricopa County living at or below poverty level. Forty-five percent of these people received food assistance last year. Only 35 percent of the low income population received food stamps last year, a drop of 8 percent from the previous year.

Portland: Although we have no data to measure unmet needs, we believe that many people are not being helped adequately through our network of pantries and meal sites. Immigrants and the elderly only use pantries as a last resort. Language and isolation are barriers to these populations even being aware of assistance that is available. Limits of frequency of service to once per quarter or once per month do not meet emergency needs of a family experiencing a crisis that lasts several months.

Seattle: Emergency food programs keep records only on the number of people served, not on the number of people turned away.

St. Paul: This is difficult to determine. We have been able to serve those who come to agencies.

People Turned Away

Forty-seven percent of the cities report that emergency food assistance facilities may have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources; 53 percent report they do not. Among the comments of officials from cities in which facilities may have to turn people away:
Alexandria: Alexandria is committed to combating hunger. The churches, synagogues, non-profit agencies, City government, and local businesses ensure that food supplies are available to families in need. When supplies run low, food drives are initiated to replenish stocks.

Boston: Thirty-one percent of food pantries report turning away clients.

Charleston: Food programs would rather reduce the amount of food given rather than turn people away.

Chicago: Not-for-profit emergency food facilities efficiently utilize available resources. They respond, to people in need, by either accommodating requests directly or by referring requests to other emergency food service facilities. In addition, the City of Chicago has established an emergency response food provision system. This system safeguards against depleted food supplies due to unforeseen natural disasters and/or an unexpected increase in requests.

Cleveland: Smaller pantries can run out of food. They try to refer to other programs when possible.

Denver: Small community-based pantries depend on seasonal donations. If the shelves are empty, people are turned away.

Detroit: Usually during peak periods such as before holidays when the demand is greater than the available food resources.

Kansas City: According to Harvester, facilities may turn away clients due to an insufficient supply of food available.

Louisville: There is an insufficient amount of donated food, or funds to purchase food, for the food shelves, emergency feeding agencies, and soup kitchens.

Miami: Shortage of food items.

Minneapolis: Food shelves can use cash assistance and/or will refer the client to another food shelf.

Nashville: If people come back for more than 3 food boxes, many times Second Harvest cannot meet their food needs. Holy Name Church’s Loaves & Fishes, a large feeding program for poor and homeless people, frequently runs low on food boxes. Nashville CARES limits its slots, and has a waiting list.

Norfolk: There is not an adequate supply of food.
Philadelphia: Most food cupboards are open only during specific hours and on specific days. No food cupboard is open all day, every day.

Portland: The "turn away" numbers are not tracked. The tight restrictions by the largest pantries would indicate the limited resources limit the number of times a household can receive help. People are "turned away" without even reaching the agency's door because they know they can be helped "X" times per year.

Providence: Established linkages assure our clients that they will receive assistance.

San Antonio: The agencies surveyed indicated they did not have to turn people away.

Seattle: Meal programs are occasionally forced to turn people away. Food banks generally attempt to serve all people requesting food, which frequently results in severely limiting the amount of food made available to each individual/family.

St. Louis: This lack of resources includes some inability to manage the operation costs of a pantry such as storage and utilities.

**Exemplary Programs**

Among the comments from the city officials on exemplary programs or efforts underway which prevents or responds to the problems of hunger:

**Boston:** Mayor Menino's office coordinates an annual food drive. Boston Can Share, for three weeks prior to Thanksgiving, to help low-income individuals and families during the holiday season. The Boston business community and City employees contributed over 200,000 lbs. of food through Can Share last year. This food was distributed to food pantries, soup kitchens and shelters.

Project Bread's annual fundraising event -- The Walk For Hunger -- raises funds for over 500 food pantries, soup kitchens and homeless shelters in Massachusetts. More than 46,000 people participate in the 20-mile walk on the first Sunday in May, raising nearly $3 million annually.

Advocacy by anti-hunger activists, in response to cutbacks in Food Stamps, helped to convince the state legislature to increase statewide funding of the Massachusetts Emergency Food P Assistance Program from $3.5 million to $7 million annually.

There are now 14 Farmers Markets in the City of Boston. Supported by the State's Department of Food and Agriculture and the City of Boston, these markets offer low-cost, fresh produce to inner city customers. The City continues to attract major supermarket chains to the inner city, increasing competition and lowering price for consumers.
**Charleston:** The most exemplary program throughout the Greater Charleston Area is the East Cooper Community Outreach (ECCO). This small non-profit organization provides emergency food assistance for a large population of people living east of the Cooper. With limited staff and resources they have made a significant difference in the lives of hungry people spread throughout a semi-urban, but mostly rural community which stretches to the very limits of Charleston County. This incredible task is successful due to the caring leadership of ECCO’s director, Penny Todd, her staff and a well organized army of volunteers.

**Charlotte:** In this last year Loaves & Fishes and Community Link (formerly known as Traveller's Aid) have collaborated to provide bags of non-perishable food for Community Link clients who are taking long bus trips to return to their community of origin.

**Chicago:** The Community Kitchens of Chicago is a food preparation and life skills training program made possible through the collaboration of the Greater Chicago Food Depository, DePaul University Office of Applied Innovations, Association House of Chicago and Westside Catholic Educational Ministries. The program provides the skills necessary to move people from public assistance or underemployment to self-sufficiency through employment in the food service industry. Participants will train with a chef for a period of ten weeks. The chef will instruct participants in basic food preparation, sanitation, and knife usage skills.

Life and employment skills training will be coupled with the food service training component. Topics covered during the training will include: stress management, study skills, financial responsibility and budgeting, establishing and using credit, balancing work and personal lives, completing a job application, developing a resumé, personal hygiene, proper workplace behavior and the importance of following instructions.

Trainees work with a team case manager both during the training class and after graduation. The case manager assists each participant in formulating a work plan with individual goals and objectives, helping each participant to secure and retain employment.

**Denver:** There are many: A local television station has two major food drives a year. On November 21, they collected 96 tons of food, $44,000.00 and tons of toys and clothes for those in need. (The station is KUSA).

The VOA's City Harvest food bank collects food from a variety of sources as does the Denver Food Pantry Coalition.

**Detroit:** The City of Detroit's Department of Human Services (DHS) provides emergency food boxes year-round through its Emergency Food Program (EFP). Food boxes are provided to eligible persons in a crisis. Individuals and families who have lost benefits from programs such as AFDC or food stamps and who do not qualify for any type of other assistance are the primary recipients of this program.

DHS provides pre-packaged food boxes (pantry pacs) which are about 45 lbs. and provides about
15 meals to customers who declare an emergency need for food. The eligibility criteria require that customers meet and document income eligibility guidelines. Generally, the customer cannot be served more frequently than once every 90 days, however, exceptions are made for emergencies.

The food boxes include a reasonable combination of the following four (4) food groups:

Meat or meat alternate group; Vegetable and fruit; Bread or bread alternatives; Milk or milk alternatives.

Donated food is distributed when it meets the same standards of quality, sanitation and safety that purchased from commercial sources. Home-canned or preserved foods are not distributed.

Emergency food is distributed to customers between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday in three (3) DHS Community Service Centers throughout the city.

Customers who receive assistance through this program are also informed of other supportive services which may be available to them through DHS. Examples are clothing, home weatherization, heating bill assistance, drug treatment and so forth.

**Kansas City:** Harvesters is a local food bank that provides nutritious food for area pantries. Harvesters also coordinates major food drives to raise donation. Harvesters organized the "World Food Day of Greater Kansas City," which provides local and international solutions to the problem of hunger. Project Strength is a program that teaches nutrition education and hands-on cooking to low-income families.

**Louisville:** The food bank has developed aggressive programs in produce delivery, children's feeding programs (Kids Cafés), nutrition education for children and their families, and expanded food pantry support. In 1997-98, the food bank partnered with St. Vincent dePaul shelter and the Kentucky Restaurant Association to train formerly homeless and substance-dependent clients in kitchen and other job skills, with daily outputs used to feed the children at Kids Café.

**Miami:** Camillus House serves meals to the homeless daily and provides food to food banks and other assisting agencies. The total meals provided ranges from 1,000-1,200 daily.

**Nashville:** Second Harvest Food Bank participates in:
A) The U.S. Postal Service food drive, which occurs one day each year, and reaps 500,000-800,000 pounds of food each year;

B) The Food 2 Families program, sponsored by Kroger and WKRN News Channel 2, which has earned local and national Emmy awards and raised food and awareness about the need for food in the area; and c) the Kid's Café, sponsored by the Junior League of Nashville, which is a feeding program for children ages 3-20 who reside in low-income areas of the city. There are 6 sites, where approximately 800-1,000 children are served each week.
Second Harvest is currently developing a produce and meat recovery program.

Nashville's Table harvests excess prepared and perishable food from area eating establishments and distributes it, free of cost, to agencies serving hungry, needy and homeless people. The agency currently serves over 60 recipient agencies.

**Norfolk:** An agency operates a food pantry within our City. As a result of that program, they determined the individuals and families they served had other service needs. Based upon these needs, they now offer rental assistance, job counseling and placement programs.

**Philadelphia:** Philabundance is a not-for-profit food transportation system that reclaims surplus food from the food industry and efficiently distributes the food to community-based organizations serving people in need. Philabundance recognizes that 27 percent of the food produced in the United States goes to waste while millions go hungry. Philabundance aims to "harvest" the surplus food and use it to fight hunger. Since its inception in 1984, Philabundance has delivered over 30 million meals and its goal in 1998 is to collect enough food to provide over 6.2 million meals to needy residents.

On November 12, 1998, Philabundance opened a new Hunger Action Center that will enable the organization to effectively double its existing services to Delaware Valley residents in need. The Center's location is South Philadelphia's food distribution complex will allow greater access to the over 120 food-related manufacturers, wholesalers, brokers and shippers in that area. The Center is also within a 20-minute drive of 80 percent of the delivery sites. The Hunger Action Center will provide cold storage capability, allowing Philabundance to accept large perishable food donations. The Center will also allow for expansion of the inner City Nutrition Project, which combines nutrition education with food distributions to benefit low-income young mothers.

**Phoenix:**

- Community gardening
- Produce Bag Program - distributed on Fridays at Murphy School District of Kids to take home to have food over the weekend.
- Coop Good Buying Programs - FoodCARE, Care Club, Help Yourself, FSH - stretch food money or stamps 45-50 percent
- School breakfast and lunch
- Summer Food Programs
- AZ Gleaning Project rescued 36 million pounds of food last year for food banks.

**Portland:** Oregon Food Bank's Community Basket: a cross between a brown bag program and a food buying club, CB members purchase a monthly newsletter subscription ($15 per year) and receive a bonus grab bag of donated food. Members must be low income and are responsible for running the food distribution. The newsletter "Basket Weaving" contains articles by members, and focuses on linking members with our community programs and educational information relating to living on a limited budget. After two years: 5 sites, reaching 900 households per month. Oregon
Food Bank's harvest Share Program: Collects wholesome yet unsaleable produce from wholesale distributors for distribution to member agencies. Agencies use the produce in their programs and 15 "free produce markets" are held each month for low income households. In its second year: 1.5 million pounds of produce were distributed to over 100 agencies in the Portland area.

**Providence:** More than 55 percent of our state's low-income residents live in the City of Providence. In order to assist our clients with a variety of services we have an "umbrella of sites/services". Approximately 1.6 million dollars per year is provided through the city's CDBG Award process to local nonprofit agencies with anti-poverty programs. Many of these agencies are neighborhood-based making them easily accessible to our clients. The City's local CAP oversees the CDBG Human Service Grants. The CAP's position easily enables it to coordinate citywide efforts.

**Salt Lake City:** Utahns Against Hunger is a statewide private non-profit organization which provides training on food programs for groups and individuals. Pre-screens food stamp applicants, provides information and assistance to low-income people on nutritional programs, rights and benefits and acts as an advocate on food issues. Each year they sponsor Share The Harvest, where citizens can donate excess garden produce to others.

**San Antonio:** The Society of St. Vincent de Paul responds to hunger several ways: through emergency food pantries located throughout the community, a soup kitchen for homeless persons that provided three meals a day, and nutrition sites for elderly persons. The network of Catholic churches involved in these efforts ensures that the maximum number of people in the community receive the necessary food.

**Seattle:** The following project describes an exemplary partnership effort between the business community and the emergency food program:

The Produce for the People Project began as a demonstration program that works with produce wholesalers to distribute/recycle unsaleable produce to neighborhood food banks (first phase). The Project is a program of Food Lifeline, one of three distribution programs for the emergency food programs in the City of Seattle. The response from the wholesalers has been very positive that it is common for food programs to receive, top, market quality produce. The Project has been very successful in that the Project has distributed over 151,000 pounds of commodities in its first five months of operation, beginning December 1997. In 1999, the Project expects to phase in all the food banks and begin working with meal programs in the City of Seattle.

**St. Louis:** We are nominating Operation Food Search as an exemplary organization in the St. Louis area which utilizes a "Best Practices" approach to helping alleviate hunger.

The organization is a non-profit corporation founded in 1981 to help feed the hungry in the Greater St. Louis area. It is a grassroots organization distributing local food to local people who are hungry. "Lean" in staff, the organization utilizes hundreds of volunteers and a dedicated Board of Directors to spread "plenty" to hungry individuals in the St. Louis area.
In their last fiscal year, they distributed more than $13,000,000.00 of food from 900 food donors, supplying the average food pantry in the area approximately 4500 pounds of food per month-most of dispatched within the same day of receipt.

Other Best practices make it worthy of nomination:

Efficiency -- For every $1.00 spent on operations, the agency distributes more than $20.00 of food. The agency provides a 7 day/week, 24 hour per day Hunger Hotline through which the needy can find information on where to find food assistance as well as other kind of help. The voice mail system assisted 13,761 individuals during the last year.

Cleanliness and sanitation -- It is the first organization in the area to offer a ten hour training course for food distribution agencies that want to handle perishable food products. The course is given at no cost to the agency and is required of all newly applying Operation Food Search Agencies.

Community partnership - they work with LOCAL retailers, distributors, brokers, restaurants, caterers, hospitals, and cafeterias to alleviate hunger in the LOCAL area.

It is an agency we are proud to recommend for special recognition.

**St. Paul:** A) We have an expanded "Produce Project" which delivers perishable goods to smaller communities located more than 75 miles distance from St. Paul. This improves the nutrition of the low-income residents in those communities.

B) Mise-En-Place: (A Community Kitchen Initiative) is a free 20-hour culinary Jobs Training Program. It teaches food preparation skills and useful job skills.

**Trenton:** T.A.S.K. and weekend feeding done through local churches and Loaves & Fishes. This is NOT a city program.
## City Data on Hunger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percent Increase in Demand for Emergencv Food</th>
<th>Percent Increase in Families’ Demand for Emergencv Food</th>
<th>Percent Requesting Emergency Food Assistance as Members of Families with Children</th>
<th>Level of Resources</th>
<th>Food Assistance Provide Adequate Quantity of Food</th>
<th>Nutritionally Balanced Food</th>
<th>Are People Being Turned Away</th>
<th>Percent of Need Unmet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homelessness

The Problem

Emergency Shelter Requests

Seventy-two percent (21) of the survey cities report an increase in requests for emergency shelter during the last year. Five cities -- Nashville, New Orleans, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, and Santa Monica -- report that the number of requests for emergency shelter remained the same during the last year. Three cities--Alexandria, Norfolk, and St. Paul -- report that the number of requests for shelter declined during the last year.

Across the survey cities, the average increase was 11 percent. The percentage of increase requests ranged from 9 percent in Burlington, 23 percent in San Antonio, 20 percent in Detroit, 15 percent in Cleveland and in Denver, 5 percent in Chicago, and one percent in Boston.

Among the comments from the city officials on the number of people requesting emergency shelter:

Alexandria: The City of Alexandria has four year-round emergency shelters with a total of 227 beds. During the cold weather months from November through March, a winter shelter plan is implemented to provide emergency overnight beds for hard-to-serve residents. The winter plan provides approximately 60 additional emergency overnight beds in order to reduce the health risks associated with exposure to the elements.

To gauge demand, "a request for shelter" is defined as the number of new persons sheltered in year-round facilities and the winter plan during the last year. This is not an unduplicated count, since persons may be sheltered by more than one facility or use the winter plan and a year-round facility.

During 1996-97, the four year-round shelters served a total of 1,507 persons. Last year the same facilities admitted a total of 1,545 persons. The number of unduplicated persons served through the winter shelter plan decreased from 602 in the winter of 1996-97 to 540 persons last year, the winter of 1996-97. Overall, the City experienced a minimal decrease of 1 percent or 24 requests for shelter for both year-round and winter plan placements, from 2,109 requests in 1996-97 to 2,085 requests last year.

Boston: We continue to see incremental increases every year. The City has already put overflow beds on to meet the demand for this winter. The Federal McKinney Homeless Assistance that we have received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development has enabled us to move
thousands of people out of shelter and into jobs and housing. Without these resources, the demand for emergency shelter would be much higher.

**Burlington:** BES (Burlington Emergency Shelter): We have seen a 10 percent increase in the number of people.

**Charleston:** The majority of small shelters are reporting a 10 percent increase in requests for shelter while the large shelter in the community is reporting a 5 percent decrease.

**Charlotte:** Unaccompanied men with limited job skills comprise most of increase in those seeking shelter.

**Chicago:** The response is reflective of information received through the City of Chicago, Department of Human Services 24-hour Emergency Services Communication Center.

**Denver:** The city’s strong economy has caused landlords to raise rents at alarming rates. As a result, there are more people who are working but poor. More are being evicted and more are either in cheap motels or homeless.

**Detroit:** During the 1996-97 season, the DHS Warming Center serviced 17,648 clients. During the 1997-98 season the center served 22,104 clients or 4,456 more clients. There was a considerable increase in women and children served.

**Kansas City:** The Hotline for the Homeless operated by City Union Mission, is the primary source of information. One of their primary goals is to link homeless persons with area shelter providers. According to the data collected by their office in 1997 they had 13,724 persons that requested assistance. In 1998 that number indicated a marginal increase to 14,826. (These are unduplicated figures.)

**Louisville:** In Louisville & Jefferson County in 1997, the homeless shelter system provided shelter & services to 11,106 persons as follows: Single Men - 6,584 - 59 percent; Single Women - 1,306 - 12 percent; Young on their own - 821 - 7 percent; Men with children - 83 - 1 percent; Women with children - 895 - 8 percent; and Children in families - 1,417 - 13 percent.

**Miami:** Welfare reform The increased need for primary care for those with substance abuse problems and mental illness.

**Nashville:** Most agencies have seen the same number. However, the Salvation Army's shelter is operating at overcapacity (sleeping people on the floor rather than putting them out), and still turning people away. Nashville CARES has seen an increase of 10 percent in the number of homeless people it serves, and estimates that 75 percent of them are consistently or repetitively homeless.
New Orleans: There has been a shift in the composition of the homeless population: there are fewer single men and increasing numbers of single women and female headed families. While the overall number of homeless remains steady, needs have changed due to the above mentioned demographic shift. It is anticipated that the number of families will continue to increase due to welfare reform.

Norfolk: Data are based upon the Division of Social Services' information July, 1997 through June, 1998. Data for the entire City are not available.

Philadelphia: There were 27,968 reception/intake requests during FY97 which increased to 31,691 in FY98. The Office of Emergency Shelter and Services (OESS) has not had to implement restrictions on entrance to shelter this year, as was necessary in the summers of 1996 and 1997.

Phoenix: In 1996, the winter low-demand shelter served 2,400 people. In 1997, the same program served 3,500 people.

Portland: On one day in March 1997, when the semi-annual statewide "One Night Shelter Count" was conducted, 2600 people were sheltered or turned away from shelter. For the same survey conducted in March 1998, 2652 people were sheltered or turned away. (These numbers include single individuals and those in families.)

