

## Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	2,985	2,705	3,630	2,025	9,220
Small Family Households *	1,185	980	1,220	620	4,725
Large Family Households *	25	160	250	140	555
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	405	405	725	390	1,545
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	275	670	765	405	805
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	630	535	610	310	670
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

**Table 3 - Total Households Table**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

There are relatively few large family households in the lowest income bracket (0%-30% HAMFI), while the other income brackets have relatively consistent share of large families, around six to seven percent. The middle brackets (30%-100% HAMFI) have the largest concentration of households with at least one person age 75 years or older (20-25%), while these household types are much rarer at the very low income bracket and very high income level brackets, each at nine percent. Approximately 45% of the households in the highest income bracket (above 100% HAMFI) are small families, a higher proportion than in any other income group. The highest income group also has very few households with young children (less than 1%), much smaller than any other group.

## Housing Needs Summary Tables

### Definitions of Housing Conditions

**Cost Burden** - HUD defines cost burdened households as those paying more than 30% of household income for housing costs, while extreme cost burdens are defined as spending 50% or more of household income for housing costs. For renters, these costs include utilities. For homeowners, it includes principal, interest, taxes, insurance and utilities.

**Overcrowding** - A housing unit containing more than one person per room, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. Severely overcrowded is defined as more than 1.5 persons per room.

**Substandard Housing Unit** – A unit which is dilapidated, which may be characterized by the following:

- Does not have operable indoor plumbing or lacks one or more plumbing facilities;
- Does not have electricity or has unsafe or inadequate electrical services;
- Does not have a safe or adequate source of heat;
- Lacks complete kitchen facilities; or
- Declared unfit for habitation by an agency or unit of government.

**Dilapidated Housing Unit** – A housing unit which does not provide safe and adequate shelter and in its current condition endangers the health, safety, or well-being of a family; or one which has one or more critical defects sufficient to require considerable repair or rebuilding.

**Substandard Building** – Any building or portion thereof or the premises on which the same is located, in which there exists any of the conditions listed in LMC 16.32.465 through 16.32.530 to an extent that endangers the life, limb, health, property, safety or welfare of the public or the occupants thereof. (Ord. 1391 S 1, 1968; Ord. 1131 S 1, 1962).

Substandard buildings will be either reconstructed or rehabilitated based upon the following criteria:

**Rehabilitation:**

- Housing- Rehabilitation will not exceed \$50,000 or 50% of the Assessed Building Valuation, whichever is greater.
- Commercial and Industrial – Rehabilitation will not exceed \$250,000 or 50% of the Assessed Building Value, whichever is greater.

**Reconstruction:**

- Housing- Reconstruction will exceed \$50,000 or 50% of the Assessed Building Valuation, whichever is greater.
- Commercial and Industrial – Reconstruction will exceed \$250,000 or 50% of the Assessed Building Value, whichever is greater.

HUD defines substandard housing or “housing problems” as having one of more of the following issues: Housing Problems – There are four housing problems in the CHAS data: 1) housing unit lacks complete kitchen facilities; 2) housing unit lacks complete plumbing facilities; 3) household is overcrowded; and 4) household is cost burdened. A household is said to have a housing problem if they have any one or more of these four problems.

## Housing Needs Summary Tables

### 1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	45	50	65	10	170	15	15	0	10	40
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	0	0	40	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	80	90	55	10	235	0	0	30	0	30
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	1,685	455	200	20	2,360	360	340	250	120	1,070
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	275	910	880	130	2,195	60	140	500	330	1,030
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	125	0	0	0	125	85	0	0	0	85

**Table 4 – Housing Problems Table**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	1,810	600	360	40	2,810	370	360	285	125	1,140
Having none of four housing problems	480	1,215	1,715	820	4,230	110	530	1,270	1,035	2,945
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	125	0	0	0	125	85	0	0	0	85

**Table 5 – Housing Problems 2**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	1,025	555	525	2,105	90	175	270	535
Large Related	25	130	45	200	0	0	85	85
Elderly	250	414	330	994	234	235	280	749
Other	790	360	250	1,400	100	80	140	320
Total need by income	2,090	1,459	1,150	4,699	424	490	775	1,689

**Table 6 – Cost Burden > 30%**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

#### 4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>								
Small Related	845	110	45	1,000	80	140	95	315
Large Related	25	85	0	110	0	0	15	15
Elderly	140	185	135	460	200	130	105	435
Other	745	125	40	910	90	80	40	210
Total need by income	1,755	505	220	2,480	370	350	255	975

**Table 7 – Cost Burden > 50%**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

	Owner	Renter	Total
Cost Burden <= 30%	1,754	1,410	3,164
Cost Burden > 30% to <=50%	445	485	930
Cost Burden >50%	405	500	905
Cost Burden not available	0	65	65
Total	2,610	2,464	5,075

**Table 8 - Housing Cost Burden Overview- Kelso; Source 2006-2010 CHAS Data**

	Owner	Renter	Total
Cost Burden <=30%	6,420	2,740	9,160
Cost Burden > 30% to <= 50%	1,460	1,930	3,390
Cost Burden >50%	740	2,040	2,780
Cost Burden not available	85	60	145
Total	8,715	6,775	15,485