Salt Lake City: Waiting list data indicate an increase in the number of men (1996/97 average is 27; 1997/98 average is 37). There was no significant change in the number of women and families. (Average 1997/98 number: 10 women and 28 families).

San Antonio: Agencies that were surveyed indicate that the number of people requesting emergency shelter increased as a result of welfare reform, public housing renovation projects, the extensive Section 8 waiting lists, the zero-tolerance rule at public housing, domestic violence.

Seattle: The One Night Street count as well as annual reports from city-funded emergency shelter programs indicate an increase in the number of people requesting emergency shelter. With increased numbers of women and families with children in need of emergency shelter, the Mayor provided an additional $500,000 this spring, with a commitment to continue this funding next year, to alleviate some of the urgent need.

St. Louis: The Welfare-to-Work initiative has contributed to the increase.

St. Paul: We have reduced the number of beds in our shelters and since requests for shelter are not counted, the number of shelter users has dropped.

Trenton: The number increased due to the New Work First New Jersey regulations which apply more time limits.
Emergency Shelter Requests by Families

Requests for emergency shelter by homeless with children increased in 64 percent (18) of the survey cities during the last year. Boston, Charleston, Louisville, Nashville, Salt Lake City and Santa Monica said the number of requests by homeless families remained the same during the year. In 11 percent of the cities, the number of requests declined during the last year.

Across the survey cities, the average increase in requests for emergency shelter by homeless families with children was 15 percent. The percentage of increased requests ranged from 35 percent in San Antonio, 30 percent in Phoenix, 20 percent in Cleveland, Minneapolis and Philadelphia, 15 percent in Denver, and two percent in Alexandria. The number of requests decreased by 31 percent in Norfolk, 19 percent in St. Paul, and two percent in Trenton.

Among the comments from the city officials on requests for shelter by homeless families with children:

Alexandria: The four year-round shelters admitted the same number (235) of new families with children in 1997-98 as they had admitted in 1996-97. The number of families with children served through the winter plan increased from 23 families with children in 1996-97 to 29 families with children in 1997-98. Overall, the number of families sheltered increased by 2 percent.

Boston: The number had decreased at the time of our homeless census, but since then the State has had to put additional family shelter beds on line. We are seeing an increasing number of working families becoming homeless. We are also concerned about the welfare reform time limits which are being implemented starting December 1, 1998.

Chicago: The response is reflective of information received through the City of Chicago, Department of Human Services' Monitoring and Reporting System. The Department requires the completion of reports for all City-funded services (service requests, referrals, and direct service provision). The information garnered, from these reports, facilitates the tracking of homeless services (as well as other program) trends.

Denver: High rents plus many instances of spousal abandonment have resulted in ever-increasing numbers of families seeking shelter.

Detroit: Large families in all lower-income categories have the highest percentage of housing problems. Overall improvement in the local economy has not led to significant gains in housing affordability for the poor. Obviously, homeless persons being at the bottom of the income scale, have extreme difficulty locating decent affordable permanent housing. Any increases in income are largely consumed in housing and utility costs.

Kansas City: Hotline for the Homeless documented 6,424 families in 1997 and 7,215 families in 1998 requested emergency shelter. They report that more people are homeless due to eviction, unsafe living conditions, drug and alcohol addictions, and poor decision-making.
Louisville: The number of beds available has remained the same in emergency shelters for families.

Miami: Welfare reform.

Nashville: During the year, the Salvation Army had 334 families call requesting transitional shelter, but could only accommodate 12-15 at a time.

New Orleans: As reported by the emergency shelter providers the number of families seeking shelter has increased in the year.

Norfolk: Data are based upon the Division of Social Services' information July, 1997 through June 1998. Data for the entire City are not available.

Philadelphia: At the end of October 1997, 1,399 family members were in shelters. At the end of October 1998, 1,689 family members were in shelters.

Phoenix: Information from emergency/transitional shelters report 25 percent to 30 percent increases in requests each month.

Portland: On one day in March 1997, when the semi-annual statewide "One Night Shelter Count" was conducted, 443 families were sheltered or turned away from shelter. For the same survey conducted in March 1998, 509 families were sheltered or turned away.

Salt Lake City: Waiting list data indicate an increase in the number of men (1996/97 average is 27; 1997/98 average is 37). There was no significant change in the number of women and families. (Average 1997/98 number: 10 women and 28 families).

San Antonio: The inadequate availability of Section 8 certificates and the demolition of public housing have impacted families drastically. Also, several programs have lost funding and therefore lack the resources to meet housing needs.

San Diego: There has been an increase in the number of families seeking emergency shelter. Their unmet need has resulted in expanding shelter overflow areas to avoid turning families away until beds become available.

Seattle: The One Night Street count as well as annual reports from city-funded emergency shelter programs indicate an increase in the number of people requesting emergency shelter. With increased numbers of women and families with children in need of emergency shelter, the Mayor provided an additional $500,000 this spring, with a commitment to continue this funding next year, to alleviate some of the urgent need.
St. Louis: The fastest-growing population of homeless are single women with children, due in large part to welfare reform but also due to violence and substance abuse.

St. Paul: St. Paul records and tallies the names of those in the shelters throughout the year. This information makes it possible to determine a hard count of unduplicated individuals.

Trenton: Data from (MCBSS).

The Length of Time People are Homeless

People remained homeless for an average of 10 months in the survey cities. The average length of time people remain homeless is 9 months in Boston, 2 in Burlington, 3 in Charleston, 9 in Chicago, 6 in Denver, 6 in Louisville, 12 in Norfolk, 6 in Philadelphia, 9 in San Antonio, 5 in San Diego, 18 in Santa Monica, 6 in St. Louis, 1 in St. Paul, and 8 in Trenton.

Fifty-four percent of the cities report that the length of time people are homeless increased. Forty-five percent of the cities report that the length of time people are homeless stayed the same during the last year. New Orleans reported a decrease.

Among the explanation of the city officials on the duration of homelessness:

Alexandria: In previous surveys, information on length of stay was available from one facility in the City, the Alexandria Community Shelter. This year data is available from all four year-round facilities and the emergency winter shelter. In 1996-97, the average length of stay for the Community Shelter was 34 days. This year, the length of stay at the four shelters and the winter shelter averages 35.5 days. The increase in minimal at 1.5 days. We have no reliable method for tracking the length of time non-sheltered homeless persons remain homeless.

Boston: The improving economy has resulted in landlords' being able to charge more for rent. The result has been that low-income people are being priced out of rental housing. Boston also has a large college student population that competes with residents for rental housing. The current vacancy rate in Boston is less than 2 percent. The State took away from the cities of Boston, Cambridge and Brookline the ability to control rents. This has also exacerbated rent levels in our City. Homeless individuals and families have to wait months, even a year, in a shelter until they can access affordable housing.

Burlington: Very limited affordable housing therefore difficult to find long term housing for homeless youth.

Charlotte: Charlotte Emergency Housing has had to increase the length of stay for their family guests who cannot find other appropriate housing.
Chicago: The provision of quality service, as well as the unchanging causes of homelessness, has acted in tandem to maintain the time indicated.

Cleveland: Increasing numbers of single men and women are becoming "permanent" residents of the shelter system. It is taking longer for families with children in shelters to find appropriate permanent or transitional housing. This is reducing availability of full-service emergency shelter and forcing more new families into overflow shelters.

Denver: Higher rents and large deposits have made housing out of reach for many.

Detroit: Individuals usually remain homeless longer than families. Again, the figure varies depending on individual circumstances.

Kansas City: The Hotline for the Homeless reported that people remain homeless longer due to a long waiting list for public housing and bad credit. Because this population does not have the resources to correct their credit problems, they remain homeless.

Louisville: A recent family survey indicated 6 months. Information on singles is not available at this time. Many families are involved in case management programs and housing locations which tend to extend their stays.

Miami: Most of the people being seen now suffer from chronic homelessness or have assumed a way of life which includes living with relatives or friends.

Nashville: Although the shelters accepting single men have not seen dramatic increases, family shelters note an increase. Nashville Family Shelter reports that because of the tight rental market for low-income families and resulting increase in move-in costs, along with the need for good credit history, the amount of time spent homeless by families has increased. Section 8 is not an option and Shelter Plus Care certificates are in short supply; therefore, public housing applicants can wait several months before units become available. This results in longer stays for the families in the shelters. Nashville has glut of minimum wage jobs, which increase reliance on and need for low-income housing. Nashville CARES also sees an increase, due to lack of available, affordable housing.

New Orleans: Additional outreach and transitional housing with supportive services has led to a decrease in the duration of individual episodes of homelessness.

Philadelphia: The number of people remaining in shelter for 180 days has increased. The lack of subsidized permanent housing (Section 8) has stopped movement out of shelter into transitional and eventually permanent housing.

Phoenix: Services and housing options have not increased to a level which would significantly impact the length of time people remain unhoused.
Salt Lake City: Served 2,102 households consisting of 2,456 persons, an 8 percent decrease because people are staying longer. Reasons include a focus on more intensive case management, high cost of housing, low-paying jobs.

San Antonio: Agencies surveyed indicate that the length of time people are homeless has increased due to public housing decreasing density and creating mixed-income housing programs, a dearth of affordable housing, and the fewer vacancies in transitional housing facilities as families lengthen the terms of their residency.

Santa Monica: Outreach teams are seeing more dual-diagnosed homeless people on the streets.

Seattle: With a very short supply of affordable permanent housing units (either subsidized or market rate), the length of stay has increased for people staying in emergency shelter and transitional housing. Not only is Seattle experiencing more homeless people, service providers report that the families seeking services have problems that are more intractable. These problems are major obstacles for stabilizing families rapidly.

St. Louis: Many families continue to live doubled up and/or in overcrowded conditions.

St. Paul: County policy limits the state of people in emergency shelter. Therefore, the length of stay remains constant.

Trenton: According to the Rescue Mission, based on their daily records people using their emergency shelter program are remaining longer. (Data also from TEDCO Volunteers of America and Catholic Charities).

The Population

Across the survey cities it is estimated that single men comprise 45 percent of the homeless population, families with children 38 percent, single women 14 percent and unaccompanied youth three percent. Seventy-five percent of the homeless families in the survey cities are headed by a single parent.

Survey city officials estimated that 49 percent of the population is African-American, 32 percent is white, 12 percent is Hispanic, four percent is Native-American and three percent is Asian.

It is estimated that persons considered mentally ill account for 24 percent of the homeless population in the survey cities; substance abusers account for 38 percent. Twenty-two percent of the homeless in the survey cities are employed in full- or part-time jobs. Twenty-two percent are veterans. Eight percent have AIDS or HIV-related illness.
Case Studies of Homeless Families and Individuals

The city officials were asked to describe the conditions faced by an actual homeless family or individual in their city. Following are brief case studies of homeless families and individuals:

Alexandria: Ms. Z, 24 years old, and her 4 month old daughter were admitted to a shelter as she could no longer reside with family or friends. She has never leased a home. Since reaching age 18 she has resided with friends and family members in the metropolitan area. Ms. Z has no employment history or income. Having only a 10th grade education, she lacks job skills, interviewing skills, and interpersonal skills. She also lacks the basic working attire and transportation funds for job-seeking. Ms. Z was provided clothing, transportation funds, and child care so that she could meet the case management service goal of obtaining employment. She diligently looked for work on a daily basis without success. She was approved for public assistance during her shelter stay. After over three months of job seeking Ms. Z obtained full-time seasonal employment earning $6.00 per hour. Ms. Z will have extreme difficulty obtaining market rate housing unless her earnings can be improved.

Boston: Bernice S. was a single mother with a 7 year old son. Bernice worked a night shift cleaning downtown office buildings. When Bernice's landlord raised her rent $200/month she quickly fell behind. When she went to the State's Department of Transitional Assistance and applied for emergency assistance so that she could enter a State-funded emergency shelter, she was told that she was over income and thereby not eligible for shelter. Bernice called the Mayor's office because she and her son had nowhere to go. The City used some HUD Emergency Shelter grant funding and through Travelers Aid put Bernice and her son in a hotel room until a (non-State funded) community room was available.

Charleston: Lela has been homeless on and off for quite some time now. She is only 19 and has had significant problems when trying to live independently. The police brought her back to a local shelter where she had stayed many times before and had been finally asked to leave. The staff finally agreed to give her one more chance with conditions. Lela had to agree to complete tasks given to her each day. She was assigned to help the shelter's bookkeeper and performed basic office tasks. She was on time everyday and worked well without complaining. She eventually found a job with a local fast food restaurant and was doing very well. On the eve of moving into her own apartment, Lela stopped going to work and lost her job. She is pregnant again and is back to square one.

Chicago: Mr. and Mrs. B. along with their three children enter the City's Shelter system in June of 1996. The family received shelter and supplemental social services for a period of 19 months. During that time, Mr. B. is currently receiving services at Hines Veterans Administration Hospital. Mrs. B. has obtained her GED and is enrolled at Malcolm X College. She is pursuing an
On February 27, 1998, the family purchased a home. The Chicago Department of Human Services assisted the family by providing a home start-up kit (dinnerware, flatware, cook ware, cleaning supplies and bathroom supplies) and bunk beds.

**Denver:** "Erin" has been homeless off and on for about nine years. Prior to his becoming homeless, Erin was an accomplished musician and had completed two years of college. Erin was an alcoholic who lost of series of jobs and many of his social ties to his addiction. He eventually became homeless. Erin joined A.A. and became sober. However, his inability to provide a recent work history has made it difficult for him to obtain a good job. Erin also struggles from severe depression. This has made it difficult for him to put his life back together. Erin is now receiving mental health care through CCH's Stout St. Clinic. He has become an active volunteer with several service providers and has consequently regained his self-esteem. Erin is now confident that he will be able to get off the streets.

**Kansas City:** John and Marie owned their own home and lived with four of their five children. The oldest child was living on his own. This family entered the homeless Continuum of Care when they showed up at Crossroads Emergency Shelter. John had a gambling addiction and they had lost their home. The family entered the strengths based case management program and began working on goals they set for themselves, i.e., housing and budget counseling. Both were still employed. After four weeks, they moved to a transitional shelter where they continued to work on the previous goals as well as parenting skills, life skills and counseling with Gamblers Anonymous. They set up a saving account and for five weeks seemed to be turning things around. Then John began to visit the boats again and within a week, the money that they had saved was gone. The case manager confronted Marie's tendency to enable John's unhealthy behavior. She made excuses for him and was working two jobs to support the family. Within a week, John moved to California. For the next two weeks, Marie tried to follow through on her goals. However, she gave into the stress of homelessness and single parenting and left the shelter to move in with her son.

Source: Mid-America Assistance Coalition.

**Louisville:** Originally from Louisville, this person had a successful position as a department head in a university in Ohio. A bout with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder landed him back in Louisville with family members. A crisis arose, symptoms of PTSD returned and he became homeless and even nameless to shelter staff for several months. Hospitalization resulted and following treatment he was told of the possibilities for disability benefits. An application was filed and approved. Since the person previously had a significant salary, benefits were sufficient to allow rental of an apartment on the resident's own.

**Miami:** A 28 year old male came to Miami from Maryland. He eventually became drug dependent. He was employed and able to maintain employment for two years, until his substance abuse began interfering with his work. Also, at this time he was using his income to get high and
was not paying his rent. He soon became homeless. The gentleman went to Camillus House for drug treatment. After 6 months he will go into transitional housing for 18 months and then move on to permanent housing.

**Nashville:** Chris and her three children came to the emergency shelter when continued emotional and some physical abuse by the husband became intolerable. Chris suffers from depression as well as diabetes. This combination of condition made it difficult for her to maintain employment and adequately supervise her children. The family was eligible for the Nashville Family Shelter's (HUD-funded) transitional housing program that targets those with chronic health problems, and entered the program after spending almost two months in the shelter. Chris has received counseling, budgeting, homemaking and employment-search coaching. After 10 months in the program, Chris and her children are moving into a Shelter Plus Care subsidized apartment.

Spencer is one of the harder-working and more serious visitors at the Campus. He grew up one of three children, with a twin brother and older sister. Spencer quit school after his junior year and started to work. He does not like the fact that he has used drugs, but his treatment has been successful.

Spencer is a thirty-nine year-old black male. He has never been married but has fathered one child, with a friend. Spencer stated that he never really had many problems growing up - his family was a middle-class, church-going family. Although his parents did separate when he was ten, it did not have a negative effect on the dynamics of the family. The children lived with the mother and made regular visits to see the father.

Spencer's recent treatment was his first. After several bouts with drugs and the street life, which started when he was 25, he decided it was getting harder with age. He states that keeping off drugs is easy for him if he stays away from his friends, because it was never really the drugs he wanted - it was the acceptance from his friends that came along with using.

Spencer has maintained work and maintained his sobriety for now. His case manager notes that Spencer's self-esteem as a person, not as a user, is extremely low. The case manager fears that his loneliness and possibly his inability to make friends may someday force him back to drugs and a street life he obviously does not care for.

**New Orleans:** A single mother is resident of the Catholic Archdiocese of New Orleans Barrone Street Transitional Housing Program. Recognizing both her ability and her skills, Mrs. X was hired as the full time receptionist/secretary at the facility which also houses Lindy's Place, a transitional program for single women. She has been employed for the past six months at minimum wage. At the beginning of December 1998, Mrs. X announced that she has been hired by a major health corporation at a substantially higher salary with benefits for herself and her son. Being part of the transitional housing program and working has allowed Mrs. X to establish a savings plan. Her intention is to move into permanent housing at the beginning of 1999 with an eye toward homeownership.
Norfolk: A shelter received a call from a pastor on the Eastern Shore of Virginia stating he had an individual en route to our area. This individual was in need of emergency shelter until he could find a job and permanent housing. The pastor had also communicated with a local contact to help this individual make good job connections. The shelter provided housing, laundry facilities, clothing and hygiene supplies to the man. During his stay here, the shelter worked with the local contact person and assisted with job counseling, bus tickets and bag lunches for job search. Once the man was employed, follow-up services included assistance with food and household goods.

Philadelphia: A single mother (DOB - 5-19-76) entered a shelter with two children. A third child lives in South Carolina with a grandparent. Ms. C. left her father's home one year ago when she was evicted "due to personal conflict..." Ms. C. then lived with an aunt until "the drug environment" became unbearably for her. The family's income was bi-weekly TANF ($158). She attends school two nights a week. She recently secured a job and now works 30-40 hours per week at $7.50 an hour. She has been in shelter since April 1998. Currently, she is requesting her savings of $1625 so that she can enter a rental property on November 16, 1998.

Portland: The first year-round shelter for homeless families has recently opened in Portland/Multnomah County. One resident family for the past 5 weeks consists of a mother and her 4 children ranging in age from 6 to 14. The woman left her husband due to domestic violence and is in the process of divorcing. A native of Oregon, she relocated from another community for safety reasons and to locate a community able to provide some resources for her and her family. She is suffering from severe depression and other undiagnosed psychological disorders. One expression of her psychological state is a severe lack of focus. Services to Children and Families (child protective services) is involved as a result of neighbors reporting her neglect and abuse of the children. She is having a hard time finding employment due to her lack of focus and other behaviors. She initially found housing when she left her husband but lost it because she let another homeless family move in. Needed now is counseling for her and family due to the abuse, neglect and domestic violence experienced by the mom and witnesses by the children. She is currently receiving welfare and has been excused from JOBS program due to psychological issues. However, they are threatening to sanction her grant if she doesn't promptly find a job. She has no previous work experience as her husband had good income and she was a stay-at-home mom. Her current goals are to find employment and to find temporary housing here in Portland until she can return to her community. She is proceeding with the divorce. They own two homes and she wants possession of one of them at which time she will relocate with her children.

Phoenix: Mr. and Mrs. L. and their four children lived with Mrs. L's parents for three weeks after Mr. L. lost his job. The family had to move from this situation because the landlord would not allow the L. family to reside in the grandparents' two-bedroom apartment. Mr. L. had not found employment yet, so the family had no resource to obtain other housing. Mrs. L. called all of the family emergency shelters in the County. All were full. The L. family lived in their car for seven days until they found an agency with funds to help them pay for a hotel/motel. The children in the family did not attend school during the time the family lived in their car. Mr. L. eventually found employment and the family accessed a transitional shelter two months after losing their housing.
San Antonio: Jane is a seventeen year old parent with a 16 month old daughter referred by her caseworker. Jane's biological parents are deceased and her elderly grandmother lives in another country. She has been in state foster care for four years, she completed high school shortly after giving birth, and her child's father is not involved in any way. Previous placements could not accommodate a teen parent with a baby. There was no reason for the state to take custody of the baby, but the mother needed a stable residence so that she and her daughter can continue to higher education and manumission. She has been at Seton Home for about four months, her baby is thriving and she is registered for spring classes as San Antonio College and has secured part-time employment.

Seattle: This homeless family consisting of a mother, father, and four children had been evicted from a local shelter due to the father's refusal to comply with the shelter rules. The family was housed for one night by the Community Service Officers (the social service arm of the Seattle Police Department) and referred to Travelers Aid. This family had recently returned to the Seattle area and were without resources. They had a very unstable housing history because of the father's bipolar disorder, impulsive and assaultive behavior, chemical dependency and associated legal problems. The family was provided with a voucher for emergency shelter, crisis/marital counseling, a referral to a mental health and chemical dependency services, TANF Grant assistance, food voucher, transportation vouchers and an assessment for relocation. The mother also engaged in planning to address the underlying issues of homeless.

St. Louis: In the U.S., families are the fastest growing homeless group. And in St. Louis, up to 5,500 kids are living on the streets, in shelters, with relatives or friends, or in dangerous uninhabitable places. A typical example is Tommy. His father, Joe, a Native American Vietnam veteran, returned home in '73 with post traumatic stress disorder. He tried to adjust to normal family life, but after eight years, his illness led him to seek help elsewhere. Tommy was seven when his father left.

Through the years, Joe worked at odd jobs, bouncing from place to place, until he landed in a motel room in Cahokia, IL. By then, 14 year old Tommy had joined him. So everyday with Tommy in tow, Joe would go for treatment to Cochran VA Medical Center on Grand in St. Louis. Since Tommy couldn't get into a Belleville school because of lack of a permanent address, he hung around the VA everyday waiting for his father. The VA staff became concerned and called in St. Louis City Schools and Legal Services of Eastern Missouri. Together with Joe, they decided Long Middle School near Cochran would meet Tommy's best interest, allowing him to rejoin his father at the end of the day. So far, Tommy is still in school and doing well.

St. Paul: Jan is a single mom with 4 children in a third-rate motel which is under orders to close. In spite of a $1,400 a month income and a Section 8 certificate which was newly issued to her, she was unable to find a 3-bedroom that she can rent in the entire city. Part of the problem is the shortage of actual units to rent at any price. When she learned of the availability of the Section 8 program, she gave proper notice of intent to move. The she discovered the unpopularity of the Section 8 program among landlords and that her current landlord had rented her unit behind her.
She was forced to move to a motel room for $800/month as her only option. Last Monday the motel closed and she moved again with her Section 8 certificate having expired.

**Trenton:** This case consists of a mother aged 37 years and two children (daughter aged 13 and a son aged 16 years). Client was employed for 12 years before the company closed down. After her UIB ran out, client came into our agency requesting financial and housing assistance. Client was approved for $275 TANF and is receiving $200 in child assistance. Client's rent was $700 per month and was 2 months behind in rent. PSE&amp;G; was paid up as client was using her tax refund to pay that and rent. Landlord was contacted and rent was lowered and a TRA was initiated. TRA lasted 4 months and client found employment and self-sufficiency.

**Causes of Homelessness**

A number of diverse and complex factors have contributed to the problems of homelessness in the survey cities. Many of these factors are interrelated. Listed in order of frequency, the following causes were identified by the cities in response to an open-ended question: Substance abuse and lack of needed services, mental illness and the lack of needed services, low-paying jobs and other employment related problems, domestic violence, changes and cuts in public assistance programs, poverty and lack of access to affordable health care.

- **Lack of affordable housing** was identified as a major cause of homelessness in 23 cities: Alexandria, Boston, Burlington, Charlotte, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Kansas City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Santa Monica, Seattle, St. Louis, St. Paul and Trenton.

- **Substance abuse and the lack of needed services** were identified by 19 cities as a primary cause of homelessness: Alexandria, Boston, Burlington, Charleston, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Miami, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Diego, St. Louis and Trenton.

- **Mental illness and the lack of needed services** were identified by 17 cities as one of the main causes of homelessness: Alexandria, Boston, Burlington, Charleston, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Louisville, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Diego, Santa Monica, St. Louis and Trenton.

- **Low-paying jobs** were identified by 16 cities as a primary cause of homelessness: Alexandria, Boston, Charlotte, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland, Salt Lake City, Santa Monica, Seattle, and St. Louis.
• **Domestic violence** was identified by 14 cities as a primary cause of homelessness: Alexandria, Burlington, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Louisville, Nashville, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, Santa Monica, Seattle, and St. Louis.

• **Changes and cuts in public assistance programs** were identified by seven cities as a cause of homelessness: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, New Orleans, Philadelphia, St. Paul and Trenton.

• **Poverty** was also identified by eight cities as a main cause of homelessness: Alexandria, Charleston, Charlotte, Louisville, Miami, Phoenix, San Antonio and Santa Monica.

• **Lack of access to affordable health care** was identified by four cities as a cause of homelessness: Boston, Nashville, Phoenix and Seattle.

## Services for Homeless People

### Emergency Shelter Beds for Homeless People

Across the survey cities, the overall number of emergency shelter beds for homeless people is estimated to have remained approximately the same last year. The number of emergency beds increased in 43 percent of the survey cities -- Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, and Trenton. Three cities - - Detroit, Nashville, San Diego decreased. They remained the same in 52 percent of the survey cities.

Across the survey cities, the overall number of emergency shelter beds specifically for homeless families increased by 10 percent during the last year. The number of emergency shelter beds specifically for homeless families increased in seven cities: Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, San Antonio. They decreased in Kansas City, Nashville, and St. Louis and remained the same in the rest of the survey cities.

### Transitional Housing Units

The number of transitional housing units increased overall by an average of 11 percent across the survey cities during the last year. Sixty-one percent of the cities (17) registered an increase in transitional housing units: Alexandria, Boston, Charlotte, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, Philadelphia, San Antonio, San Francisco, Santa Monica, and St. Louis. San Diego saw a decrease in transitional housing units last year.
The number of transitional housing units specifically for homeless families increased overall by an average of 17 percent during the last year. Forty-two percent (11) of the survey cities registered an increase in the number of transitional housing units specifically for homeless families during the last year: Alexandria, Charlotte, Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Philadelphia and St. Louis.

**Single Room Occupancy Units**

Single room occupancy units increased by an average of seven percent across the survey cities during the last year. Five cities (24 percent) reported an increase in the number of SRO units: Boston, Cleveland, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Trenton. Chicago, Detroit, Louisville and Miami reported a decrease in the number of SRO units. The remaining survey cities reported that the number of SRO units remained the same during the last year.

**Family Break-Up-A Requisite for Shelter**

In 53 percent (16) of the cities, homeless families may have to break up in order to be accommodated in emergency shelters. Among the city officials’ explanations for families having to break up in order to be sheltered:

**Alexandria:** Shelters do not separate or break up family units. In the rare occurrence that a family of 5 or more members is sheltered, the family members may need to use more than one room. However, they remain in the same wing of the same facility.

**Boston:** Most shelters for families do not accommodate men. Since only 3 percent of the families have two parents they can usually be accommodated by the shelter that do take men. Occasionally, though rarely, a parent may have to stay at a single adult shelter because they cannot stay in the family shelter.

**Burlington:** Sometimes kids would be housed by grandparents, ex-spouses/boyfriends or friends for a number of reasons, no room is not the biggest reason for this, but can be.

**Charlotte:** Not all two parent families can be accommodated without breaking up.

**Chicago:** The Chicago Department of Human Services makes every effort to accommodate two-parent families. The Department has placed priority on funding such shelter programs. Two-parent families are referred to programs which house clients in apartment settings and/or unique single building (compound) structures.

**Cleveland:** There are only limited shelter units available for intact families. Husband, wife and children must split up if these are full. Male children over the age of 12 cannot stay with their mothers in Women's shelters.
Denver: Not usually.

Detroit: Nature of Warming Center facility accommodations and for security reasons.

Kansas City: According to the Hotline for the Homeless, there continues to be difficulty in locating enough emergency shelter space for homeless families. If couples with children are not married, they almost always have to split up. Families with older teen boys often have to be split up.

Louisville: Families may stay together in two shelters. But in other shelters families are separated.


Nashville: Families are often forced to break up in order to receive shelter. The largest shelter for families in Nashville asks fathers to sleep in a mission approximately 2 miles away from where the family is sheltered. Another family shelter (now closed) did not take boys over the age of ten, or grown men. Of the remaining two shelters, one does accept men and older boys; the other takes mothers, fathers and minor children only. Available beds at these two shelters are limited.

New Orleans: The emergency shelters and some of the transitional housing facilities are not able to accommodate adolescent males due to the physical layout of their facilities. UNITY continues to contract with YMCA to provide emergency shelter to these families. Additionally, two transitional service providers now have programs that can accommodate these families, both intact and single parent.

Norfolk: Some shelters keep the family together as a unit while others allow family members of the same sex to stay together. If there is a mother with a son and the son is over a certain age (7 in some cases, 12 in others), he is not allowed to share a room with his mother but must stay in an all-male ward in the same facility.

Philadelphia: On occasion, the adult male parent may have to be placed in another shelter, separate from his family for a period of one to seven nights until a shelter unit is obtained where the entire family is placed together. Since the majority of homeless families consisting of single females with children are housed in congregate settings, the City continues to identify and set aside temporary shelter resources for adult male parents, two parent families, and families with teenage boys.

Phoenix: Some shelters are unable to accommodate families with male children over eleven years old. Male and female couples without children are usually placed in separate sleeping areas.

Portland: In general, homeless families can remain together in shelters and transitional housing. But, there are exceptions. A heterosexual couple without children is housed in shelter as a single man and a single woman. In domestic violence shelters and domestic violence transitional housing
generally no boys over age 11 are able to be housed. This means that some women have the young men stay elsewhere while they are in shelter, or that some families don't enter domestic violence shelters.

**Salt Lake City:** Sometimes Travelers Aid Society operates the only shelter that will admit fathers and boys over 10 years old. Couples without children are placed at Men's and Women's shelters.

**San Antonio:** Agencies surveyed indicate that in many cases families have to break up in order to be accommodated in emergency shelters for the following reasons: some shelters are gender-specific, have age restrictions for boys, and have men housed separately.

**San Diego:** On occasion husband/wives may be separated due to program structure.

**San Francisco:** All city funded shelters accept both male and female parents. Families are only referred to shelters that can accommodate their family size.

**Santa Monica:** Most of the emergency shelter beds are for single adults. Families usually go to shelters in nearby cities. Some families live in vehicles or other substandard housing.

**Seattle:** Sometimes teenagers in families go to youth shelters when family shelters are full due to lack of capacity or that the program does not accept teenage males in their program.

**St. Louis:** Due to shelter capacity, concerns of privacy and domestic violence, shelters do not accept males over age 13.

**St. Paul:** A partnership that considers itself a family, but where one member is not related to the child, will find the unrelated member sent to a separate shelter.

**Trenton:** According to MCBSS, generally families do not have to be separated. However, on occasion when there is an adult male or older adolescent, the family would have to be separated to be accommodated in a shelter.

**Limitations on the Use of Shelter Facilities/Alternatives During the Day**

**Officials in 50 percent (15) of the survey cities report that homeless families may have to leave shelters in which they are staying during the day.** The rest of the survey cities homeless families do not have to leave shelters in which they are staying during the day. Among the city official’s comments on the necessity of leaving shelters and where homeless people go during the day:

**Alexandria:** The emergency shelters employ a case management service delivery system. Homeless families are required to participate in service planning designed to promote
self-sufficiency. Residents are required to be out of the shelter during daytime hours to pursue their individual service goals (e.g., working, seeking employment, attending job training, pursuing educational opportunities, securing child care, applying for income maintenance programs, receiving mental health, and/or substance abuse counseling and treatment, conducting a housing search, etc.). Families/residents may remain in the shelter during the day for extenuating circumstances (infant care, illness, etc.).

**Chicago:** Families residing in Transitional and Second Stage shelters are not required to leave during the day. They are encouraged to look for jobs, permanent housing, to apply for entitlement or job training programs and/or obtain various supportive services.

Additionally, the Chicago Department of Human Services is in the process of merging overnight shelter facilities with day-time supportive services. The resulting action is the transformation of overnight shelters into 24-hour facilities which provide a complement of social services.

**Cleveland:** Most shelters close for part of each day. Overflow shelters are only open at night. Adults go to seek apartments, jobs, etc., or participate in substance abuse sessions. Children go to school. Day shelters provide a variety of daytime services. Single persons go to meal sites at various locations near downtown.

**Denver:** Most shelters require this so people go to day shelters, day labor, libraries, or sell newspapers - or hang out in the streets.

**Detroit:** The DHS Warming Center is not a "shelter" facility, it is a warming center which operates between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. During severe weather conditions the center remains open during the day.

**Kansas City:** Most shelters in the Kansas City area require that the consumers leave the shelter during the day. This presents a problem for those homeless persons who are working during the day and just need a place to rest until they return to work in the evening. The Homeless Services Center, provides limited daytime services for the homeless such as shower, laundry facilities, and mail services. However, they are not allowed to stay the entire day unless they are receiving services from their case manager.

**Louisville:** Only one shelter requires families to leave.

**Nashville:** Three of the four family shelters provide shelter for only 12 hours during the evenings. During the day, children are to be in school; parents need to look for employment, go to work, attend GED/training classes, look for housing, apply for benefits, etc. The Nashville Family Shelter stays open on weekend days, when volunteers can be found. Some family members from this shelter stay during weekdays at a nearby community center. Homeless families must seek day shelter wherever they can find it. There are a few day shelters in the city. However, they are
frequented by many single men who may intimidate homeless families. Some return to the streets; others go to job interviews or seek other social services.

**New Orleans:** The Multi Service Center for the Homeless, Brookhaven Homes, Bridge House Drop In Center and the Ciaccio Center all provide day time programming and services for homeless persons and families. However, since many emergency shelters require payment some families are forced to spend the day seeking vouchers or other resources to pay for their next stay.

**Portland:** This varies depending on the particular shelter. One family shelter recently opened and is available to the families 24 hours per day. Other family shelters, that are not domestic violence shelters, are vacated during the day. Some of those programs also operate or refer to day shelter programs. Some homeless families do not have a place to go during the days.

**Phoenix:** Adults must seek employment, apply for benefits, work, or attend training. Children must be with their parents, in child care programs, or in school. Exceptions are made for the elderly, disabled, or ill people.

**San Antonio:** The rules of the shelter determines whether a family leaves the shelter during the day. Most shelters do not have these rules, but the one that does asks families to leave so they may secure housing, employment and other necessary assistance to move to permanent housing.

**San Diego:** The City sponsors a Winter Shelter Program for families and it is open 24 hours a day. Other programs may require job search or other activities during the day as a condition of staying in private shelters. Some programs may not have staffing to allow facility to remain open on a 24-hour period.

**San Francisco:** Under most circumstances, families are allowed to stay in shelters during the day. The city also has a day center for families.

**Santa Monica:** Homeless families work full- or part-time during the day, attending job-training or educational classes, or seek work opportunities.

**Seattle:** Many families are participating in work or TANF requirements looking desperately for permanent housing and childcare.

**St. Louis:** Shelters aimed at men and/or the mentally ill may require participants to leave during the day. Families are required to attend school and participate in other support services during the day.

**Trenton:** The families engage in housing and employment searches, school or work activities.
Funding

During the last year 90 percent (27) of the survey cities reporting using city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support homeless services efforts. Approximately $359,132,757 was used by the survey cities for homeless services during the last year. Locally generated revenues accounted for 23 percent of these funds, state grants for 15 percent, McKinney Homeless Assistance funds for 30 percent, the Community Development Block Grant for 19 percent, the Community Services Block Grant for one percent and other federal funds or sources for 12 percent.

Cities that used **locally generated funds** to support homeless services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>4,350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>128,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>54,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>5,434,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>469,965.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>723,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>73,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>14,161,651.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>52,086.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,519,908.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1,294,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>3,217,061.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>775,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities that used **state grants** to support homeless services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>34,185,054.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>322,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>4,208,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>12,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>12,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>12,023,653.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>81,748.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cities that used **McKinney Act funds** to support homeless services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>15,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cities that used **Community Development Block Grant funds** to support homeless services:

Boston .................................. 2,224,067.00  
Burlington ................................ 8,400.00  
Chicago .................................. 1,600,000.00  
Cleveland .................................. 114,745.00  
Detroit .................................. 461,864.00  
Minneapolis ............................. 1,400,000.00  
Nashville ................................ 71,934.00  
Philadelphia ............................ 3,012,009.00  
Phoenix .................................. 1,750,600.00  
Salt Lake City ............................ 273,177.00  
San Diego .................................. 375,751.00  
Santa Monica ............................. 245,100.00  
Seattle .................................. 4,595,082.00  
St. Louis .................................. 630,000.00

Cities that used **Community Services Block Grant funds** to support homeless services:

Boston .................................. 450,000.00  
Chicago .................................. 315,000.00  
Denver .................................. 328,800.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>77,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>166,855.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>77,637.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unmet Need

Estimated Requests by All Homeless People for Emergency Shelter which Go Unmet

An average, 26 percent of shelter requests by homeless people are estimated to have gone unmet during the last year across the survey cities. Estimates of unmet requests range from 65 percent in San Diego, 43 percent in Kansas City, 40 percent in Minneapolis, 30 percent in Santa Monica, and 2 percent in St. Louis.

Among the comments from the city officials on requests by all homeless people for emergency shelter which go unmet:

**Alexandria:** Although turn-away data is available, it does not accurately reflect unmet need. Some persons seeking shelter are turned away because of persistent behavioral problems in the facilities. In addition, staff attempting placements will make multiple calls to the shelters resulting in overstating the need.

**Burlington:** All people requesting shelter at the Waystation were given shelter in 1998. We often are forced to go over capacity in the winter.

**Charlotte:** The year round shelter for men turn always an average of 80 men per month except during winter months when there are added resources. The shelters for women and children have adopted a not turn away rate.

**Denver:** Thirty percent are turned away from shelters due to lack of space. Most of these people are referred to Social Services for motel vouchers.

**Detroit:** Individuals who are known to shelters via behavioral problems and other infractions are usually "red tagged". Being difficult to transition, they are usually placed in SROs.

**Kansas City:** The Hotline for the Homeless was the primary source of information for this question. Of the 10,810 unduplicated requests for assistance, 5,935 requests went unmet. The reasons are varied.

**Louisville:** The increase in the total number of the homeless population is more than the shelter system can support. There are slightly over 2,000 beds to serve over 11,000 people.

**New Orleans:** The average length of stay has increased from 6 to 8 weeks. Emergency shelter providers keep neither waiting lists nor phone logs, but report a 10 percent increase in the number of requests for both shelter and information.
Philadelphia: There are a significant number of individuals suffering from mental illness, substance addiction or a dual diagnosis who do not seek or have difficulty succeeding in shelter. These clients must express motivation to comply with shelter rules and treatment. Many elect to stay on the streets or feel that they have no option but to stay on the streets. The initiative described in Question 13 is designed to engage these individuals.