**Table 9 - Housing Cost Burden Overview- Longview; Source: 2006-2010 CHAS Data**

	Owners Total	Owners %	Renters Total	Renters %
0-30% HAMFI	165	80.5%	430	68.8%

30-50% HAMFI	150	41.7%	60	16.2%
50-80% HAMFI	25	5.6%	10	2.1%
TOTAL	340	33.7%	500	34.6%

**Table 10 - Severe Cost Burden Kelso; Source: 2006-2010 CHAS Data**

	Owners Total	Owners %	Renters Total	Renters %
0-30% HAMFI	230	63.9%	1,325	74.1%
30-50% HAMFI	310	58.5%	435	30.1%
50-80% HAMFI	225	20.4%	210	13.1%
TOTAL	765	38.4%	1,970	40.7%

**Table 11 - Severe Cost Burden- Longview; Source: 2006-2010 CHAS Data**

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
<b>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</b>										
Single family households	105	90	65	10	270	0	0	30	0	30
Multiple, unrelated family households	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other, non-family households	0	0	30	0	30	0	0	0	0	0
Total need by income	105	90	95	10	300	0	0	30	0	30

**Table 12 – Crowding Information – 1/2**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Housing conditions are characterized by overcrowded units with more than one person per room, and/or lacking one or more plumbing or kitchen facilities. Poor housing conditions are also geographically concentrated and are correlated with high poverty, low household income, low

rates of homeownership, and age of housing. A high percentage of single-family households with the lowest percentage of AMI are burdened the hardest by overcrowding.

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 13 – Crowding Information – 2/2**

Data Source Comments:

### **Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.**

Washington State Department of Commerce calculated that in the 2013 calendar year, 2,399 unduplicated individuals entered Homeless Prevention, Rapid Re-Housing, Transitional Housing, Emergency Shelter, Permanent Supportive Housing or Permanent Housing. There were 119 veterans accounting for 5% of the individuals seeking some form of housing assistance. A majority, 81% of clients, identified themselves as non-Hispanic and 92.1% as white. Clients averaged 46 days in an emergency shelter, 440 days in transitional housing, 198 days in the rapid re-housing program for a total of 228 average days a client spends in these services. Individuals who exited the programs totaled 1,585.

Longview Housing Authority (LHA) had 441 households eligible for a studio or one bedroom unit, representing about half of the wait list population. Kelso Housing Authority (KHA) reports 353 households on the wait list for a one bedroom or studio apartment. Many of these are elderly and/or disabled.

The 2013 Point In Time (PIT) count identified 99 households consisting of 103 single adults who were housed within the homeless system and another 63 households with 60 single adults who were unsheltered, for a total of 162 households with 172 persons. Each of these persons most likely would need housing assistance for a brief period of time. An additional 188 households (233 persons) were temporarily living with family or friends, and housing assistance could be beneficial in helping them establish their own housing. The housing assistance needs of single persons, when coupled with the family households in similar circumstances, far outstrip program resources for people who are homeless, without including those who are doubled up with others. Most of these households are in need of income that will sustain housing and not lead to repeated incidents of homelessness. This is challenging given chronic levels of local unemployment, business practices that limit work hours, particularly those at minimum wage, and scheduling those hours so that a second job, if available, is difficult to schedule with the first job shift requirements.

### **Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.**

Data from the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) indicates that for 2010 and 2011 (the two most recent years for which data is available) there were approximately 800 incidents of domestic violence per year in Cowlitz County. This includes repeat incidents within a given household. The rate of domestic violence incidents is 7.8 per 1,000 persons, significantly higher than the Washington State rate of 5.7% and higher even than counties with similar economic and demographic characteristics. Those who have experienced domestic violence may not necessarily need housing assistance, although they may need to relocate their household. Domestic violence has little to do with income, and thus makes it difficult to assess what proportion of these households would need housing assistance.



The Emergency Support Shelter calculates that 239 persons were served between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013 and of those, 169 were persons in a family.

Data regarding the occupancy of public housing and housing choice vouchers that serve households who include a person with a disability is provided in a following section. Using the PHA data, It appears that approximately one-third of households on the waiting lists for tenant or project-based assistance have someone with a disability in the household. This is somewhat higher than the rate of disability within the general population, but not significantly so. The PIC data indicates that 49.1% of public housing authorities' households are disabled, and that 100% of PHA households have requested some sort of accessible feature for their living unit. This does not match with the anecdotal responses from program managers regarding the frequency with which accessible units are requested. It may be inferred that local PHAs reach out to and provide housing assistance to residents who have needs related to support for a disability.

### **What are the most common housing problems?**

About 40% of all households in the Longview-Kelso Consortia have some type of housing problem. Cost burden is by far the most common, impacting 63.6% of all low income renters (4,555 households) and 50.4% of all low income owners (2,100 households). Those renters in the greatest level of poverty are hardest hit by cost burden: 70% of renters in the lowest income group pay more than half of their income on housing-related costs. Overall, 39% of all renters pay more than half their income on housing costs. Homeowners are not as burdened with substandard housing or overcrowding as renters, yet 75% of extremely low income home owners pay more than half their income for housing costs and overall, 32% of all owners have housing costs greater than half of their income. Cost-burdened homeowners are predominantly elderly households.