Phoenix: There are 3,300 shelter beds for 6,000-8,000 homeless people each night.

Portland: Of those requesting shelter on March 25, 1998, 24 percent were refused shelter for lack of capacity. This does not include those who never sought shelter on that day.

Salt Lake City: The only method available to measure unmet need is the shelter waiting list and as long as the person or family calls in daily to keep their name on the list, that person/family will eventually be in shelter. Averages are men - 48, women - 10, families 28.

San Antonio: This percentage is an average based on estimates from surveyed shelters. The increase in demand exceeds the rate shelters can provide bedspace.

San Diego: It is assumed that there are 6,500 homeless in San Diego and 2,266 can be accommodated in shelters thus leaving an unmet need of 4,234 or 65%.

St. Louis: Our continuum of care assists us in being acutely responsive to the needs of the homeless and those at-risk of homelessness.

St. Paul: Beds for single men were reduced for administrative reasons by our largest provider of shelter for men. This led to overflow-shelter options filing up and turning away people requesting floor space in all but the coldest weather.

Trenton: The number of requests for emergency shelter has exceeded the number of beds available. Also come housing needs to unmet due to the new Work First New Jersey welfare regulations.

An average of 30 percent of the shelter requests by homeless families are estimated to have gone unmet during the last year in the survey cities. Estimates of unmet family requests range from 88 percent in Nashville, 55 percent in Kansas City, 52 percent in Phoenix, 20 percent in Santa Monica to four percent in St. Paul.

Among the comments from the city officials on requests for emergency shelter specifically by homeless families which go unmet:

Boston: The State does not track the families that they deny shelter access. We are unable to estimate this number.
**Burlington:** In 1998, 225 families requested shelter. Only 49 were able to be accommodated. WHBW: 26%

**Charleston:** There are enough empty shelter beds to accommodate all requests for shelter.

**Charlotte:** Many families still seek shelter in doubled up situations with family or friends.

**Chicago:** The Chicago Department of Human Services has established an emergency shelter back-up system which maintains 500 standby beds. If shelters, which participate in the clearinghouse system, reach maximum capacity the emergency shelter back-up system is automatically activated. To date, this has never occurred.

**Denver:** Thirty percent are turned away from shelters due to lack of space. Most of these people are referred to Social Services for motel vouchers.

**Detroit:** Families are given priority consideration for placement and extensive follow-up via FIA, Dept. of Human Services and other agencies necessary to assist the family to assimilate into the mainstream.

**Kansas City:** According to the Hotline for the Homeless, there is an increase in the number of homeless families in the summer months versus the winter months.

**Louisville:** One (1) family is able to remain at the shelter while four (4) must be turned back to the streets.

**Nashville:** This estimate is based on informal shelter estimates, and those who requested housing but were turned away due to lack of shelter beds. For example, during a three-month period at the Nashville Family Shelter, three were 72 different families with children requesting shelter. Of this number, 9 eventually entered the shelter.

**New Orleans:** The increase is based on reports from family service providers. Other agencies report increases in requests for service from families. Finding shelter is particularly difficult for large families or those with older adolescent male children.

**Norfolk:** During the period of July 1997 through June 1998, 2,500 persons were turned away from family shelters in our City.

**Philadelphia:** OESS is able to house most families. We urge and assist those who can utilize other resources, even on a temporary basis, to do so.

**Phoenix:** There are 877 emergency shelter beds for 1,800 people in families with children.
**Portland:** Of those requesting shelter on March 25, 1998, 27 percent were refused shelter for lack of capacity. This does not include those who never sought shelter on that day.

**Salt Lake City:** There is an average of 28 families at any given time on the waiting list at Salt Lake Community Shelter and Self Sufficiency Center. The waiting time may be as long as 4-6 weeks.

**San Antonio:** This percentage is an average based on estimates from surveyed shelters. The increase in demand exceeds the rate shelters can provide beds.

**San Diego:** Although requests for services exceed resources, to our knowledge no family is refused services even if it means accommodating families in lobby of shelter providers. It is assumed that there are 1,050 family members who are homeless and 658 can be accommodated in shelters thus leaving an un-met need of 392 or 37%.

**Seattle:** Again, we don't know the answer to this. According to the Community Information Line, we have experienced a 5% increase in the number of callers (homeless families) requesting emergency shelter. (1,264 callers during August/September 1998 compared to the 1,206 during August/September 1997).

**St. Louis:** When a family has severely violated shelter rules, they may be declined entry, yet most are given a second chance at a later time.

**St. Paul:** Our family overflow "church basement system" was required to double the months of service in order to accommodate the demand.

**People Turned Away From Shelters**

In **67 percent (20)** of the cities emergency shelter may have to turn away homeless families due to a lack of resources. Among the comments from the city officials on emergency shelters having to turn away homeless families in need because of lack of resources:

**Alexandria:** The four year-round emergency shelters reported accepting 1,547 new persons last year while turning away 391 persons. This is the first year that each year-round shelter has recorded turn-away data. Neither the number of persons served nor the number of person turned away is an unduplicated account. There are situations when persons may not be able to obtain shelter space. However, families and caseworkers have other shelter options. The staff will contact all shelter in the city for available space. If no beds are available in the city, they may place a homeless person/family in a shelter in a neighboring jurisdiction for brief period of time under a regional policy developed by Northern Virginia Human Services Officials. In addition, homeless families or individuals may be housed in a motel for a short period of time with discretionary funds or charitable contributions.
**Boston:** The State Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA) controls access to family shelter. Each year the eligibility requirements have been narrowed. There are strict income eligibility requirements which make working families who become homeless ineligible for State funded shelter. If a family of 3 makes more than $6.00/hr and they are burnt out of their apartment they are not eligible for shelter. The City has used Emergency Shelter Grant and McKinney money to create emergency shelter beds to assist this growing population.

**Burlington:** Yes, sometimes the shelter is full, we cannot accept more with children. The homeless shelter providers in Chittenden County work together to solve problems of homelessness in our area. COVEO has agreed to assist families who have been turned away from WHBW because of lack of capacity.

**Charlotte:** The year round shelter have greater demand than can be met. Seasonal shelters help address unmet needs during the coldest months.

**Chicago:** The City of Chicago operates not only a 24-hour emergency care system but also operates a 24-hour communication center that acts as a clearinghouse for shelters that are full or have empty beds. Any shelter (or homeless person) can call the communication center to receive or make referrals. In addition, the City employs staff who consist of mobile assessment teams which provide on site counseling, referrals (including family and friends), placement and/or transportation.

**Cleveland:** Regular shelters routinely turn away families because of lack of space. An overflow shelter in a church basement assures that no families are without shelter.

**Denver:** The city housed people [who were] turned away from shelters in motels for a total of 8,971 nights in 1997. Forty-eight percent of these were families. This number has increased significantly during 1998.

**Detroit:** DHS Warming Center does not turn away anyone. Those homeless individuals who cannot be accommodated in shelters are usually temporarily placed in SROs.

**Kansas City:** No system is currently in place to track what happens to homeless families that cannot be accommodated by the shelters. Hotline for the Homeless reported that they were unable to provide space for 5,935 of 10,810 families who sought shelter.

**Louisville:** The need for shelter requested is more than the system can hold. There are no available federal funds for more emergency housing and not enough transitional or affordable housing.

**Miami:** Alternative emergency shelter placements are utilized, e.g. other shelters and motels.
**Minneapolis:** Hennepin County refers clients to private shelters and provide voucher assistance for local motel use, safe waiting is also available.

**Nashville:** Yes, constantly. Shelter capacity has not increased this year, and one facility offering shelter/transitional housing has closed down. During the winter, additional families can be accommodated at the Room in the Inn program. Several small family shelters would expand if they had the resources. When they don't find shelter, families either leave Nashville, sleep in cars, camp out, sleep in a cheap motel, or double up with family or friends.

**New Orleans:** Emergency shelters continue to report increasing numbers of families requesting services. Shelters are turning families away due to lack of resources. Shelter staff continues to refer these families to other resources.

**Norfolk:** Demand exceeds available resources. Some families turned away may be accommodated by another shelter provider. Some will continue to live in cars or on the street while others may be housed for a night in motels.

**Philadelphia:** For the beginning of FY99, OESS has expanded bed capacity to meet demand; however, we are approaching the maximum physical and fiscal capacity of the system and anticipate that by the end of the year some demand may go unmet.

**Phoenix:** From April through mid November families unable to obtain shelter are placed on waiting lists and remain unhoused. From mid-November through mid-March, the City of Phoenix operates a winter overflow program. Families with children receive hotel/motel vouchers. Casework, job development, and other support services are provided. Approximately 461 families are served in this program each year.

**Portland:** Families that are turned away from shelter resort to a number of different circumstances. Some stay in cars. Some sleep outside, either hidden in the city, or camping in one of the national forests or other parks. Some move in temporarily with other people (doubled up). Domestic violence survivors also employ these strategies. However, some of them return to the abuser for a lack of anywhere else to stay.

**Salt Lake City:** Families are placed on a waiting list on a first-come, first-served basis, with an average waiting time of 4-6 weeks. During cold months families are housed at a separate temporary site until space is available at Salt Lake Community Shelter and Self Sufficiency Center.

**San Antonio:** Agencies surveyed indicated that they turn away families on a regular basis. Those families who are turned away sleep in cars, parks and under bridges. They also stay with other family or friends in doubled and tripled up capacities, usually in substandard housing. This is a quick solution that does not resolve the families' homelessness as they cannot receive the support they need to move to housing and are forced to wait until shelter space is available.
San Diego: To our knowledge no families are turned away. They are accommodated in overflow areas such as lobby of private shelters, etc.

San Francisco: Families are either housed temporarily in hotels or they are referred to shelters in neighboring cities.

Santa Monica: Most homeless families go to shelters in nearby cities.

Seattle: There continues to be an alarming trend occurring where families cannot access emergency shelter, transitional housing or permanent housing. They sleep in cars, in parks, double up with other families or sleep in places not fit for human beings to sleep. This past year the Somali Community Center has provided space on the floor for families with no other place to go.

St. Paul: Those who are turned away, are not tracked. Twenty-two percent (22 percent) of the family turn-aways are turned away for lack of space. Typical survey answers indicate they double up, accept charity from strangers, sleep in cars, abandoned building, or out of doors.

Trenton: They are placed in transitional housing or motels.

In 67 percent of the survey cities, emergency shelters may have to turn away homeless people other than families because of a lack of resources.

Boston: The City and State provide resources to put additional beds on line when there is increased demand during the colder individuals.

Burlington: 176 families were referred elsewhere because we did not have the resources here to shelter them.

Charlotte: Some turned away because there is no "wet" shelter except during winter months. One shelter has converted beds for singles to beds for families needing longer shelter stays.

Chicago: The City of Chicago operates not only a 24-hour emergency care system but also operates a 24-hour communication center that acts as a clearinghouse for shelters that are full or have empty beds. Any shelter (or homeless person) can call the communication center to receive or make referrals. In addition, the City employs staff who consist of mobile assessment teams which provide on site counseling, referrals (including family and friends), placement and/or transportation.

Despite the system which has been established to safeguard against such occurrences, some shelters do turn away clients because of a lack of resources. Some shelters are not equipped physically or financially to deal with the homeless mentally ill, who are acting out, or people under the influences of mind-altering substances. However, some of these individuals are accommodated at detox centers. While others are referred to hospitals or to the Police Department, who in turn contact the Chicago Department of Human Services for placement assistance.
Cleveland: There are limited regular shelter beds for single men. Overflow shelters are opened in an effort to assure that everyone has a place to sleep.

Denver: Again, we have had to turn to motels as shelters do not have enough room to house women or men requiring respite care. In 1997, 39 percent of those housed in motels were single adults; 13 percent were adult couples.

Detroit: The telephone hotline, 963-STAY and 1-800-SHELTER works feverishly each and every night to facilitate placements as shelters fill. Very seldom is anyone turned away because of lack of resources. Placements are coordinated via several shelters to SROs.

Kansas City: According to the Hotline for the Homeless, usually the reason single people with no children are unable to access shelter is because of conflicting work schedules. Many of the clients work the third shift. Currently there is no shelter that will accommodate clients during the day. Many of the clients have been banned from the area shelter due to aggressive behavior.

Louisville: Single women are a growing population and there is not enough shelter space to accommodate the growth. Women’s facilities are population-specific - i.e., recovery, mental illness, etc.

Miami: When the shelters reach their capacity, the families or individuals are assigned to an outreach team that will provide them with alternative shelter placement.

Minneapolis: Catholic Charities and Hennepin County offer safe waiting areas for homeless when shelter use is unavailable or not accepted.

Nashville: The local Salvation Army has to turn away an average of 90 homeless men each month, due to the shelter being full. Several area shelters could expand if resources were available. During the winter, the Room in the Inn program provides shelter for an average of 200 homeless individuals, at churches and synagogues. During this time, the local Rescue Mission sees no decrease in the number of its guests. Homeless people who do not obtain shelter may sleep outdoors, in abandoned houses/buildings, in motels, in cars, double up with family or friends.

Due to lack of bed space, the Room in the Inn program averages 10-20 turnaways per night.

New Orleans: Currently there is insufficient capacity to meet the demand for both day and night shelters.

Norfolk: The demand for shelter exceeds available resources. Individuals and families continue to live in cars or on the street. Some limited funds are available to purchase shelter in hotels/motels.

Phoenix: During mid-March through mid-November, single people who can't access shelters remain unhoused. From mid-November through mid-March, the City of Phoenix partners with
United Methodist Outreach Ministries to operate a Winter Overflow Shelter Program for 350 single men and 40 single women each night. This nighttime shelter also offers casework, job development, primary healthcare, mental health services, and clothing. Approximately 3,500 people are served through this program each year.

**Portland:** Families that are turned away from shelter resort to a number of different circumstances. Some stay in cars. Some sleep outside, either hidden in the city, or camping in one of the national forests or other parks. Some move in temporarily with other people (doubled up). Domestic violence survivors also employ these strategies. However, some of them return to the abuser for a lack of anywhere else to stay.

**Salt Lake City:** During cold winter months all agencies helping the homeless collaborate and devise strategies to provide additional shelter. During 1998/99 and the next two years thereafter, community emergency winter housing will be sited in Midvale Utah a community 12 miles from Salt Lake City. They will be provided with emergency shelter, access to food, medical care, case management and other resources.

**San Antonio:** Agencies surveyed indicate that they turn away families on a regular basis. Those families who are turned away sleep in cars, parks, and under bridges. They also stay with other family or friends in doubled and tripled up capacities, usually in substandard housing. This is a quick solution that does not resolve the families homelessness as the cannot receive the support they need to move to housing and are forced to wait until shelter space is available.

**San Diego:** Not all single adults requesting services can be accommodated.

**Santa Monica:** Many put their names on waiting list for local shelters. Some stay at shelters in nearby cities until bedspace becomes available locally.

**Seattle:** The annual one-night Street Count that took place on October 23, 1998, revealed approximately 800 individuals sleeping under roadways, in vehicles, on benches, and in alleys, doorways, and parks.

**St. Louis:** Most persons with persistent mental illness may be referred to mental health organizations. Others, such as veterans are generally referred to the VA. Homeless persons may also be assisted at the Empowerment Center and church-based organizations.

**St. Paul:** Those who are turned away, are not tracked. Typical survey answers indicate they double up, accept charity from strangers, sleep in cars, abandoned building, or out of doors.

**Trenton:** The City of Trenton has a comprehensive winterization plan that provides additional shelter for homeless adults after the emergency shelter is full. Homeless families are placed in motels.
Exemplary Programs

Among the comments from the city officials on an exemplary program or effort underway which prevents or responds to the problems of homelessness:

**Boston:** Transitions to Work Collaborative was funded by the City using HUD McKinney resources. It is a collaborative between family shelters and the Job Training Alliance. The program was Mayor Menino's number one priority for funding to assist homeless families facing the welfare reform time limits.

Women in shelter are provided access to educational and job training programs. The goal is to help women have the tools and skills necessary to acquire jobs that will provide a living wage when their two year time limit comes up.

Clean Corners, Bright Hopes was also funded by the City using HUD McKinney resources, Mayor Menino was able to raise additional resources for Clean Corners, Bright Hopes by asking the Boston Red Sox to support this program. The program provides homeless single adults with on the job training. There are many homeless single men and women who are not disabled but do not have the skills necessary to get jobs. This job helps them with counseling and economic literacy. It also teaches them what employers want in a worker -- a good attitude and reliability. This program has helped many adults get permanent employment and housing.

**Burlington:** COTS Streetwork Program is a social service program located in COTS Daystation. The program is closely linked with the Homeless HealthCare Project, which provides primary medical care, maternal and child health care, dental care, vocational counseling, basic education, and substance abuse counseling. In 1997, we served 700 persons through the Streetwork Program.

WHBW provides many supportive services to women once they leave shelter and establish permanent housing. Our goal is to help them maintain their housing.

**Charleston:** The Humanities Foundation is a private non-profit organization which began a program called Shelter Net just a few short years ago. Shelter Net provides funds to individuals and families in an effort to prevent them from becoming homeless. Shelter Net will help a client catch up on back rent to avoid eviction, or they will help a currently homeless family or individual with the startup money needed to move into an apartment. They have also been known to help with other needs such as funds for limited daycare, medication and furniture, to name a few. The money to start the Shelter Net program was raised by one person who went around banging on the doors of companies with some pretty deep pockets. The Humanities Foundation is also responsible for creating projects that have built affordable apartments for the working poor and people with special needs.
Chicago: The City of Chicago's continuum-of-care concept offers a holistic approach to homelessness, providing a network of services to strengthen the safety net and address the many factors that can cause homelessness, including poverty, mental illness, lack of job skills, etc. These services are essential in building the long-range skills that enable the individual to achieve his or her potential.

Additionally, the Chicago Department of Human Service is in the process of implementing several new initiatives which will further complement the existing continuum of care. The indicated initiatives will include but are not limited to: the establishment of a family assessment center, the merging of supportive service centers and overnight shelter facilities into full day (24-hour) program, the creation of mentoring programs for homeless and/or formerly homeless persons, the creation of linkages with City Colleges to promote educational activities among the homeless and the placement of homeless individuals into vacant Chicago Housing Authority apartments.

Cleveland: The Cleveland/Cuyahoga County Office of Homeless Services was formed to coordinate local homeless assistance activities and facilitate the creation of a continuum of services approach incorporating prevention, outreach, emergency shelter, transitional housing and permanent housing with supportive services. The Office of Homeless Services has worked to identify gaps in the homeless services system and to develop resources to fill those gaps. Much of its work has been on established supportive housing options designed to allow long-term homeless persons to obtain and keep permanent housing. The Horizons for the Homeless program has enabled 400 homeless families, that have successfully completed a transitional housing program, to obtain affordable permanent housing with follow-up case management. Over 670 homeless persons with mental illness, substance abuse problems or AIDS have received permanent housing linked to services through the Shelter Plus Care Program.

Denver: The state of Colorado has had a voluntary tax check-off program for the prevention of homelessness for the last seven years. Denver is one of the beneficiaries of this program through various community based organizations.

Detroit: The close partnership between the City of Detroit and the Detroit/Wayne County Homeless Network is a coalition of over 230 organizations which advocate for and provide shelter, housing and services to homeless individuals and families in the Metropolitan Detroit area. The membership of the network represents government, service providers, advocacy organizations, homeless and formerly homeless individuals and concerned citizens. Various committees of the network meet throughout the year to review continuum-of-care plans in light of the ever changing reality of homelessness and the inventory of services available to address the needs of this population.