Approximately 2.4% of all renters (170 households) with an income at or below 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) lack complete plumbing or kitchen facilities and 3.3% (235 households) deal with overcrowded units, with a concentration of overcrowding found within the 30-50% HAMFI income bracket. Most of the overcrowded households are single family households. Severe overcrowding is only identified for 40 renting households in the 50-80% income bracket. Only 1.0% of homeowners have substandard units (40 households) and less than one percent (30 owner households) are overcrowded, with all of these occurring within the 50-80% income band.

A series of three community input meetings held in February 2014 identified several housing needs that are recurring themes across neighborhoods. These include:

- Emergency shelter & transitional housing for homeless persons
- Affordable rental housing
- Fair housing education
- Rental assistance
- Security deposits

- Housing for people with disabilities
- Senior housing
- Cottage housing for appropriate groups, e.g. seniors, special needs, ethnic preference, work/live units
- Homeowner maintenance program
- Down payment/closing cost assistance
- Weatherization improvements

### **Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?**

Across the Longview-Kelso Consortia, substandard housing impacts renters at the “middle” bands of low income (30-80% AMI), which are the households with the greatest share of young children as well as elderly members. This is also where severe overcrowding predominates. Substandard housing also disproportionately impacts the lowest income bracket for homeowners (0-30% AMI). Severe overcrowding is worst among renters in the 50-80% AMI bracket. Affordability is the hardest challenge for renters and owners in the lowest income bracket (0-30% AMI). These were also the only groups showing zero or negative income. The most severe affordability challenges affect elderly homeowners and “small related” and “other” (unrelated) renter households within the lowest income bracket (0-30%).

In Longview, the most severe cost burden among homeowners is found in the two lowest brackets, at 0-50% AMI, while for renters, the greatest burden falls more narrowly on those at the bottom, in the 0-30% AMI bracket. In Kelso, the most severe cost burdens fall on both owners and renters at the 0-30% income brackets. Kelso has a higher proportion of struggling low income homeowners (one-third of all homeowners), while Longview’s share is 25%. Longview has a greater share of struggling renters (58% of all renters), while Kelso’s share is 40%, substantially lower.

A series of focus groups was held on January 14, 2014 to consult with local agencies and key institutional partners about local housing and homeless needs. A summary of needs identified by these agencies includes:

- Housing quality and housing choice; need an array of price points
- Tight lending criteria, difficulty identifying loan programs for housing development
- Available and affordable lots for development, with existing infrastructure
- Bias against multi-family housing; more focus on single family detached housing, which is more expensive
- Mixed use properties and cottage housing for multi-generational households and retiring/disabled community members
- Accessible units with focus on aging in place and households with a disability
- Tight rental market limits choice

- Rental markets are not in sync with fair market rents
- Habitability issues and code enforcement; no relocation assistance for those locations that should be condemned
- Public transportation and transit linkage to affordable housing; convenient transit schedule
- Affordability, even with Section 8 vouchers, given other costs (utilities, etc.)
- Legal issues - affordability of tenant screenings and background checks
- Unmet housing and service needs for minorities, particularly among the Hispanic population
- Renter qualifications, rental deposits, utility arrears
- Service animal issues with tenants and landlords
- Tenant education and landlord education; understanding and commitment to responsibilities of each party

**Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance**

Focus group participants from local service and housing agencies as well as institutional partners identified household characteristics and needs of low-income individuals and families with children who are at-risk or receiving rental assistance as:

#### Household Characteristics

- Untreated behavioral health issues such as mental illness and chemical dependency
- Incidence of domestic violence – high rate in our population, overall
- Intergenerational poverty
- Under-employment due to the proliferation of part time jobs; chronic unemployment within the region due to over-reliance on a resource-based economy
- Low educational attainment, coupled with a “poverty mentality”
- Poor household management/life skills
- Criminal history; incarceration of primary wage earner
- Chronic disease management (CHF, CHPD, Diabetes)
- Youth truancy
- Lack of social support- family/friends assistance informal support

#### Needs

- Child care – it is more affordable not to work than to pay child care costs
- Transportation – convenient, accessible public transportation
- Language barriers

- Medical and prescription costs; previously unpaid medical bills that present barriers to credit and housing
- Lack of savings/ money management
- Legal aid/ legal issues
- Need for caregivers and resources for caregiver support
- Low disability income payments
- Tenant education and certification to address housing barriers
- Intensive case management

Households who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing termination of that assistance have several needs and challenges, identified by housing program staff as including:

- Increasing household incomes
- Job skills, training, and support
- Securing SSI/SSDI benefits, when applicable; those who have been denied have a longer timeline without that income
- Secure, steady employment with enough hours to generate income needed to sustain housing
- Crisis resolution, landlord mediation, and/or case management
- Quick and assured access to behavioral health services (mental health, addiction treatment)

**If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:**

At-risk are estimated using the PIT Count. Households who are doubled up with others are considered “at-risk” of homelessness. These estimates are generated during the PIT count by gathering household interviews with clients of local service and housing agencies. Since 2013, this has occurred in conjunction with our annual Project Homeless Connect service fair for homeless persons and those at-risk of homelessness. The 2013 count of at-risk was 435 persons in 223 households with 177 children.

**Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness**

Focus group participants from agencies and institutional partners who provide housing resources in our community identified the following housing characteristics that are linked with instability and increased risk of homelessness:

- Rising/high rents that lead to overcrowding and violation of lease agreements.
- Unhealthy, unsafe environments (e.g., molds, lack of heat).

- Housing needs of elderly and access to/affordability of housing and associated services.
- Paying too much for housing due to the stigma associated with subsidized housing/low-income housing.
- Affordable housing that is not conveniently and affordably located close to employment centers.
- Location – neighborhoods where problem behaviors are concentrated and social network limits ability to succeed.

## **Discussion**

## NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205

### (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

#### Introduction

#### 0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,600	295	145
White	2,245	260	130
Black / African American	50	0	0
Asian	0	0	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	50	4	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	160	20	15

**Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than one person per room,
4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

#### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,940	750	0
White	1,660	685	0
Black / African American	10	15	0
Asian	24	25	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	210	10	0

**Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**50%-80% of Area Median Income**

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,030	1,910	0
White	1,915	1,565	0
Black / African American	0	30	0
Asian	28	8	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	24	4	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	30	220	0

**Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

**80%-100% of Area Median Income**

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	570	1,650	0
White	440	1,535	0
Black / African American	0	0	0
Asian	10	20	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	80	25	0

**Table 17 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

## **Discussion**

For households at the lowest end of the income spectrum (0-30% HAMFI), Black/African American and American Indian/Alaska Native populations have disproportionately higher rates of housing problems than other racial or ethnic groups. It is noteworthy that no Asian or Pacific Islander households even appear in this income bracket. Pacific Islander households do not make an appearance in the overall data set.

In the 30-50% HAMFI income group, Hispanics experience the most disproportionate housing impacts of any group by far. In the 50%-80% income bracket, the American Indian/Alaska Native population experiences the greatest disproportionate share of housing problems, followed by Asian households.

Within the 80%-100% income band, Hispanics experience far greater housing problems than their share would indicate—three times the rate within the community as a whole, while Asian households have a much smaller—but still disproportionate—share of housing problems.

Overall, a disproportionate share of housing problems is experienced by Hispanic, Asian and American Indian/Alaska Native households.



## NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

### Introduction

This section will assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

### 0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,075	815	145
White	1,790	710	130
Black / African American	35	15	0
Asian	0	0	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	35	15	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	120	60	15

**Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	840	1,860	0
White	705	1,635	0
Black / African American	10	15	0
Asian	4	45	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	20	0

<b>Severe Housing Problems*</b>	<b>Has one or more of four housing problems</b>	<b>Has none of the four housing problems</b>	<b>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</b>
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	105	115	0

**Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

### 50%-80% of Area Median Income

<b>Severe Housing Problems*</b>	<b>Has one or more of four housing problems</b>	<b>Has none of the four housing problems</b>	<b>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</b>
Jurisdiction as a whole	635	3,315	0
White	610	2,870	0
Black / African American	0	30	0
Asian	0	38	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	4	18	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	20	230	0

**Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

### 80%-100% of Area Median Income

<b>Severe Housing Problems*</b>	<b>Has one or more of four housing problems</b>	<b>Has none of the four housing problems</b>	<b>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</b>
Jurisdiction as a whole	145	2,080	0
White	95	1,875	0

<b>Severe Housing Problems*</b>	<b>Has one or more of four housing problems</b>	<b>Has none of the four housing problems</b>	<b>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</b>
Black / African American	0	0	0
Asian	10	20	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	40	70	0

**Table 21 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

\*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities,
2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities,
3. More than 1.5 persons per room,
4. Cost Burden over 50%

## Discussion

Within the 0-30% HAMFI income band, Black/African Americans and American Indian/Alaska Native households have a disproportionate share of severe housing problems, though not markedly greater than within the jurisdiction as a whole. The number of racial groups in this situation is due primarily to the hardships associated with living within the 0-30% income band, and are not significantly greater than those experienced by all households in this income bracket.

Hispanic and Black/African American households experience the most severe housing problems within the 30-50% HAMFI income group, at a rate significantly higher than this income group as a whole. American Indian/Alaska Native and White households bear the most disproportionate housing needs in the next highest income group (50-80% HAMFI) but the incidence registers at about the same proportion experienced by the community as a whole.

Within the 80-100% income band, Hispanic and Asian households have a markedly greater share of severe housing problems than other racial groups in this income bracket, at about five times the rate of the community as a whole.

Overall, the most severe housing needs are disproportionately experienced by Hispanic and Asian households.

## NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

### Introduction

#### Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	12,380	4,235	3,365	145
White	11,260	3,765	2,925	130
Black / African American	70	15	35	0
Asian	138	64	10	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	74	39	35	0
Pacific Islander	10	0	0	0
Hispanic	520	230	250	15

**Table 22 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI**

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

### Discussion

Racial groups that have the lowest housing cost burden include White, Asian and Pacific Islander households, with Pacific Islanders enjoying the lowest cost burden of all. Groups with a moderate housing cost burden (paying 30-50% of income) are predominately American Indian/Alaska Native and Hispanic households, although their cost burden is not significantly greater than that experienced across the jurisdiction as a whole. Households with a severe housing cost burden are concentrated among Black/African American households—at almost twice the rate within the jurisdiction—followed by Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native households, which occur at rates about 50% higher than other racial/ethnic groups.

Overall, cost burdens are borne disproportionately by Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native and Black/African American households.

## **NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion - 91.205 (b)(2)**

### **Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?**

Within the 0-30% income bracket, Black/African American and American Indian/Alaska Native populations have disproportionately higher rates of moderate to severe housing problems than other racial or ethnic groups.

For the 30-50% bracket, Hispanics and Black/African American households experience the greatest disproportionate share of housing problems.

Within the 50-80% income bracket, American Indian/Alaska Natives bear the greatest needs, followed by Asian households.

The 80-100% bracket shows a disproportionate housing need among Hispanic and Asian households.

### **If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?**

Focus group participants representing local service and housing agencies indicated that the Hispanic community presents needs for behavioral health services and housing stability. The identification of this ethnic group may be due to its predominance within a relatively small proportion of the general population. Our community is slowly growing in diversity. Hispanics now represent 7.9% of the overall population, while minorities as a whole represent 14.2% of the population.

### **Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?**

Census Tracts 3, 5.01 and 5.02 have the greatest concentrations of minority populations. These areas are also known as Tenant Way area, the St. Helens neighborhood, and the Highlands. These areas lie along the southern quadrant of the city, adjacent to the industrial waterfront. This swath of the city was originally planned as a residential area for the workers employed in the adjacent industries, which were, at the time of the city's establishment, also concentrated with minority populations.

**NA-35 Public Housing - 91.405, 91.205 (b)**

**Introduction**

**Totals in Use**

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	33	100	1,479	66	1,381	10	0	3

**Table 23 - Public Housing by Program Type**

**\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

KHA owns two public housing complexes; both have been renovated within the past decade and are in good condition; however, they have identified \$1,321,800 in needed capital improvements. Annual HUD funding is available to meet capital needs, with \$516,461 awarded since 2010 for renovations for 50 units of family housing at Kelso Homes located on 10th Street, and 50 units of housing for seniors at Cowlitz Villa on Grade Street, providing an average of \$5,165 per unit.

There are five basic types of housing vouchers issued by HUD that assist households with housing costs. The vast majority are Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, which allow a tenant to select their own rental unit. The types of vouchers that may be administered by a local housing authority include:

- Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)– assigned to a particular tenant/household and can be used wherever landlords accept it for housing that meets quality standards;
- Project-Based Section 8 Vouchers – dedicated to a specific housing unit, regardless of occupant;
- Non-Elderly Disabled (NEDS) – targeted to disabled householders under age 62;
- Mainstream Vouchers – intended to assist disabled households regardless of age of householder; and
- Family Reunification Vouchers – for families working with Division of Families and Children under a plan to prevent high costs of out-of-home placement.

There is a total of 1,628 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers available between Longview and Kelso Housing Authorities. Of these, 1,394 are assigned to LHA throughout a four-county service area and 281 are administered by KHA within the City of Kelso. The charts that follow provide data regarding the usage of these vouchers at the time of reporting. Not all vouchers are filled at any given point in time; therefore, they will not include 100% of the vouchers available within the Consortium. Vouchers available within the Consortium area are allocated for the purposes outlined above.

### Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# Homeless at admission	0	4	3	45	0	40	5	0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	0	40	277	49	224	1	0
# of Disabled Families	0	22	33	736	4	716	3	0
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	33	100	1,479	66	1,381	10	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 24 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

**Race of Residents**

Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	32	90	1,405	65	1,309	10	0	3
Black/African American	0	0	1	28	0	28	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	1	7	21	1	20	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	2	5	0	4	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**\*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

**Table 25 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)



## Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	0	4	45	3	42	0	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	33	96	1,434	63	1,339	10	0	3
<b>*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition</b>									

**Table 26 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

**Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:**

While the PIC data indicates that 49.1% of PHA households are disabled, and that 100% of PHA households have requested some sort of accessible feature for their living unit, this does not correlate to specific requests for accessible units. LHA states that their agency has not had many requests specifically for an accessible unit. When prospective tenants are invited for an apartment, LHA may install minor reasonable accommodations such as ADA toilet or grab bars in the bathroom. Some need a unit with an elevator, or have service animals. Some have caregivers that visit often, while a very few have live-in caregivers. Many take advantage of the government cell phone program and have participated in a free dental clinic.