Kansas City: In the past year, the Homeless Services Coalition of Greater Kansas City (HSC) accepted the challenge to become the "lead agency" for Kansas City's Continuum of Care a HUD driven model for communities to coordinate their responses to homelessness. To more effectively address the ongoing needs of homeless people in the Kansas City area, HSC recently engaged in a
strategic planning process. As a result, the coalition consisting of more than 30 homeless service providers and government agencies, developed a comprehensive and coordinated five-year plan. The plan is to develop the Coalition into an organization that: 1) is clearly recognized in the community as a leading voice for homeless issues; 2) facilitates a more effective program and service delivery system for the homeless; and 3) enhances community awareness and participation in breaking the cycle of homelessness.

**Louisville:** The 1998 Louisville/Jefferson County Continuum of Care Plan (The Plan), developed by the Louisville/Jefferson County Coalition for the Homeless, in partnership with the City of Louisville and Jefferson County Community Development in 1994, is the collaborative effort of government agencies, the shelter providers, and supportive service agencies committed to ending the plight of more than 11,000 homeless individuals and families in the area. The mission, goals, and action steps of the 1998 Plan are discussed with shelter staff and service providers at various weekly committee meetings, monthly Coalition board meetings, and at Resident Issues Forums. Updating the 1998 Plan is an ongoing process with meetings scheduled throughout the year to review, coordinate, and assess the comprehensive and integrated services offered in the areas of prevention, outreach, intake, assessment, emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent housing, and service-enriched permanent housing. The Coalition conducted its annual Needs Survey; the results were presented to the community in a public forum and analyzed gaps in the delivery of service were scrutinized and rated. New and renewal projects meeting those gaps were reviewed and evaluated.

**Miami:** The Community Partnership for the Homeless and the opening of it's additional center in the Southern area.

**Nashville:** Shelter Plus Care, a HUD-funded program, has brought to Nashville critical rent subsidies for homeless people with three targeted disabilities: chronic mental illness; chronic addiction; and/or AIDS. This provides to agencies the access they need to affordable housing for the homeless people they work with, while holding the agencies responsible for providing necessary support services to assure that the people can remain stable and maintain independent living.

**New Orleans:** April 21st marked the opening of a new transitional housing for families and unaccompanied women in a beautifully renovated former elementary school at the corner of First and Baronne Streets in the central city. Built in 1879, this 30,000 square foot building now provides housing and supportive services for up to 18 families (including intact families, single parent male headed households, and families with teenage boys.) Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New Orleans operates this program on the second floor. Lindy's Place provided transitional housing and supportive services for 36 unaccompanied women, occupying the third floor. Both agencies share space on the ground floor, working in a true collaboration to provide quality, cost effective services. The building was renovated by First Commerce Community Development Corporation in partnership with UNITY housing and Chevron. The Freeport Foundation provided $1.25 million for this project.
Norfolk: Last year the Mayor appointed a Task Force on Homelessness which was comprised of community leaders, homeless providers, non-profits, the faith community, business leaders, the academic community and homeless persons. The Task Force Report presented this fall made the following recommendations:

1. The creation of an advisory committee to look at issues of homelessness on an ongoing basis.
2. Support regional responses to homelessness.
3. The implementation of a public education program about homelessness.

Philadelphia: In response to a recently passed Sidewalk Behavior Ordinance which restricts sitting, lying and soliciting funds on the sidewalks of Philadelphia, the City has begun an initiative to engage and assist those individuals who have traditionally been resistant to seeking shelter, living instead on the streets. The number of mental health and substance addiction outreach teams working on the streets has been doubled. A new model in which the outreach teams also function as case managers has been adopted. Teams are assigned to specific clients and are responsible for establishing a relationship with the client while he or she is on the street that continues even as the client moves into a residential placement. All outreach activity will be coordinated through the non-profit Outreach Coordination Center where a new management information system to improve client tracking will be installed.

Several new residential facilities that are specifically designed for this population have been developed. These relatively small (25-person) facilities are low demand. Also, additional supported independent living capacity is being added to the end of the services continuum which will free up entry-level openings within the current mental health and drug treatment residential systems.

A mobile behavioral health assessment team and a group of set-aside beds with specialized behavioral health supports have been added to the City shelter system. Also a day program has been established for walk-in and short term clients at the City's largest shelter for males. Finally, the police, who will be responsible for enforcing the new legislation, are being trained in conjunction with the outreach teams.

Phoenix: Another Chance is a new program which targets housing and supportive services to 120 alcohol and/or drug abusing single homeless people in downtown Phoenix. Participants receive up to 4 months of intensive outpatient alcohol/drug abuse treatment. Housing options provided through the program include transitional, bridge, and scattered site permanent supportive housing. Case management is provided through a five-phase model of survival, interim, transitional, stabilization and follow-up.

San Antonio: San Antonio's Continuum of Care continues to identify gaps in services for homeless families and individuals. This collaboration of homeless service providers has successfully secured federal funding to address the myriad of issues homeless persons face as well as increase the amount of affordable housing. The Continuum strengthens its ability to combat
homelessness by creating linkages between homeless service providers and mainstream service providers outside the community. The San Antonio Area Homeless Action Coalition is a grassroots organization designed to address the needs of the homeless by bringing attention to homeless issues in a forum that includes a diverse membership, ranging from social workers to government officials. The Coalition educates the public through various publications and programs designed to bolster awareness regarding homelessness.

**Santa Monica:** The Santa Monica Police Department maintains a four-person unit, known as the Homeless Liaison Program (HLP) team, who provide outreach to the homeless, link them up with community resources, as well as provide social service interventions when businesses or residents have problems or concerns with homeless people in their neighborhoods.

**Seattle:** Since 1994, the City of Seattle has coordinated a Continuum of Care (C of C) system with King County to ensure a regional approach to homelessness. A cornerstone is the partnership between our governments and the Seattle-King County Coalition for the Homeless with strong community participation of the C of C is a foundation for city and county budgets; joint application for McKinney funds; distribution of CDBG, ESG and City of Seattle funds; and development of both consolidated plans ranging from prevention efforts, street outreach and emergency shelter to long-term support services and permanent affordable housing, the C of C system allows homeless people to move from street or shelters into permanent housing and to receive the support they need to eliminate or maintain the underlying causes of their homelessness. Our region's C of C will be jeopardized by an inability to renew prior projects and flat or reduced funding.

**St. Louis:** The St. Patrick Center Employment Services Building Employment Skills for Tomorrow (BEST) work training program is a supportive services program which boosts self-esteem and facilitates the integration of homeless persons back into the community through job development, job readiness, job placement and follow-up. It is directed toward homeless individuals who reside in the City of St. Louis and those homeless individuals with a history of chemical dependency and/or mental illness. See attached "Monthly Activity Report".

**St. Paul:** St. Paul Housing Inspectors, when called to a unit without basic facilities such as electricity, water, heat, activate a special "House Calls" team to work with the occupants and to restore the basic services and thereby avoid a building condemnation with the subsequent "vacation of the building."

**Trenton:** DCA has 80 slots available for temporary rental assistance for three year period for TANF clients who come off of assistance due to employment. This is only for the months of October, November and December. However, if they qualified it is a benefit to assist clients in maintaining their housing while they adapt to employment and hopefully achieve increased salary over the three-year period.
The Impact of Federal Policy and Funding

The survey cities reported that the Federal Government’s Continuum of Care policy has made a difference in their community’s effort to address homelessness. Among the city officials explanations on the effectiveness on the Continuum of Care Policy:

**Alexandria:** Alexandria has taken steps in the last year and one-half to formalize the process through a standing committee of public and private sector providers. Prior to that, Alexandria provided each of the continuum services: from outreach, to emergency shelter, transitional, supportive and permanent housing through an informal network of public and private service network.

**Kansas City:** The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Continuum of Care policy has made it necessary that communities work together to address homelessness. In Kansas City, the Homeless Services Coalition, Inc. is the agency responsible for the development of the Continuum of Care. The coalition is an association of sixty-four membership organization representing non-profit and governmental agencies, who provide variety of services and assistance to the homeless in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The coalition meets monthly to network, share information and plan.

The Homeless Services Coalition, Inc. has been providing services to the homeless population since 1982. In 1997 the coalition was identified as the organization to initiate and implement the Continuum of Care strategies. The Continuum of Care, as such, has generated a community wide commitment to better managing and allocating resources. (Refer to the Coordinated Strategy to Prevent Homelessness.)

**Los Angeles:** The Continuum of Care policy has been the impetus of community-wide planning and coordination of homeless programs. The federal support of a coordinated, local response to homelessness strengthens the efforts of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority to foster local, community-based planning and collaborating efforts. The success of this approach is evident in the number and diversity of programs funded to meet the increasingly complex needs of homeless persons. The Continuum of Care has, over the years, has also spawned increasing interest among smaller local government agencies in better coordination of programs for homeless persons.

**Minneapolis:** Federal Continuum of Care policy has made a difference in addressing homelessness in the City of Minneapolis and Hennepin County in that it has reinforced the existing multi-jurisdictional framework that works to gauge needs, identify gaps in service delivery, and provide leverage in a coordinated manner.

Since 1990, the Hennepin County/City of Minneapolis Homelessness Implementation Task Force has been meeting to build a comprehensive network of housing and services for homeless adults, families, and youth. The Task Force meets monthly to coordinate funding projects to help
maintain and enhance the Continuum of Care. The combined leverage component that this group provides allows projects multiple consideration in a large number of funding sources including private funds, State, local, and other entitlement funds such as Emergency Shelter Grant. As a result of this partnership, over one thousand units of transitional, supportive and permanent housing have been created. Collaboration between the non-profit housing development community and social service providers has allowed for a more streamlined and better-focused range of housing units and companion services.

**Nashville:** The process has forced local providers to prioritize proposed projects each year; it has helped the service community approach the problems of homeless people in a more cohesive fashion. The separate homeless programs of HUD (Supportive Housing Program, Shelter Plus Care, SRO, etc.) are now looked at as components that can fill gaps along a continuum, and employed by Nashville in an increasingly interconnected way. The application process seems more unified, and is simpler and more streamlined than the “old days” of applying for different programs at different times of the year.

**Norfolk, VA:** The Continuum of Care was developed by the Norfolk Homeless Consortium (a group comprised of homeless service providers, potential providers, non-profits, government representatives and the faith community.) The Consortium worked to blend many different philosophies and approaches into a strategy to continue closing gaps in services to homeless citizens of our city. This cooperative effort was instrumental in the awarding of $1.5 million dollars of Supportive Housing Grants to non-profit agencies serving the homeless.

**Phoenix:** The policy has made a positive difference in the following ways:

- The coordination of many efforts to fill gaps in the Continuum of Care in Maricopa County, in response to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) policy, is accomplished by the Maricopa Association of Government’s Homeless Task Force. This group consists of City Council representatives from Paradise Valley, Tempe, Phoenix, and Mesa. It also includes representatives from the Arizona Department of Economic Security, Glendale Community Council, City of Phoenix Human Services Department, human service staff from Maricopa County and the City of Phoenix, Area Agency on Aging, Avondale Community Action Program, the Regional Behavioral Health Entity, the University of Phoenix, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans Administration, AIDS Housing Task Force and twenty-five non-profit agencies working with or advocating for homeless people.

Since 1997, the Task Force has update the Maricopa County plan for addressing homelessness, discussed responsibility for housing and services for the Seriously Mentally Ill, development of specific actions to address the needs of homeless women forced to flee their homes because of domestic violence, and participated in development of applications for two rounds of Continuum of Care funding.
• More local governments are working cooperatively in addressing the needs of homeless people in Maricopa County because of the HUD policy. During the last round of Continuum of Care, representatives from the following governments participated in analyzing gaps in the Continuum of Care or reviewed and ranked Continuum of Care projects in priority order: Mesa, Tempe, Chandler, Phoenix, Avondale, Glendale, Scottsdale, Wickenburg, State of Arizona, and Maricopa County.

During the last round of Continuum of Care, these governments were joined by a wide range of non-profit agencies, coalitions, and the general public. Participants included representatives from the Valley of the Sun United Way, Morrison Institute at Arizona State University, Phoenix Consortium to End Homelessness, Northwest Coalition for the Homeless, Phoenix Consortium to End Homelessness, Northwest Coalition for the Homeless, Maricopa Association of Governments, Corporation for Supportive Housing, Executive Directors Council, housing developers, Corporation for National Service, Tempe Community Council, Arizona Public Service, private citizens, and the Wickenburg Community Action Program.

• The positive aspects of working together as a result of the HUD policy includes efforts to coordinate the administrative activities of local and state governments in planning and contracting for assistance to homeless people. The City of Mesa, City of Phoenix, Maricopa County, and Arizona Department of Economic Security are developing common monitoring tools and procedures, collaboration in joint on-site reviews, development of standard outcome measures, and utilization of consistent service specifications in contracts for housing and services.

St. Paul: The federal Continuum of Care policy has helped local government identify gaps in the service structure and create programs to respond to the needs. Notably we have a program that teaches people how to search for housing and how to get around town using public transportation. It has helped keep the stays of families in our shelter is relatively short.

The survey cities reported that the increase in HUD funding to address homelessness has resulted in more homeless families and individuals accessing transitional and permanent housing and reaching self-sufficiency in their cities. Among the city officials explanations on the impact of HUD funding:

Alexandria: Two years ago, a local transitional provider received a large, multi-year supportive housing award from HUD which resulted in 12 - 15 additional families impacted by Virginia’s welfare reform program accessing transitional housing.

Kansas City: As a result of receiving our first Supportive Housing Program grant in 1995, we were able to increase the number of transitional housing units in Kansas City. During the 1997 Continuum of Care application process a Gaps Analysis was conducted and concluded that
transitional housing for families was a “high priority.” Permanent housing for individuals and families also represents a large unmet need. No new projects were funded in the 1997 Continuum of Care application and only three of the four renewal projects were funded. The project that was not funded is one of the most successful transitional housing programs in Kansas City. We have been able to maintain those units due to an increase in other HUD funding.

The following are stories about participants who successfully completed a Supportive Housing Transitional Housing Program in Kansas City.

- Participant enrolled in Devry and is scheduled to graduate in February 1999. He is no longer on TANF and is employed 30 hours a week at $7.00 an hour. The participant also does motivational speaking and has received his minister’s license.

- Participant completed RN school is and is now working as a RN making over $40,000 a year. She has purchased a new car and is in the process of buying her own home.

- Participant quadrupled her income is not a Bilingual Customer Sales Representative for Sony. She now serves on the agency’s board as a formerly homeless person.

- Participant is employed at the Kansas City AIDS foundation making $20,000 a year. Her income has doubled since the beginning of the program. She is no longer receiving TANF.

- Participants completed training as a medical transcriptionist. She purchased a computer and is now working from her home making $8.50 an hour. She no longer has to pay for childcare, and receives $600 a month child support. She has also purchased a van.

Los Angeles: More individuals and families are being served through this system. In the City of Los Angeles, more than 800 beds have been added since 1995. Programs providing other services, such as job development and placement, have also expanded and been replicated in various parts of the city. HUD funding, first through the Homeless Initiative, and now with SHP funding, has enabled Los Angeles to develop Access Centers as a point of entry into the system of services for homeless individuals and families. From the Access Centers, homeless persons can enter into drug treatment or recovery programs, job training, and housing placement programs with associated case management. As the system has developed, it has been easier for agencies to help clients make the transition from homelessness back into permanent housing and provide the additional service necessary to preventing recurrent homelessness.

Minneapolis: HUD funding has played a major part in assisting Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis in addressing homelessness. The funding that HUD provides allows projects greater leveraging power which in turn result in projects being completed in greater frequency at a much more efficient rate. With more projects coming on-line sooner, the needs of homeless adults, families, and youth are met more efficiently. Furthermore, the importance of federal dollars in the
funding of service providers who provide companion services with units is key to transitioning homeless persons through the Continuum of Care system to self-sufficiency.

For example, the Spectrum Homeless Project provides permanent supportive housing for 20 single adults with serious mental illness. Spectrum leases units in a number of different buildings that are made available to low-income adults with mental illness and provides support services to residents to assist them in developing independent living skills.

**Nashville:** More agencies in Nashville have received awards of funding via HUD homeless programs; naturally, this has translated into increases in the number of homeless people receiving necessary support services and accessing housing. As an example, in 1997, awards to the city totaled over $2,765,000. Funds provided three-year renewal funding to two successful transitional housing programs for homeless families which will serve a total of 607 people during the program term. Another program for recovering female addicts was funded to assist 112 women and children; The Salvation Army got funds to develop a transportation system for homeless families staying at shelters throughout Nashville - this program will serve 150 children. Finally, MDHA (Nashville’s public housing agency) received a Shelter Plus Care grant that will provide affordable rental housing to 44 homeless people with disabilities and their family members.

**Norfolk:** A woman made a promise to herself that by the age of 40 she would own her own home. She is well on her way to this goal, for she has now earned her way into a home ownership program of a local homeless center. Over six years ago, she entered the Center’s programs. She was a former substance abuser who had lived in 25 foster homes before the age of 15. She had several addiction and emotional problems. She started the program three times, each time short lived. Finally, at the fourth try, she faced several legal problems and lost custody of her two children. This last time worked. That was three years ago. She regained custody of her two children. She went through all of the Center's steps, and is the first client to complete every step. The Center's crisis shelter program was the first step, funded in part through HUD ESG programs. She and her children then entered the Center's second step at a transitional housing program funded by HUD's SHP. Just recently, she moved into the Center's supportive housing and home ownership program. This is also funded by HUD SHP funds. This June, she celebrated being drug-free for three years and has held a job for almost three years - the longest she has ever held a job in her life. Her children are equally successful. Both children are progressing in school and participating in extracurricular activities. The mother celebrated her 40th birthday recently.

**Phoenix:** The HUD funding has allowed our community to more fully address the needs of homeless individuals and families:

- The increased funding will have an increase in the number of families accessing transitional permanent housing through the current construction of two 8-Plexes (a total of 24 bedrooms) for use as transitional housing for larger homeless families; 20 units of
transitional housing for young mothers and their children; and, ten units of transitional housing for families recovering from substance abuse.

However, funding was also used to save housing stock (HUD $1/year homes) previously used as transitional housing for families. In 1996, twenty-seven of these homes were purchased so they could remain in the Continuum of Care inventory. In 1997, three additional HUD $1/year homes were also purchased, saving them for transitional housing programs for families.

- The increased HUD funding has allowed the development of a county-wide tracking system for recording housing and services provided to homeless people and the implementation of on-line information about emergency shelter and transitional housing bed availability. This information can be accessed through 1-800 or local telephone numbers at a call center or on-line through modem connection to a data base maintained by the City of Phoenix Human Services Department.

- Much of the HUD funding has been used to renew projects previously funded. These include 24 permanent supportive housing units for the Seriously Mentally Ill, nine leased apartments for transitional housing for victims of domestic violence, 45 beds of transitional housing for women and children, and has allowed the continuation of a child care program to support a transitional housing program for families.

- HUD funding has also been used to increase permanent supportive housing for disabled homeless people in Maricopa County: 24 units for single people recovering from substance abuse, 25 units for single people with HIV/AIDS, sixty permanent housing vouchers for single people recovering from substance abuse, and ten units for families recovering from substance abuse.

- The HUD funding has allowed the community to fill a critically unmet need to assist homeless and runaway youth in our community: 37 units of transitional housing for young homeless people and implementation of an outreach and drop-in center for youth.

- Additional services have been added to the Continuum of Care in Maricopa County because of the HUD funding: intensive case management for chronically homeless families, intensive case management for homeless people with HIV/AIDS, and intensive case management and behavioral health services targeted for alcohol and drug abusing homeless people in downtown Phoenix.