Homeless veterans waiting on project-based assistance face many challenges. The Veteran’s Integration Program provides outreach and case management for homeless veterans before and after they move in. LHA provides reasonable accommodations such as waiver of qualifying criteria (such as a bad rental/credit history) or service animals. Many of these tenants take advantage of transportation, help with move-in expenses, and donations of furniture and housewares while participating in interim programs that lead to a VASH or Section 8 Housing Choice voucher.

Consultation with LHA staff revealed that people on the waiting list need affordable housing, assistance with deposits, and can benefit from “preferred renter” education. Consultation with KHA staff indicated that demand for accessible units far outstrips the supply.

**What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?**

LHA statistics on waiting lists for rent assistance programs for 2/1/2014 indicate that (for Cowlitz County):

- 973 on the waiting list for Housing Choice Voucher
- 14 on the waiting list for Project Based Vouchers
- 458 on the waiting list for Non-Elderly, Disabled (Category 1) Housing Choice Vouchers
- 130 on the waiting list for Mod Rehab/Project-Based Assistance

There are 1,780 persons in 846 households on the full LHA waiting list, which serves a four-county area. Approximately 1,575 of these are within Cowlitz County. According to PIC data, only 143 vouchers turned over during the past 12 months, and are available for re-assignment. At this rate, it would take six years to serve every household currently on the waiting list, assuming they meet all PHA qualifications. Characteristics of these households are:

- 846 households on the wait list;
- Just under half (49.3%) are eligible for a one-bedroom unit;
- Almost three-fourths of these households are headed by a female;
- 10% are elderly, and 20% are “near elderly” (near 62);
- About 15% are “other adults”;
- One-third are disabled or have a family member with a disability;
- One-third of those on the waiting list are children in families (672 children out of 1,780 persons);
- 76% are of the White race; 3% are American Indian/Alaska Native, 2.5% are Black households, 1.3% are Asian and less than 1% are Pacific Islander; 2% are Hispanic; and
- 49 families on the waiting list have a local preference; 25 of these are from Phoenix House (parents in addiction recovery).

KHA has 900 households on the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher waiting list. Around two-thirds are families. 83% are White households, 7% are Black households, 3% are American Indian/Alaska Native, 1.3% are Pacific Islander less than 1% are Asian; 5% are of Hispanic origin.

There are 444 households on the Cowlitz Villa waiting list for 50 units of elderly/disabled public housing. These include:

- 111 elderly households; most qualify for a studio or one-bedroom unit
- 253 disabled households who qualify for a studio or one-bedroom unit
- 80 family households seeking studio or one-bedroom units

Some households are included on multiple KHA waiting lists. For all waiting lists combined:

- 516 households are waiting for a one-bedroom housing unit; about half of these are disabled households.
- 335 households are on the list for 2-bedroom units; 75% are family households
- 136 households are on the 3-bedroom wait list; 84% of these are families
- 36 households are waiting for a 4-bedroom unit; 83% are families and the remainder are disabled

Agency housing providers have identified the most immediate needs as: rental deposits, maintaining rental assistance to maintain stable housing, and gaining the skills and ability to become self-sufficient. This includes skills such as job training, education (GED or high school completion) money management skills and case management.

### **How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large**

The types of needs identified as applicable to households served by the public housing authority are very similar to those of households in general within the population. Poverty, income, educational attainment, behavioral health, domestic violence and similar indicators of community need cross much of the population within Cowlitz County and the Longview-Kelso urban area.

Three community meetings were held to identify housing needs of the general population, particularly those of low and moderate incomes. The following needs were prioritized by community residents attending these meetings:

Highlands:

- Emergency shelter & transitional housing for homeless persons
- Affordable rental housing/Fair housing education
- Housing for people with disabilities
- Homeowner maintenance program
- Weatherization improvements
- Rental assistance & security deposits

Communitywide Meeting (Longview):

- Transitional housing for homeless
- Senior Housing
- Affordable rental housing/fair housing education
- Cottage housing for appropriate groups, e.g. seniors, special needs, ethnic preference, work/live units
- Rental assistance
- Information on programs for “aging in place” (website, contacts)

Kelso:

- Affordable rental housing/fair housing education
- Senior housing
- Emergency shelters for homeless
- Down payment/closing cost assistance
- Rental assistance

According to LHA and KHA staff, many households on the public housing waiting lists have no money or not enough resources; no home; some have addictions, some are physically and emotionally damaged, some have no support systems; many have little education; and many have a terrible credit history. These needs correlate with the information above, regarding multiple needs of low income households.

**Discussion**

The Longview-Kelso community is characterized by chronic under- and unemployment due to over-reliance on a resource-based economy. This makes housing affordability an issue for a relatively larger share of households. The waiting list for housing assistance outstrips the supply of housing vouchers. The demographic data provided in the tables populated by PIC data also indicates that Hispanic and “Other” races are disproportionately underserved by public housing resources within Cowlitz County.

## **NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (c)**

### **Introduction:**

#### **Homeless**

- (1) Individuals and families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence and includes a subset for an individual who resided in an emergency shelter or a place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided;
- (2) Individuals and families who will imminently lose their primary nighttime residence;
- (3) Unaccompanied youth and families with children and youth who are defined as homeless under other federal statutes who do not otherwise qualify as homeless under this definition;
- (4) Individuals and families who are fleeing, or are attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence against the individual or a family member.