**St. Paul:** Increased funding has not expanded the number of transitional shelter beds in the city and as such the access remains constant. The funding has not expanded permanent housing options either. The main problem is the housing shortage. Our vacancy rate is less than 1%. Our job market has higher paid workers competing for the same space formerly rented to lower income families. The higher level of funding has been more than absorbed by the higher rental cost.
of leveling the playing field for the recently homeless person. Unfortunately, the construction of apartment buildings that serve the needs of the working poor and those at risk of homelessness are at a virtual standstill. So in fact, the number of homeless reaching self sufficiency in a stable housing setting is expected to decline. The recent increase in funding has amounted to little more than a drop in the bucket of Saint Paul Housing need.
## City Data on Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percent Increase in Requests for Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Percent Increase in Requests by Families for Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Shelter Beds</th>
<th>Transitional Housing Units</th>
<th>Family Break-up for Shelter?</th>
<th>Family Leave During Day</th>
<th>Unmet Families?</th>
<th>Percentage Need Unmet</th>
<th>Turn Away?</th>
<th>Turn Others Away?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Composition of the Homeless Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Mentally Ill</th>
<th>Substance Abusers</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
<th>Single Parent Families</th>
<th>Family Members who are Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Shelter Beds, Transitional Housing Units, SRO Housing in the Survey Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Shelter Beds</th>
<th>Family Shelter Beds</th>
<th>Transitional Units</th>
<th>Family Transitional Units</th>
<th>Single Room Occupancy Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2519</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing

Assisted Housing Requests

During the last year requests for assisted housing by low income families and individuals increased in 74 percent of the survey cities, and remained the same in six cities -- Burlington, Charleston, Chicago, Louisville, San Diego, Trenton. Among the city officials comments on the number of requests for assisted housing:

**Alexandria:** The local public housing authority last opened the waiting list for Section 8 (all bedroom sizes) for a two week period in July 1997. During this time-frame, the public housing authority received a total of 1,246 applications. The public housing authority does not anticipate opening the Section 8 list again before January 1999. The waiting list for public housing units opened in February 1998 and remained opened for two months. That waiting list has been closed since April 1998. The only waiting list that remains open is for the elderly (62 and over) and the disabled (55 and over). The waiting list for public housing, Section 8 housing, and elderly housing is currently at 1,800 appellations, a four percent increase from the November 1997 total of 1,726.

**Boston:** As the number of subsized units has declined, homeless adults and families are having an increasingly difficult time finding affordable housing. There have not been any new Section 8s targeted to homeless families allocated by the Federal Government. The State does not turn over their vouchers when a family no longer needs it so there is no supply of State rental subsidies. The State abolished rent control, which has resulted in exorbitant rent increases in Boston, Cambridge, and Brookline. As rents increase and the affordable housing supply decreases market rate apartments and rooms are beyond the reach of the working homeless.

**Burlington:** Burlington Housing Authority increased for disabled individuals, everything else stayed the same.

**Chicago:** The response is based upon the total number of requests for residency in the Chicago Housing Authority administered housing.

**Denver:** Increased due to rising rents, underemployment, and an ever-growing population of single parent families, most of whom are women.
Detroit: Over the last several years, with the improvement of Detroit's economy, housing values and rents have risen. Meanwhile, public assistance benefits have remained static or decreased over the last ten years. The same type of assistance has been eliminated for single individuals. To make matters worse, Detroit's housing stock is decreasing and affordable homes are not readily available. Many of Detroit's SRO housing was abandoned when the State's General Assistance Program for single individuals was terminated in 1991.

Kansas City: According to the Housing Authority of Kansas City, Missouri (HAKC), there is an increase in the number of families applying for assisted housing. They receive between 50 to 100 or more new applications per week.

Louisville: Although there are vacancies in public housing, the decrease reflects the changes occurring in our city. Some public housing is being torn down and new units are being built. The structure of those seeking public housing is taking on different directions. Elderly, individuals and disabled are part of those seeking housing.

Miami: Welfare reform, unmet primary care needs (transitional), and immigration.

Minneapolis: Public Housing Authority opened enrollment into the Section 8 program and received 2,500 applicants in one week.

Nashville: Nashville's Section 8 waiting list was closed from August 1995 through September 1998. In September, the waiting list was reopened, and MDHA began to issue Section 8 certificates to people who have been on the list since 1995. The applications process was opened, and 3,590 families and individuals registered to apply. MDHA will begin to take applications from this list in January 1999.

Norfolk: 134 additional Section 8 vouchers were funded under preservation. The waiting list has remained closed with no increase. The demand for public housing has decreased.

Philadelphia: As the number of families in shelter has increased, so has the number of families requesting (and filing applications for) assisted housing.

Phoenix: It is assumed that the elimination of federal preferences has led to an increase in requests for assisted housing.

Salt Lake City: The waiting list for subsidized housing for both public housing and Section 8 is up 15 percent due to the increase in low-income population in the city.

San Antonio: The Housing Authority reported over 10,000 families on the waiting list last year. This year approximately 17,000 families are on the waiting list for housing. Due to the demolition and renovation of public housing the number of families on the list has increased.
San Diego: 17,000 on waiting list for assisted housing.

San Francisco: The number of people seeking permanent low income housing has increased this year. This is due in part to the increasing number of people turned away by shelters and the one percent vacancy rate in the cities rental market.

Seattle: During the last year, requests for assisted housing by low income families and individuals in Seattle have increased. The supply of housing has continued to decrease and the demand has increased through the City of Seattle. As Seattle Housing Authority's wait list has continued to grow in numbers, low-income individuals and families have also begun to look at non-profit agencies to meet their housing needs. These non-profit agencies often have shorter wait lists.

St. Paul: Many leaving welfare have taken jobs paying less than $10 per hour. That is the wage required to rent the one average bedroom apartment in the City of St. Paul. They may, in fact, have less disposable income as a consequence of work. This increases the popularity of assisted housing.

Trenton: According to MCBSS, the number of units requested cannot keep up with the demand.

The Wait for Assisted Housing

Applicants in the survey cities must wait for public housing for an average of 24 months from the time of application until they actually receive assistance. The average wait for Section 8 Certificates is 33 months, for Vouchers 34 months.

- For public housing the average wait ranges from 54 in Alexandria, 8 in Boston, 14 in Burlington, 24 in Chicago, 24 in Cleveland, 24 in Denver, 42 in Detroit, 24 in Kansas City, 3 in Louisville, 36 in Miami, 24 in Minneapolis, 3 in Nashville, 14 in Norfolk, 9 in Philadelphia, 4 in Phoenix, 24 in Salt Lake City, 6 in San Antonio, 36 in San Diego, 24 in San Francisco, 68 in Seattle, 46 in Trenton.

- For Section 8 Certificates the average wait ranges from 54 in Alexandria, 8 in Boston, 30 in Burlington, 60 in Chicago, 24 in Denver, 48 in Detroit, 12 in Kansas City, 18 in Louisville, 36 in Miami, 24 in Minneapolis, 9 in Nashville, 48 in Norfolk, 16 in Philadelphia, 6 in Phoenix, 40 in Salt Lake City, 36 in San Antonio, 36 in San Diego, 24 in Santa Monica, 56 in Seattle, 48 in St. Louis, 48 in St. Paul, 36 in Trenton.

- For Section 8 Vouchers the average wait ranges from 54 in Alexandria, 30 in Burlington, 60 in Chicago, 24 in Denver, 48 in Detroit, 12 in Kansas City, 18 in Louisville, 36 in Miami, 24 in Minneapolis, 48 in Norfolk, 16 in Philadelphia, 6 in Phoenix, 40 in Salt Lake

Forty percent of the cities have stopped accepting applications for at least one assisted housing program due to the excessive length of the waiting lists.

Among the comments from the city officials on the closing of assisted housing program wait lists:

**Alexandria:** The waiting lists for public housing and Section 8 certificates and vouchers are closed for extended periods of time by the public housing authority. The waiting list for three bedroom public housing units remained closed from December 1989 until a brief window (30 days) opened for applications in February 1996. The waiting list for two bedroom public housing units closed in April 1992, but was opened briefly (30 days) in 1995, February 1996, and again in August 1996. The waiting list for public housing units opened for two months in February 1998, but has remained closed since April 1998. The waiting list for Section 8 (one through five bedrooms) opened for two weeks in July 1997a and has since remained closed. The waiting list for all assisted housing units is currently closed with the exception of one bedroom units for elderly and/or disabled persons. This list is always open.

**Boston:** Section 8 is only open to priority 1 applicants. Homeless Families qualify for priority 1 or 2.

**Chicago:** The City has discontinued accepting applications for Section 8. However, applications are still being accepted for conventional public housing.

**Cleveland:** Section 8 vouchers waiting list has been closed since a 1994 lottery. Public housing has 6,200 on waiting list.

**Detroit:** Under the Detroit Homeless Initiative Project (DHIP), more than 5,000 families and individuals have been placed in permanent, but not supportive housing. Additionally, DHIP has been able to prevent families from becoming homeless in about 1,000 other cases. Currently we have the capacity to handle 200 cases annually. Three hundred fifty (350) permanent housing placement slots will be added, to target individuals and families, primarily, substance abusers.

**Kansas City:** According to the Housing Authority of Kansas City, Missouri, applications are accepted weekly. The Missouri Housing Development Commission, Affordable Housing Program does not accept applications when they run out of capacity.

**Miami:** Elimination of Section 8 for several years.

**Minneapolis:** One week of open enrollment produced 2,500 applicants.

**Nashville:** The City is not taking applications for Section 8 certificates and vouchers. As of August 31, 1995, MDHA suspended application taking for the Section 8 certificate and voucher program for all bedroom sizes. The list was opened during the month of September 1998. It is now closed.

**Norfolk:** Section 8 - yes, certificates and vouchers
Public Housing - no, opened one day per month
Philadelphia: Waiting lists for units with three bedrooms or more in conventional PHA housing are closed. Section 8 is closed to single individuals unless they are elderly (over 62 years of age) or disabled.

Salt Lake City: Approximately once a year the Salt Lake City Housing Authority (SLCHA) closes the waiting list for all but 1 bedroom assistance because of length of waiting list. Plans now in progress to close list. One bedroom not closed because of higher percent of units available through Sect. 202 McKinney Act and other special needs money received by city last 2 years. Average wait for Public Housing is 6-12 months.

Santa Monica: The Section 8 wait list is expected to open within a year. It has been closed for the past six years.
People Served by Assisted Housing

An average of 27 percent eligible low income households are currently served by assisted housing in the survey cities.

Alexandria: Among eight Metropolitan Washington DC area jurisdictions that participated in a 1998 Council of Governments Survey, Alexandria and Arlington County lead the suburban jurisdictions in assisted rental housing as a percentage of housing stock. According to the 1990. The 4,308 assisted rental housing units in the City as of June 30, 1997, can accommodate 40 percent of these households. However, based upon the City’s annual rent survey, more than 75 percent of all rental units (subsidized and non-subsidized, in buildings with over ten units) in the City are affordable to low and moderate income households when taking into account the family size.

Boston: Boston has around 37,000 assisted housing units. There are 55,000 low-income households in Boston who need assisted housing.

Burlington: Burlington Housing Authority - 1,500 families

Chicago: According to statistics secured from the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, "In Short Supply: The Growing Affordable Housing Gap," 32 percent of low-income households are being served via assisted housing.

Detroit: About 2,000 beds (including emergency shelter, short term detoxification, substance abuse treatment and recuperation beds) and 1,622 supportive housing units (transitional and shelter plus care) exist. This leaves a high percent of the daily population with the substandard alternative of street living, "squatting" in abandoned buildings, as well as, temporarily living with friends or relatives.

Minneapolis: Minneapolis has 55,000 income eligible households compared to 14,000 units of subsidized housing.

Nashville: 17 percent using data from Nashville's Consolidated Plan.

Norfolk: Section 8: Information not available; the Housing Authority has the ability to assist 2,300 plus families at a given time with present funding.

Public Housing: Assisted 4,060 families.

Philadelphia: PHA subsidizes 38,000 conventional housing units and 12,000 Section 8 units. These numbers account for 59.3 percent (50,000) of the 84,254 (1990 Census figure) low-income households.

Salt Lake City: In city qualified based on income. In last 2 years (SLCHA) has seen increase in low income populations versus assisted housing growth. Housing going down.

San Antonio: This year's figures are comparable to last year's in that approximately 8,100 affordable housing units exist for approximately 85,500 low income households.
San Francisco: This is based on a comparison of the total number of publicly assisted units (approximately 25,000) to 1990 census data indicating about 126,000 households at or below 80 percent of median income.

Seattle: The figure of 4.25 percent is a ratio of the number of individuals Seattle Housing Authority houses versus the total city's populations: 21,961/516,259 (1990 census). This is our best figures as to the amount of low income individuals being served by assisted housing. Please note that Seattle has experiences an increase in the population in recent years. According to the Puget Sound Regional Council, the city's population is 545,000 (1998).

St. Paul: The number of households is finite at 100,249. Households determined to be in poverty number 23,152. The number of subsidized units is 11,853, which is about half of the demand.

Officials in the survey cities estimate that low income households spend an average of 47 percent of their income on housing.

Alexandria: According to 1990 Census Data provided for the City’s 1995 Consolidated Plan, 77 percent of renters earning up to the Section 8 Low Income Limit are paying more than 30 percent of their income on rent and 15 percent of owners earning up to the Section 8 Low Income Limit are paying over 30 percent of their income for their mortgage payment.

Boston: Families with subsidized housing pay 30 percent of their income. Families living in unsubsidized housing often pay 50 percent or more of their income towards rent.

Chicago: The above indicated figure was derived from the U.S. Bureau of the Census:1990, which states that 63 percent of all households whose income is annually $10,000 or less spend over 35 percent of their income on housing.

Cleveland: 1996 American Housing Survey for the Cleveland area documented that for households below poverty, the median monthly rent was 68 percent of income.

Detroit: Of the 107,000 Detroit renters with annual incomes below $10,000--just over 63,000 housing units were renting for less than $250.00 per month:

$250.00 per mo. X 12 = 3,000/10,000 per year

The gross income equals 30 percent per annum.

The Detroit Candidate Plan (CP) states that Detroit has 124,166 households whose median family income of 0 percent-3 percent of that for the city as a whole. It showed that four of every five poor renter households spend at least 50 percent of the income on rent and utilities.

Kansas City: The Missouri Housing Development Commission (MHDC) states that at least 30 percent of a household's adjusted income is spent on housing. The average rent for public housing, according to the Housing Authority, is $91.01 a month.

Louisville: The average is 40 percent but among the city/county there is approximately 28,000 households averaging 50 percent of income being used for housing.

Minneapolis: Single parent families use at least 70 percent of their welfare grant for rent.

Nashville CARES estimates that with an income of $500-600 each month, its clients are spending 60 percent or more, including utilities; minimum wage earners spend approximately 40-50 percent of net income.

Norfolk: Section 8: Recipients pay between 30-60 percent of income with assistance.

Public Housing: Tenants pay 30 to 35 percent of income and excess utilities.

Philadelphia: Rent in public housing is based on 30 percent of adjusted gross household income with allowances for children or senior citizens in the family, among other deductions, or 10 percent of gross household income, whichever is greater.

Salt Lake City: This is estimated based on the lack of subsidized housing in city. Therefore, even if income qualified, they must make up the difference in rent and pay own way.

San Antonio: This year's figures are comparable to last years findings in The City's Consolidated Plan which estimates that 67 percent of low and extremely low-income households spend more than 30 percent of their gross monthly income on housing expenses, and 51 percent of these spend more than 50 percent.

San Diego: 73 percent pay 30 percent or more for housing; 38 percent pay 50 percent or more for housing.

San Francisco: This is based on 1990 census data showing the percent of low income households overpaying for housing (paying over 30 percent) or 50 percent of their income on rent.

Seattle: For the majority of Seattle Housing Authority's assisted housing programs, such as low income public housing and section 8 voucher and certificate programs, residents pay 30 percent of their income. The only exception to this are individuals who pay 29 percent in Seattle Senior Housing Programs where the minimum rents are $120.

St. Louis: Section 8 Program participants pay 30 percent of their income for rent. Many local housing advocates believe some of the areas working poor are paying up to 50 percent of their income on housing.

St. Paul: Client data of the Saint Paul Housing Information Office show that low income people report the ratio of rent to income runs 3/4 of monthly income. These data exclude those in subsidized housing.
Effect of the Elimination of Section 8 Incremental Certificates and Vouchers

The officials were asked to identify the effect that the elimination of Section 8 incremental certificates will have on low-income households in their cities. What follows are their comments:

**Alexandria:** The Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority has not sought incremental Section 8 funding for several years. The elimination of incremental funding would not have a noticeable effect.

**Boston:** There is an affordable housing crisis in Boston. There is not enough affordable housing to meet the need. Both the State and Federal Government's have decreased the supply of affordable housing for low income families and individuals. The result has been more homelessness.

**Burlington:** Burlington Housing Authority - it has doubled the length of time that they wait for assistance.

**Chicago:** The elimination of Section 8 incremental certificates and vouchers has forced the closing of the waiting list. As a result, the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) can only serve the number of clients equivalent to the number of units vacated. Currently, the turnover rate on units is 900-1,000 per year.

**Cleveland:** Any loss of housing assistance is detrimental, a bigger problem at this time is HUD's aggressive implementation of plans to "voucher out" project-based subsidized units. Subsidized units are being removed from the housing supply at a time when much of the private housing market refuses to accept certificate holders.

**Denver:** It has contributed significantly to homelessness.

**Detroit:** More than a year ago, when Detroit's Public Housing Authority announced the availability of 500 Section 8 rent certificates, more than 14,000 people requested applications--further evidence of the need. The housing affordability gap has undoubtedly worsened. With the recent improvement of Detroit's overall economy, over the last several years, housing values and rents have been risen.

The availability of public housing and rent subsidies has also decreased. To make matters worse, Detroit's housing stock is decreasing and affordable homes are not readily available.

Low-income persons cannot afford to pay rent at a level that allows landlords to maintain properties.

**Kansas City:** The Kansas City Housing Authority reports that there has not been any incremental increase for the year, although Congress has approved additional funding for 1999. There is special funding available for special groups of people (i.e. elderly and disabled).

**Louisville:** The program is being expanded in our city.

**Miami:** The elimination of Section 8 has resulted in people of low income households to seek emergency shelter.
Nashville: a. Increased number of homeless families/individuals; b. Increased number of families doubled up; and c. Increased number of families experiencing a rent burden. It is much more difficult to find affordable housing in the area because of high rents.

Norfolk: Section 8: Waiting List has remained closed since June - 1993; 5,000+ applications were accepted at that time. Public Housing: No effect on waiting list.

Philadelphia: There have been no new Section 8 certificates issued in Philadelphia this fiscal year. As a result, movement out of transitional housing has been slowed, which, in turn, is applying pressure on the shelter system.

Phoenix: The elimination of Section 8 incremental units has resulted in:
- no decrease in the waiting lists
- no decrease in time people are on waiting lists
- no decrease in homelessness
- no decrease in substandard living conditions.

Salt Lake City: Due to the increase in low income population last 5 years, we have seen increase in requests for subsidies, therefore increase in waiting lists and decrease in what's available. Used to be able to supply 100/year; now, last 5 years had 10. The only time we are able to help a new person is when one moves out, then a new subsidy can be offered to a new person.

San Antonio: Although the waiting list is open, new certificates or vouchers have not been issued to the general public since 1995; the new vouchers have been issued only to individuals who were displaced by the demolition and/or renovation of public housing units. The complete elimination of certificates would dramatically increase the number of households at risk of becoming homeless as it would severely limit the already scarce housing resources available for low and extremely low income households.

San Diego: Section 8 certificates stayed fairly constant.

San Francisco: Large numbers of low income households will be forced out of their current housing with no likelihood of finding other housing they can afford.

Santa Monica: The elimination of Section 8 incremental certificates and voucher limits the Housing Authority's ability to serve additional households and meet the existing demand for assistance. This is especially difficult because rents in Santa Monica have increased substantially since 1995 and are expected to continue to rise due to the full passage of vacancy decontrol by the State of California beginning in January 1999.

Seattle: A total of 9,209 people use Section 8 certificates or vouchers. 4,063 are minors; 2,765 are adults; 1,443 are disabled persons; and 938 are elderly. If eliminated, all would be homeless!

St. Paul: The supply and demand problem for a Section 8 certificate has become worse. The wait for an enrollment date on a waiting list now only occurs every 2 years. The wait after being on the list is now longer -- up to an additional 2 years. In addition, while waiting for a Section 8
certificate many people double up to make ends meet. Unfortunately, their host families run the risk of being evicted for overcrowding.

**Trenton:** Homelessness; overcrowding; child and domestic abuse; multiple related social problems, and difficulty in finding housing due to the amount individuals receive as a living wage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Housing Requests</th>
<th>Public Housing Wait (months)</th>
<th>Section 8 Certificates Wait (months)</th>
<th>Section 8 Vouchers Wait (months)</th>
<th>Stopped Accepting Applications</th>
<th>Percent of Need Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outlook

Expected Requests for Food and Shelter

1999 Requests for Emergency Food Assistance

Ninety-six percent of the survey cities expect that requests for emergency food assistance will increase in 1999. One of the cities -- Cleveland anticipates requests for emergency food assistance to remain the same.

During 1999 requests for emergency food requests by families with children are expected to increase in 96 percent of the survey cities. Cleveland expects no change.

Among the comments from the city officials on the demand for emergency food assistance:

Boston: The State's Department of Transitional Assistance reports that up to 1,289 Boston families will lose their financial benefits at the start of implementation of the 2-year time limit on welfare benefits on December 1, 1998. Many more families will be taken off the rolls later. Although these families will still be eligible for food stamps as long as they reapply, we anticipate that many families will not know that they are eligible. The loss of monetary income from welfare (as low as the average welfare check is) will place additional pressures on these very vulnerable families.

Charleston: In both cases, the general demand for emergency food assistance and that of families, will increase for the same reasons it has increased over the last several years. People on fixed incomes or "the working poor" do not see their incomes rise with inflation. Although the inflation rate has been low due to the strong economy, that does not necessarily translate into a positive benefit for this population. The issues that cause poverty and homelessness (mentioned earlier) have a far stronger affect on low-income families.

Chicago: The indicated outlook is based upon the current increase in the demand for emergency assistance. In an effort to meet the current demand, an increased number of emergency food assistance programs have opened. Both new and existing programs have reported high utilization rates. Assistance to families with children is expected to correspondingly increase.

Cleveland: Assuming the economy remains constant, there is no reason to project a change in
demand over the coming year. However, as the time limits on financial assistance (welfare reform) begin to affect families in future years, demand could grow significantly.

**Denver:** As the economy remains strong, underemployment and rising rents will continue.

**Detroit:** Our agency records indicate that requests for human services delivery have increased dramatically over the past two (2) years among the city's low-income population. We know that proportionally, 39 percent more people were shown to be in poverty in 1999 as in 1990. For children the increase has nearly doubled. Predictably, demand for emergency food by families with children has show a dramatic increase. Currently, unemployment is low throughout most of Michigan and jobs are abundant in many areas. However, jobs that offer livable wages are difficult to find especially for many inner city residents, who have marginal skills and little or no experience.

Since the food stamp cash-out was initiated in May 1996, the number of families whose earnings are sufficient to qualify for the cash-out has been low statewide -- only 13 percent in March 1997. The low participation level in the cash-out system is indicative of the type of employment that participants of the Family Independence Agency Program are finding -- low wages, part-time, and/or unstable. Also the lack of dependable/reliable transportation is an enormous barrier.

**Kansas City:** A) Based on our survey, 58 percent of the respondents indicate that they anticipate the need to increase in 1999. In particular the demand for emergency food assistance is expected to increase as a result of welfare reform, cuts in food stamps, housing assistance and other federal programs.

B) Based on our survey, 58 percent of the respondents indicated that they anticipate the need to increase in 1999.

**Louisville:** More families will lose TANF grants, accept low paying jobs, move to set incomes below poverty level, and more children will move into poverty.

**Miami:** Because of welfare reform, we expect the demand for emergency food assistance specifically for families with children to increase.

**Minneapolis:** Welfare reform will continue to reduce family assistance while job potential remains a challenge.

**Nashville:** A) Whether they are poor and on welfare, or the working poor, they will still need assistance.

**New Orleans:** Second Harvesters Food Bank does not anticipate an increase in the number of persons needing food assistance. However, they anticipate a large increase in the amount of food assistance needed by a core group, mostly comprised of families displaced through welfare reform. B) Contributing to this expected increase are the impact of the Families First program (Tennessee's welfare reform program), plant closings and downsizes.

**Norfolk:** Many public assistance families will be reaching the time limits established by welfare.
Disinstitutionalization which may occur next year will also be expected to have an impact.

Philadelphia: Due to federal and state welfare reform, in March of 1999 all TANF recipients who have been receiving assistance for 24 months must be working 20 hours a week or their families' benefits will be lost. Loss of benefits will undoubtedly increase demand for emergency food assistance.

**Phoenix:** As families and individuals are impacted by the changes in welfare reform, many will have fewer of their own resources to purchase food. These persons will be requesting more assistance from food banks and soup kitchens.

**Portland:** Further increases are expected due to benefit cuts and the effects of welfare reform. Multnomah County residents with inadequate incomes will have $14 million fewer food stamp dollars for groceries in 1999. (There has been a 33 percent drop in the number of people receiving food stamps since 1996. Less than half of people in poverty receive food stamps). Our 1998 survey revealed that 53 percent of those asking for food did not receive food stamps. The survey results point to both new recipients (26 percent) and other who will probably be seeking help more often. (Fifty eight percent said they need food help more than once in a month). The larger pantries in Portland are experiencing significant increases over this time last year.

**San Antonio:** The continued demolition of public housing, unemployment, low wages, and the ramifications of the Great Flood of 1998 will increase the demand for emergency food assistance.

**San Francisco:** Based on the increase in number of homeless families.

**Santa Monica:** Food stamp and welfare reform will likely increase the demand for food.

**St. Louis:** Due to welfare reform, we expect to see more families homeless and in need of emergency services.

**St. Paul:** Low-end wage earners are being squeezed by housing costs that are running at 3-4 times the inflation rate.

1999 Requests for Emergency Shelter

**Ninety-three percent of the survey cities expect requests for emergency shelter to increase in 1999.** Phoenix expects the number of shelter requests to decrease.

**Eighty-eight percent of the survey cities expect requests for shelter by homeless families to increase during 1999.** Nashville expects no change.

Among the comments from city officials on expected requests next year:

**Alexandria:** For the survey year November 1997 through October 1998, the number of persons served by the four year-round emergency shelters increased by three percent over the previous year. The decrease in the number of persons served by the emergency winter program balanced the growth, resulting in a minimal decrease of one percent for the survey year. For three of the last four years, the number served has fluctuated very little. We anticipate similar results in the upcoming year.

**Boston:** The amount of time that it takes a homeless individual or family to access housing
continues to increase. This results in an increase in the amount of people in shelter on any given night. We are also seeing an increase in the amount of working families who are becoming homeless because they cannot afford decent housing. The State's welfare reform time limit is December 1, 1998. Over 1,000 families in Boston will no longer be eligible for AFDC and many of these families are not in subsidized housing. With no income to pay the rent we expect to see many of these families show up at shelters over the next year. We are also seeing more single adults who are coming out of correctional facilities because of mandatory sentences for drugs who have no where to go and end up in the shelters. Because of their criminal history, it is very difficult for these people to get housing.

**Burlington:** People will be coming up on their welfare-to-work deadlines and especially women with kids who have experienced violence may not be ready or prepared to meet the demands of those deadlines. The gulf between what it takes to sustain a household (high rent) and children continues to increase while wages do not.

**Charleston:** Requests by single males should stay the same or show a slight increase, but the greater increase will be seen with homeless families with children and single women without children who are mentally ill or have serious addiction problems.

**Chicago:** The indicated outlook is based upon an established pattern which has been observed over the past several years. In addition, the evolving structure of the existing housing market has reduced the level of affordable housing. As a result, individuals and families are increasingly seeking shelter assistance.

**Cleveland:** There has been an upward trend for new persons entering the homeless system in recent years. The length of stay in shelters, particularly for families, is also increasing.

**Detroit:** Solving the problem of homelessness is not an easy task. Approximately 1,995 people are sleeping in the city's 27 emergency shelters. There 753 units of transitional housing to provide temporary shelters through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) and city funding. The number of homeless families with children has increased significantly over the past ten (10) years, making children the fastest growing population experiencing homelessness. Half of all homeless children are elementary school age, according to a recent United Community Services (USC) 1996-97 Report to the Community.

In general, homeless people don't differ from the population as a whole. What they don't have are the "cushions" of social support, adequate employment and affordable housing that keep most people in their homes when a crisis occurs. The lack of decent affordable housing in this city is pretty glaring, and the major contributor is homelessness.

Homelessness is a doable, "attackable" problem.

1) Available employment at livable wages;
2) Continuum of services from emergency shelter to permanent housing;
3) Availability of additional resources, for existing service provider;  
4) Better communication and coordination between service providers; and  
5) Expand advocacy effort to increase the development of affordable housing.

**Louisville:** Welfare reform and the growing poor will continue to cause many families to seek employment in the cities. At this time the emergency shelters are having to turn away four (4) families for every one (1) that they are able to help.

**Miami:** Because of welfare reform, we expect the demand for emergency food assistance specifically for families with children to increase.

**Minneapolis:** Rental rates continue to increase while income for homeless people continues to shrink.

**New Orleans:** It is anticipated that most of the increase will consist of families who have lost public assistance benefits.

**Norfolk:** Many public assistance families will be reaching the time limits established by welfare. Disinstitutionalization which may occur next year will also be expected to have an impact.

**Philadelphia:** Due to federal and state welfare reform, in March of 1999, all TANF recipients who have been receiving assistance for 24 months must be working 20 hours a week or their families' benefits will be lost. Even if only a small portion of these families becomes homeless, it will greatly increase pressure on the City's emergency shelter system. For example, if just five percent of the 25,000 families who hit the two year time limits were to lose their TANF benefits and become homeless, that would represent 1,250 families, more than double the number of families currently housed in Philadelphia's emergency shelter system.

**Phoenix:** As families and individuals are impacted by the changes in welfare reform, many will have fewer resources to pay rent, utilities, child care, insurance, and health care costs. As choices about what can be paid become fewer, many people will eventually lose their housing.

**San Antonio:** The continued demolition of public housing, the lack of affordable housing, unemployment, low wages, and the ramifications of the Great Flood of 1998 will increase the request for emergency shelter.

**San Diego:** It is expected that welfare reform may impact requests for services from the private sector. High cost of housing is expected to remain for many years to come.

**San Francisco:** Due to lack of affordable housing and shelter space, homeless families in neighboring cities are less likely to seek assistance in San Francisco.

**Santa Monica:** The impact of vacancy decontrol to market value beginning January 1, 1999, will likely lead to increasingly less affordable housing. A number of Section 8 landlords have opted out of Section 8 subsidies in anticipation of higher rents with vacancy decontrol.

**Seattle:** In Seattle, there is a critical need for emergency, transitional and affordable permanent housing for homeless and very low-income people. Although the unemployment rate is high, many of the people being served or turned away from service providers are not employed or do not earn
a livable wage. Many individuals and families do not have the resources to obtain and maintain affordable housing in this market. Moreover, service providers continue to report high rates of domestic violence that result in people seeking emergency shelter and transitional housing and continued increases in the numbers of refugees seeking emergency housing. Although mention has been focused on the need to prevent the loss of existing subsized units (Section 8), maintain the current level of homeless-specific permanent housing units (e.g. assistance under the McKinney Shelter Plus Care and SRO Mod Rehab programs), and prevent the loss of additional low income housing due to demolition, abandonment, and conversion, we anticipate that some units will be lost this next year.

**St. Louis:** Again, due to welfare reform, we expect to see many families unable to meet day-to-day obligations and begin to use shelters as alternative housing.

**St. Paul:** People are still learning the lessons associated with welfare reform and making mistakes which cause them to lose their housing. In addition, the rental market is so tight that many of the working poor are being priced out of their apartments.

**Trenton:** Homelessness is an ongoing problem, with the New Work First New Jersey regulations, housing is difficult to maintain. WFNJ regulations limit benefits and emergency assistance.

# Impact of the Economy on Hunger and Homelessness

## The Current Effect of the Economy on Hunger and Homelessness

Among the comments from the city officials on the impact of the strong economy on hunger and homelessness:

**Alexandria:** We see very little correlation between the strong economy and hunger and homelessness in Alexandria. The City mirrors the national trend of steadily declining unemployment, but we do not see a corresponding reduction in people using shelters or in the need for emergency food. Lack of jobs is not the problem. However, available jobs frequently are at the lower end of the wage scale in service related industries. The increased wealth and jobs that ensure stability and self-support do not extend to the families and individuals entering our shelters because of their lack of education and marketable skills and training. The families we see in Alexandria are households predominantly headed by single female parents who are unemployed or underemployed and lack the experience and skills to become self-supporting. They still pay a disproportionate share of income for shelter. They still lack marketable employment skills and the education to compete for the type of jobs created in an economy driven by high technology.
**Boston:** The good economy is not helping the homeless and the hungry. When the economy is good landlords can get higher rents, keeping housing out of the reach of most homeless people. The good economy has not resulted in federal and state government provision of more resources for low-income people. In fact, resources have decreased for affordable housing and AFDC. We are seeing an increased demand for shelter and food.

**Burlington:** More service industry jobs for the younger homeless, older homeless have hard time finding employment. Very strong donation base for funding and food.

**Charleston:** The strong economy appears to have had very little positive impact on homelessness and hunger in the Charleston area. As mentioned earlier, there has been a slight increase in homeless families and emergency food programs have seen increased demand across the board.

**Chicago:** The increased needs of hungry and homeless individuals and families are being more efficiently addressed through the resources and services or agencies/people who have benefitted from an improved economy. Despite this fact, the number of people who experience hunger and homelessness has remained relatively unchanged.

**Cleveland:** The improved economy has had more of a direct impact on hunger than on homelessness. Many of those using hunger centers have simply lacked sufficient income. A small improvement in economic circumstances may alleviate the need for assistance. Many of the homeless face more serious problems that may be preventing them from benefitting from an improved employment climate. Further, many of the available jobs are low-wage, part-time or day labor positions that may not pay enough to allow the person to afford a rental unit.

**Denver:** Housing costs have increased faster than wages. There are more than enough jobs, but they do not support a living wage.

**Detroit:** Michigan's welfare reform initiatives which began in 1992, as well as the new policies that flow from recent federal legislation, are being implemented in the most healthy economy the state has experienced in decades. Although many employment opportunities are part-time, temporary or low-wage, they are nevertheless plentiful in many areas. As a result, Michigan's policies with regard to employment and training now stress an immediate attachment to the labor force -- a reversal of earlier policies which stressed education and training to promote long-term self-sufficiency. There is cause for concern, however, that the policy directions which are being pursued during this period of economic growth -- particularly with respect to work requirements and employment and training initiatives -- may not have the same outcomes during an economic downturn. At the point that job openings throughout the state begin to diminish, so too will the earnings available to public assistance households. Further, to the extent that recipients are only marginally situated in the labor force, without the requisite education or skills to be competitive, they will be far more likely to be adversely impacted by even a mild recession.

**Kansas City:** In Kansas City, there is certainly a growing job market in the service industry. However, typically unskilled and undereducated workers are now competing for entry level positions with people who have lost jobs in the production industry. Many of these service jobs do not offer benefits or opportunities for advancement. As welfare recipients are forced off welfare and into these jobs, they are becoming dependent on the local community and its social service
agencies to help fill the gaps. Although more people are working, the incomes earned are not sufficient to meet basic needs of food, housing, childcare, transportation and utility costs. Source: Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC).

**Louisville:** Forty-nine percent (49 percent) of those staying in emergency shelters are employed but are unable to make enough money to pay the bills, food, shelter, medical, etc. Sixty-five percent (65 percent) of families with children are seeking emergency food and there is an increase in elderly requesting food assistance.

**Nashville:** Although people are employed, wages are low and available housing for low-income people remains scarce. The need for housing and other social services will remain high.

In spite of a strong economy, there is still not enough affordable housing in Nashville, and many folks are only making a minimum wage; this causes them to seek emergency assistance. Transportation is also an issue. (Second Harvest Food Bank - 1998).

The decline in numbers of people receiving welfare has meant an increase in demand for assistance with food. Families who are homeless often have problems other than lack of housing that are difficult to solve: poor physical, mental and emotional health, inadequate education, poor financial management skills, substance abuse, spotty work histories, poor long-term goal setting. Not many agencies are prepared to address these myriad issues.

Many individuals are making minimum wage and experiencing a high cost of loving. Many adult family members work temporary/entry-level/food service jobs that provide unpredictable income and no benefits. Housing, transportation and day care costs are high, leaving very little for an adequate, nutritious diet. As food stamps are reduced or cut off due to a marginal rise in income, the situation becomes worse.

The number of homeless persons served in the Metro Health Department's Downtown Clinic has declined in the past year; it is unknown if this is a reflection of a decrease in the actual number of homeless people in the city. Nashville is viewed as a good place to go and find work, but the jobs are not always available for unskilled labor and homelessness may result. (Metro Health Dept.)

Housing costs are out of kilter. There is a lack of quality rental units. Alcohol and substance abuse keeps people from retaining jobs and saving money for necessary expenses; however, more people are stepping up and seeking help and there is a little less denial. (Campus).

There is concern that there may not be enough child care assistance to mothers getting off of welfare who will be required to work. By-products of scarce child care resources may be an increase in school truancy and child neglect. Affordable child care simply must be available if mothers are expected to be weaned off of AFDC dependency. Another concern is the lack of sufficient benefits at jobs, and if there will be enough jobs for everyone.
Many providers believe that if social programs are cut significantly, this can only mean that more people will become homeless and need emergency shelter and services. A local feeding program forecasts that it will serve more single mothers with children, continuing a trend they are seeing already.

New Orleans: For the last several years the United States has enjoyed a strong economy with low unemployment and inflation. This year, we expect a surplus in the federal budget, and welfare caseloads also continue to decline.

Norfolk: Initially, we have experienced reductions in requests for shelter, however, the implementation of welfare reform time limits during the coming year may negate this trend.

Philadelphia: Despite a strong regional economy as well national economic prosperity, the number of individuals and families seeking food and emergency shelter continues to increase in Philadelphia, as evidenced by these survey results. Thus, it is clear that a significant and increasing proportion of our citizenry is not sharing in the City's economic well-being and the disparity of the have and the have-nots is increasing. The rising economic tide is not lifting all boats.

Phoenix: The strong economy has not had a positive impact on low-income people. Minimum wage increases have not been sufficient to keep pace with the costs of housing, child care, health care, etc. Housing being developed are units which are "on the high end" in terms of affordability.

Portland: Unfortunately, the strong economy has not resulted in creating many living wage jobs for lower-skilled workers in the Portland area. Low-wage jobs do not pay a living wage for a family, and often do not offer benefits. Even with the minimum wage rising in January to $6.50 an hour here in Oregon (the highest minimum wage in the country) it will not be sufficient. Local estimates are that for a family with two children, wages of at least $12/hour are needed for a minimal living wage. Many families have left public assistance, but are unable to find jobs that will provide for their basic needs. In addition, many people are experiencing cuts in Food Stamps and other benefits due to federal welfare reform. Local survey findings show that families who are "successful," who are leaving public assistance for jobs, are having a hard time making it. Too many are going without food for a day or more or are at risk of homelessness. While wages have stagnated, housing costs have skyrocketed placing many families and individuals at risk of homelessness, hunger and other problems.

Salt Lake City: The data indicate that people are staying longer in shelters and transitional housing. It is taking much longer for a person or family to save the necessary deposits for housing, utilities, etc., in order to move out of shelter.