#### **“At-Risk” of Homelessness:**

Cowlitz County has reassessed its homeless prevention programs and has determined that strategic targeting of resources to those considered to be at the highest risk of homelessness is necessary in order to maximize resources. These criteria include:

- Income at 30% of area median household income for singles; up to 50% of median for families with children
- A trigger crisis
- No resources or viable plan to resolve the crisis
- A reasonable expectation for a sustainable resolution

## Homeless Youth

The “No Child Left Behind” Act as well as the 1987 McKinney Homeless Assistance Act require local school districts to assist homeless students and their families to meet transportation needs in order to continue attending school. School bus runs are scheduled to include stops at local homeless shelters when a student is staying there. School buses may also pick up students at designated locations when a homeless family is staying with family or friends. This latter situation is also known as “doubling up” or “couch surfing.” An annual count of homeless students is required by the McKinney-Vento Act. In addition, schools must provide any services needed by homeless students to ensure equal access to all programs and services that non-homeless students can receive. This includes special education, tutoring, and other programs.

The attached chart indicates the number of school-aged children who were homeless during the 2012-2013 school year. The number of unsheltered (21) and those staying in hotels/motels (25) mostly represents an addition to the data displayed regarding the 2013 count of homeless persons.

School District	Shelters	Doubled Up	Unsheltered	Hotels/Motels	Total
Castle Rock	0	66	12	0	78
Kalama	0	27	0	0	27
Kelso	45	158	1	4	208
Longview	31	204	1	14	250
Toutle Lake	0	32	1	0	33
Woodland	2	26	6	7	41
TOTAL	78	513	21	25	637

**Table 27 - Homeless Youth; Source: Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction, 2012-2013 Academic Yr.**

## Description of the Homeless System

### Prevention

The majority of persons seeking homelessness prevention assistance need funds to avoid eviction from their home, including securing housing either through first and last month’s rent, or a security deposit. Assistance to single adults has historically been very limited in mainstream

service programs as well as homeless assistance. Those who are temporarily disabled may receive a housing stipend through Housing & Essential Needs (HEN); long-term disabled persons may obtain SSI/SSDI benefits, which are typically difficult to access. The ability to pay fair market rent is most difficult for low-income, disabled persons who are most affected by the rental cost burden.

Prevention is the most cost-effective, least disruptive method of providing services for homeless families. Prevention activities can take many forms, but Cowlitz homeless rental programs target households that are most at-risk of becoming homeless. Examples of prevention activities include rental assistance, utility assistance, eviction prevention assistance and landlord/tenant mediation. Other private agencies also provide assistance with basic necessities, such as food and limited medical assistance that help people avoid homelessness.

**Situations Preceding Homelessness**

The chart below illustrates the circumstances immediately preceding homeless by individuals and households in Cowlitz County, as indicated from the Point in Time Count. Prevention is important in reducing the incidence of homelessness. Social services and emergency interventions will remain critical to this effort.

<b>Circumstance</b>	<b>Individuals</b>
Drug and Alcohol Use	50
Job Lost	54
Temp. Living Situation Ended	19
Domestic Violence	55
Family Breakup	69
Mental illness	42
Conviction	14
Medical/Health Problems	16
Lack of Job Skills	10
Eviction	47
Discharge from Institution/Jail	7



Medical Costs	7
Primary Economic Reasons	114
Lack of Child Care	1
Language Barrier	5
Other	60
TOTAL CONTRIBUTING FACTORS	570

**Table 28 - Situations Preceding Homelessness**

### **Outreach**

Outreach is an essential part of the local homeless system. Outreach workers are often the first point-of-contact between homeless individuals and social service providers. They seek out homeless members of our community, talk to them about the type of social services they might need, and encourage them to get help. The PATH program has one full-time outreach worker funded through the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Mental Health Division. This worker is housed within Lower Columbia Mental Health. Love Overwhelming is another homeless service provider who provides outreach, typically to those who are chronically homeless, through the Daily Living Essentials Café, HOPE Shelter, and beginning in 2014, implementation of the Coordinated Entry & Assessment Center, which will serve as a “one-stop” location to access housing services. Lower Columbia CAP conducts outreach through the Low Barrier Housing case worker, who identifies high users of public services for permanent supportive housing.

### **Emergency Shelter**

The Emergency Support Shelter is a women’s domestic violence shelter located in Kelso which can house 36 persons. The Community House on Broadway serves single men, single women, and families and can house up to 90 at a time, not including winter overflow capacity in the lobby. Love Overwhelming has operated a barrier-free shelter over the past year at several temporary locations. They are seeking a permanent location to provide a day-time drop in center/urban rest stop, barrier free shelter, and coordinated entry and assessment into the homeless system. Severe weather shelter opens on a temporary basis and is typically operated by Mountain Ministries at Kelso Assembly of God, although this is an informal arrangement.