San Antonio: Ironically, more homeless people are employed but still remain homeless due to the low wage market in San Antonio. Support services -- i.e. bus tickets, child care, uniforms, etc., -- are now geared to supporting individuals who are underemployed yet lacking the resources to obtain or sustain permanent housing. The challenge for case managers is to motivate individuals to enroll in school or a job training program when their immediate need for money is met though at a low wage.

San Diego: The strong economy both nationally and locally does not seem to impact the
homeless, who have many barriers to employment specifically in the areas of substance abuse and mental health.

**Santa Monica**: Despite the strong economy, welfare reform is pushing or increasing number of low-income individuals and families to the brink of homelessness.

**Seattle**: Seattle's robust economy has been a powerful magnet for job seekers, resulting in an increased demand for market rate as well as subsidized housing. As a result, Seattle is experiencing an inflation in housing (rental and ownership) prices and a very low rental vacancy rate. Jobs available to people with limited skills are usually in the service industry where wages do not match the cost of living. A city of many cultures and many languages, Seattle continues to be a popular destination for refugees and immigrants. New arrivals face language and cultural barriers which make getting and holding decent wage jobs difficult and which make it difficult to access education, housing, health and social services. Many shelter and transitional housing programs report increasing numbers of refugees and immigrants. In 1999, the Washington Stage Office for Refugee and Immigrant Assistance and voluntary resettlement agencies estimate that approximately 5,000 refugee arrivals will settle in the state, mostly in Seattle.

The strong and robust economy has enabled the emergency food system to leverage more in-kind and financial resources from the business sector and other city municipalities. Given the robust economy, the Summer food Program of the City's Department of Housing and Human Services' Division of Youth Services reported an increase in youth, 0-18 years of age, who received sack lunches during the summer months. The elderly population in the city of Seattle is growing and with that, congregate meal programs continue to see a rise in the number of participants whom for many, depend on the social interaction gained during the mealtimes. The emergency food system will also experience the "ripple effect", as seen by other social service providers working towards ending homelessness, due in part to Seattle's strong economy and for being a magnet of providing vital services to its citizens.

**St. Louis**: Minority and poor families continue to require assistance due to financial hardship and the lack of adequate affordable housing in St. Louis.

**St. Paul**: Housing prices have risen. Immigration from all over the U.S., especially Illinois and California is up. Migration from Mexico and Central America is up as well. The vast majority are pursuing jobs. More people descending on a fixed housing supply have caused extensive doubling up.

**Trenton**: Due to the number of cuts in funding, many service providers will have a difficult time in servicing their clients. Also available jobs are out of reach due to transportation, day care, etc. Families cannot sustain themselves on minimum wage.

**Expected Effect of the Economy on Hunger and Homelessness**

Among the comments from the city officials on how hunger and homelessness will be affected by the economy during 1999:
Alexandria: We anticipate no change in the impact of the economy in 1999. As noted, low income families and individuals and families impacted by welfare reform are not becoming fully self-sufficient with entry level jobs at low wage level, without fringe benefits such as health insurance and paid leave. They remain vulnerable to minor disruptions in pay or a single missed paycheck. For this reason, even though families may obtain employment, we anticipate there will still be a need for at least the same level of emergency food and shelter.

Boston: Without an increase in supply of affordable housing, jobs paying a decent wage, day care, adult education and training programs, and access to health care benefits for the mentally ill and substance abusers, we will not see any decrease in homelessness and hunger in Boston.

Burlington: Homeless kids are still a much overlooked population.

Charleston: The strong economy appears to have had very little positive impact on homelessness and hunger in the Charleston area. As mentioned earlier, there has been a slight increase in homeless families and emergency food programs have seen increased demand across the board.

Chicago: If the economy remains strong in 1999, clients will reap the benefit. With increased service provision, clients will receive the supportive services (job training, recovery services and financial counseling/assistance) necessary to secure and maintain independent living.

Cleveland: It will depend on the direction of the economy in 1999. Eventually, the economy will turn down and the impact will be felt by food and shelter programs. This will particularly be true once the impact of the welfare reform assistance time limits fully takes effect.

Denver: Sixty-five percent of the new jobs in the metro area between 1990-96 have been in the lowest paid sectors: retail, services, etc. We do not anticipate any change in this trend during 1999.

Detroit: The predictive ability of hunger and homelessness in Detroit and the affect on the economy during 1999 can be described in several different ways. Of course, to a person already living at or below the level of subsistence, the economy during 1999 seems rather bleak. Indeed the true human costs of welfare reform are incalculable, and only until the public sees the tragic consequences of this reform does the real impact hit home for the majority. Needless to say, with thousands of individuals and families abruptly cut off from their sole source of income, via welfare reform, we will undoubtedly see a dramatic rise in family disturbances. Also predicted in an abnormally high social unrest and a sharp decline in the overall quality of life for a large segment of Detroit’s inner city residents.

On any of the worst case scenarios, children will suffer disproportionately. This, in turn, will damage progress toward improvement in the Detroit Public Schools. School attendance, while on a positive trend upward now, could suffer with the size of the school population previously on public assistance.

Although the precise impact of homelessness and hunger-1999, in the Detroit community is undoubtedly very complex and subject to varying interpretation, common sense argues that certain indicators begin to appear when high unemployment rates and resulting poverty have
continued for several years.

Prediction of a strong economy in 1999 is somewhat misleading. True, welfare rolls are decreasing; however, the average wage is generally $6.00 per hour or less, an amount woefully inadequate to support a household.

**Kansas City:** The concern among social service providers in Kansas City is that the need for housing and food assistance will increase. Emergency shelters are already turning people away and food pantries find it more difficult to keep their shelves stocked.

Source: Mid-America Assistance Coalition (MAAC)

**Louisville:** Even though the country has enjoyed a strong economy, the numbers of hungry and homeless has continued to increase since the early 1980's.

**Nashville:** If the economy slows down and jobs are lost due to decreased demand for U.S. products from abroad, pressure to provide food and shelter will increase here.

One provider believes that the economy has little to do with the lifestyle and mind set changes that need to occur to get off the streets.

The director of Second Harvest believes needs are continuing to rise. "Until we see more affordable housing and better wages, people will still seek us out."

The Health Department notes that even in a thriving economy, food is not readily available to non-working makes with no dependents. Public sources are limited and private sources are restrictive; thus, many will continue to have less.

Some nonprofit shelter programs worry that potential contributors will say that the economy is good, that there are plenty of jobs, and "why don't people just go to work?" They often fail to see the barriers. There is a fear that people will stop contributing to social service programs for the needy.

With the loss of continuous food stamp benefits available to homeless and other single adults, many more homeless persons will have to rely upon non-governmental feeding programs to avoid hunger. These programs are unlikely to be able to fill in all the gaps; thus, many homeless persons will go hungry. (Metro Health Dept.)

**Philadelphia:** Though Philadelphia's regional economy is fundamentally sound, it is not sufficient to absorb into the workforce the thousands of heads of households currently receiving TANF who, beginning in March, must either work or risk losing their welfare benefits. Welfare reform is a "train wreck waiting to happen" which threatens to cut off thousands of families from their primary means of income support with a corresponding increase in the number of households seeking emergency food and shelter.

**Phoenix:** The expected impacts are the same as this year. Welfare reform is expected to have more impact than economic conditions.
Salt Lake City: Low unemployment rate does not reflect lower-paying service sector jobs. The cost of housing is very high but has not increased as much as in prior years. Utah has a 3-year limit on welfare benefits, so as that date draws near it is likely that we will see a large increase in need among families and children.

San Antonio: The booming San Antonio economy is threatened by the imminent closure of Kelly Air Force Base, our largest community employer. The improved economy will not translate into an economic recovery for homeless people. In San Antonio, a strong national economy means a potential increase in tourism and a need for more low-wage service related jobs. Services will need to focus on financial and career counseling services as well as on those services that assist homeless people attain higher educational and skill levels.

San Diego: It has been predicted that welfare reform may increase the demand on the private sector for services which were previously funded through public assistance.

Santa Monica: One positive impact has been an alliance between Santa Monica's major three-and four-star hotels and job-training programs for the homeless. One City-Funded agency, Chrysalis, maintains contracts with several beachfront hotels to train the homeless in job-readiness in return for entry-level jobs in the hotel and tourist industries. Computer training is also provided for the homeless by several City-funded agencies.

Seattle: Seattle's economy is projected to continue to be robust during 1999. It is expected that housing prices will continue to increase and demand for affordable housing will likewise increase. The loss of Section 8 units and other low income housing units due to sale, conversion, or demolition will make matters worse. We are and will continue to see a significant increase in request for subsidized housing, emergency food and emergency housing from all groups of people.

Currently, community food advocates are negotiating with the State legislature to add and additional $1,171,200 statewide to the Emergency Food Assistance Program, or EFAP, for the next biennium. This amount would represent a 22 percent increase in the current amount, bringing the total to $6,579,217. With the changes to the USDA reimbursement requirements, the city has reported a decrease in child day care homes participating in the program. This in turn affects the availability of meals day care providers can provide to children and we can project that neighborhood food banks may see a rise in households using food banks to supplement their nutritional needs. Furthermore, with families transitioning out of public assistance such as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, the emergency food system can expect to see an initial increase in the need for food assistance as families change from one income source to another.

St. Louis: We expect to see an increase in the numbers of low-income families requesting emergency services including food and housing. Any increases in federal Homeless Assistance Act funds will help combat homelessness.

St. Paul: The demand for housing units is so intense in St. Paul that some workers find no place to live and become homeless. If they are lucky, they will be able to double up with a friend. If not, they move into a shelter. More and more the numbers of working poor will fill our shelters.
**Trenton:** Families are being removed from welfare with no resources. Jobs are difficult to locate at a living wage. Many recipients lack skills, education and the City of Trenton will be affected by an increase in homelessness, substance abuse, crime and hunger.
## Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities
### A Fourteen-Year Comparison of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Demand for Emergency Food</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities in which Demand for Food Increased</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Demand by Families for Food Assistance</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion of Those Requesting Food Assistance who are families with Children</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for Emergency Food Unmet</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities in which Food Assistance Facilities must turn people away</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities which expect demand for Emergency Food to increase next year</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOMELESSNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Demand for Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities in which Demand increased</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for Emergency Shelter Unmet</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities in which Shelters must turn people away</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities which expect Demand for Shelter to increase next year</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition of Homeless Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with Children</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Mentally Ill</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abusers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Population, Poverty and Unemployment Survey

#### Data for Survey Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1990 Population</th>
<th>1990 Poverty Rate Estimate</th>
<th>October 1997 Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>October 1998 Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>111,183</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>574,283</td>
<td>18.70%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>39,127</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>8,414</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>395,934</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2,783,726</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>55,616</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>467,61</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>1,27,974</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>425,146</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3,485,398</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>269,63</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>358,548</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>368,383.00</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>488,374</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>496,938</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>261,229</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,585,577</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>983,43</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>437,219</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>16,728</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>159,936</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>935,933</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,11,549</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>723,959</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>86,95</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>516,259</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>396,685.00</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>272,235</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>88,675</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATUS REPORT ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS
INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following survey and return it by NOVEMBER 20, 1998 to:

Eugene T. Lowe
The U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Fax (202) 293-2352

A report will be published based on the responses to this questionnaire. Experience has shown that such survey reports are effective when they include examples of individual city data. If, however, you want your city's answers to any questions held confidential, please specify those questions by number: ________________

________________________________________________________________________

NOTE: The year for which information is requested is November 1, 1997 to October 31, 1998. It is referred to as "the last year" in the survey questions. Homeless persons are defined as those who reside in shelters, on the streets, in cars or in other locations not intended as residences.

________________________________________________________________________

HUNGER

1. **THE DEMAND**

   A) Has the total number of requests for emergency food assistance in your city ___ increased, ___ decreased, or ___ stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ___%

   Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any other data which supports it.
B) Has the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance in your city increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? Please explain or expand upon your response and include any other data which supports it.

C) What percentage of those requesting emergency food assistance are members of families with children?

% 

D) Has the number of elderly persons requesting emergency food assistance in your city increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? Please explain or expand upon your response and include any other data which supports it.

E) What percentage of those adults requesting emergency food assistance are employed? 

% 

2. THE CAPACITY
A) Has the number of emergency food assistance facilities in your city increased, decreased or stayed the same during the last year? Please explain.
B) Has the level of resources (e.g. funds, volunteers, food, etc.) available to emergency food assistance facilities in your city increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ___%  Please explain.

C) Are emergency food assistance facilities in your city used for emergencies only, as a steady source of food for long periods of time, or both?  Please explain.

D) For those who receive assistance, are emergency food assistance facilities able to provide an adequate quantity of food?  ____Yes  ____No  Please explain.

E) Do emergency food assistance facilities in your city have to decrease the quantity of food provided and/or the number of times families and/or individuals can come to get food?  ____Yes  ____No  Please explain.
If yes, have emergency food assistance facilities had to increase the limit on the number of bags provided and/or decrease the number of times families and/or individuals can come to get food during the last year?  
______ Yes  ____ No  Please explain.

F) Is the food provided nutritionally balanced?  ____ Yes  ____ No  Please explain.

3. **THE FUNDING**  
During the last year, has your city government spent public funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts?  ____ Yes  ____ No

If Yes, please check below the funding sources used by your city government and indicate the amount spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally generated revenues</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants (not federal pass-through monies)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney homeless assistance programs (please specify which ones on separate sheet)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Block Grant</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal funds (please specify):</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **THE UNMET NEED**

A) Do emergency food assistance facilities in your city have to turn away people in need because of lack of resources?  ____ Yes  ____ No  Please explain.
B) Please estimate the percentage of the overall demand for emergency food assistance in your city which goes unmet. _____%  
Please estimate the percentage of the demand by families with children for emergency food assistance in your city which goes unmet. _____%  
Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any data which supports it.

5. **THE CAUSES**  
What are the main causes of hunger in your city?

6. **AN EXEMPLARY RESPONSE**  
Please describe briefly an exemplary program or effort underway in your city which prevents or responds to the problems of hunger.
7. **THE DEMAND**

A) Has the total number of people requesting emergency shelter in your city increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%

Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any other data which supports it.

B) Has the number of families with children requesting emergency shelter in your city increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%

Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any other data which supports it.

C) Has the length of time people in your city are homeless increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the last year? Please explain.

D) What is the average length of time that people in your city remain homeless? ____ months.

8. **THE PEOPLE**
A) Please provide a brief case study (one paragraph) of an **actual** homeless individual or family your city.

B) Please describe the characteristics of your city’s homeless population on the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of Families with Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Youth (age 18 &amp; under)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abusers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with AIDS or HIV-related illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS (please explain any significant changes which occurred in the composition of your city’s homeless population during the last year):

C) What percentage of the homeless families in your city are headed by single parents? ____ %

D) What percentage of the members of homeless families in your city are children? ____ %
9. **THE CAPACITY**

A) Did the number of emergency shelter beds for homeless people in your city _____ increase, decrease, or _____ stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%
How many shelter beds currently exist in your city for use by homeless people? ______

B) Did the number of emergency shelter beds specifically for homeless families in your city _____ increase, _____ decrease, or _____ stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%
How many shelter beds currently exist in your city for use by homeless families? ______

C) Did the number of transitional housing units in your city _____ increase, _____ decrease, or _____ stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%
How many transitional units currently exist in your city? ______

D) Did the number of transitional housing units specifically for homeless families in your city _____ increase, _____ decrease, _____ or stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____%
How many transitional units specifically for homeless families currently exist in your city? ______

E) Did the number of SRO units in your city _____ increase, _____ decrease, _____ or stay the same during the last year? By what percentage? ____% How many SRO units currently exist in your city? ______

F) Do homeless families in your city have to break up in order to be accommodated in emergency shelters?
   ____ Yes  ____ No  Please explain.

G) Do homeless families have to leave the shelter in which they are staying during the day? ____ Yes  ____ No  If yes, please explain why and tell where they go during the day.
10. **THE FUNDING/RESOURCES**

During the last year, has your city government spent public funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless people?  
---

**Yes**  
**No**  
If yes, please check below the funding sources used by your city government and indicate the amounts spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally generated revenues</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants (not federal pass-through monies)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney homeless assistance programs (please specify which ones on separate sheet)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Block Grant</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal funds (please specify):</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **THE UNMET NEED**

A) Do emergency shelters in your city have to turn away homeless families in need because of lack of resources?  
---

**Yes**  
**No**  
Please explain, including information on what happens to the homeless families that cannot be accommodated in shelters.

B) Do emergency shelters in your city have to turn away other homeless people in need because of lack of resources?  
---

**Yes**  
**No**  
Please explain, including information on what happens to the homeless people who cannot be accommodated in shelters.
C) Please estimate the percentage of requests by all homeless people for emergency shelter in your city which goes unmet. _____% Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any data which supports it.

D) Please estimate the percentage of requests for emergency shelter specifically by homeless families in your city which goes unmet. _____% Please explain or expand upon your response, and include any data which supports it.

12. **THE CAUSES**
What are the main causes of homelessness in your city?

13. **AN EXEMPLARY RESPONSE**
Please describe briefly an exemplary program or effort underway in your city which prevents or responds to the problems of homelessness.
14. **THE DEMAND**

During the last year, did requests for assisted housing by low-income families and individuals in your city

___ increase ___ decrease or ___ stay the same during the last year? Please explain.

15. **THE CAPACITY**

A) Please indicate the average wait in months in your city from the time of application for assisted housing until an applicant actually receives assistance for:

- Public Housing _________ months
- Section 8 Certificates _________ months
- Vouchers _________ months

B) Has your city stopped accepting applications for assisted housing programs due to the excessive length of the waiting lists? ___ Yes ___ No If yes, please specify the types of housing for which the waiting lists have been closed.

C) Please estimate the percentage of eligible low-income households in your city currently being served by assisted housing. ___% Please explain or expand upon your response and include any data which supports it.

D) Please estimate the average percentage of income that low income households in your
city are spending on housing. _____% Please explain or expand upon your response and include any data which supports it.

E) Please describe the effect that the elimination of Section 8 incremental certificates and vouchers over the last several years have had on low income households in your city.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE NEXT YEAR

16. THE OUTLOOK
A) Do you expect the demand for emergency food assistance in your city to _____ increase, _____ decrease, or _____ stay the same during 1999?
Do you expect the demand for emergency food assistance specifically by families with children in your city to _____ increase, _____ decrease, or _____ stay the same during 1999?
Please explain.

B) Do you expect requests for emergency shelter in your city to _____ increase, _____ decrease, or _____ stay the same during 1999?
Do you expect requests for emergency shelter specifically by homeless families with children to
increase, decrease, or stay the same during 1999? Please explain.

17. THE IMPACT OF THE ECONOMY ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS

For the last several years the United States has enjoyed a strong economy with low unemployement and inflation. This year we expect a surplus in the federal budget, and welfare caseloads also continue to decline.

A) What has been the impact of the strong economy on hunger and homelessness in your city? Please describe any impact in terms of the people affected and the services provided.

B) How will hunger and homelessness in your city be affected by the economy during 1999? Again, please describe any impact in terms of the people affected and the services provided.

------------------------------------------
Person completing form:
Name: 
Title/Agency: 
Address: 

125
Telephone/Fax: ____________________________

___
## Survey Cities and Their Mayors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Kerry J. Donley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Thomas Menino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Peter A. Clavelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>Joseph P. Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Pat McCrory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Richard M. Daley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Michael R. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Wellington Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Dennis Archer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Emmanuel Cleaver II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Richard Riordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Jerry Abramson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Joe Carollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Sharon Sayles Belton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Philip N. Bredesen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Marc Morial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Paul D. Fraim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Edward Rendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Skip Rimsza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Vera Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Vincent Cianci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis</td>
<td>Clarence Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>Norm Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Deedee Corradini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Howard W. Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Susan Golding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Willie Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>Robert T. Holbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Paul Schell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>Douglas H. Palmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>