### **Transitional Housing**

Transitional Housing is housing with a rental subsidy combined with support services. Families or individuals usually remain in transitional housing for one to two years. Much of the Cowlitz Transitional Housing inventory has been eliminated in recent years, as the Continuum of Care/Homeless Coalition moves more towards a “housing first” approach. Longview operates nine units of transitional housing for people who have been living on the street; this housing is available in two-week increments based on program participation. Country Run Apartments in Kelso has reserved 20 units for people exiting homelessness and also assists with cost of providing case management services to this population.

### **Permanent Supportive Housing with Homelessness Criteria**

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) typically has no limit on length of stay. Supportive services are available on an as-needed basis, but are not mandated. The Phoenix House is funded as permanent supportive housing with 20 units for parents who are recovering from addiction. Participants who exit or “graduate” the program are eligible for a permanent Section 8 housing choice voucher through Longview Housing Authority, because the development is supported through project-based vouchers, which require assignment of a housing choice voucher upon exit. The Chinook Apartments offer 21 single-room occupancy units operated by Kelso Housing Authority under a HUD Shelter + Care grant aimed at people who are homeless and need mental health support. Longview Housing Authority also manages 25 HUD VASH vouchers for veterans to provide permanent supportive housing across a four-county area, with services provided by the Veterans Administration (VA).

### **Strategies to Eliminate Chronic Homelessness**

Cowlitz County Homeless providers are moving towards adaption of a “Housing First” approach to deal with chronic street homelessness to meet the needs of the hardest-to-serve. Lower Columbia CAP operates a 6 bed group home for chronically homeless individuals who are high utilizers of public services. Love Overwhelming operates the Daily Living Essentials Café and the HOPE Shelter which primarily serves people who are chronically homeless. An important next step is to expand the number of permanent supportive housing units available to chronically homeless persons.

### **Assessment of Gaps**

During the development of the 2011 update to the Cowlitz County Ten Year Plan, the following gaps were identified and transferred into service priorities for the Cowlitz Housing First! Coalition:

1. Gaps in Populations Served:

- a) Chronically Homeless
- b) People with Multiple/High Service Needs
- c) People Exiting Institutions
- d) Homeless Youth

2. Gaps in Services:

- a) Landlord Incentive Program
- b) Single Point of Entry/Assessment Tool
- c) SOAR Program
- d) Extreme Weather Shelter
- e) Low Barrier Housing & Services
- f) Housing Retention Team
- g) Life Skills Training
- h) Urban Rest Stop
- i) Discharge/Reentry Program
- j) Interim Housing

3. Gaps in the Continuum of Care:

- a) Long-term Rental Assistance
- b) Permanent Supportive Housing
- c) Affordable Housing
- d) Behavioral Health Services

Contracts have been issued to fill a prioritized list of projects and activities intended to fill these gaps. Since 2011, all but two activities have been funded to fill gaps in services. Partnerships with local housing authorities have been explored to identify sources of long-term rental assistance and affordable housing. These resources have been targeted to specific populations that do not reflect the un/underserved populations identified in the gaps analysis. The Affordable Care Act will help with making behavioral health services more accessible to homeless persons, but will not be adequate for high needs populations.

**Discharge Coordination Policies**

Individuals who are members of special populations receive support at discharge from institutional settings as they return to community living in Cowlitz County. The Southwest Washington Regional Support Network (RSN) provides transition to people with mental illness who are discharged from state treatment. St. John Medical Center coordinates with shelters and case managers for the discharge of persons who are homeless. The Washington Department of Corrections provides case management for ex-offenders who have earned early release and 90 days of housing assistance. The Cowlitz County Jail typically has around 35 inmates booked in as homeless at any given time. It is hoped that the Coordinated Intake Center, operational in 2014, will provide additional interim support to prevent discharge into homelessness.

Facility	Individual	Family Beds	Total Beds
Emergency Shelters			
Community House on Broadway (Longview)	80	10	90
Emergency Support Shelter (Kelso)	0	36	36
Hope Center - barrier free shelter	25	0	25
Vet Shelter	6	0	6
SUBTOTAL	111	46	157
Transitional Housing			

Country Run Apartments	0	52	52
4 the Long View	18	0	18
SUBTOTAL	18	52	70
Permanent Supportive Housing			
Phoenix House (Kelso)	0	40	40
Chinook Apartments	21	0	21
Vet VASH Vouchers	25	0	25
SUBTOTAL	46	40	86
TOTAL	175	138	313

**Table 29 - Inventory of Homeless Facilities & Housing Resources**

**If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):**

**Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)**

<b>Race:</b>	<b>Sheltered:</b>	<b>Unsheltered (optional)</b>
White	0	0
Black or African American	95	0
Asian	5	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	53	0
Pacific Islander	12	0
<b>Ethnicity:</b>	<b>Sheltered:</b>	<b>Unsheltered (optional)</b>
Hispanic	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0

Data Source  
Comments:

**Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.**

The 2013 Point In Time Count identified 169 persons in households with children who were doubled up with friends and family and 33 homeless youth who were doubled up. This represents 46.4% of all persons who were doubled up or at risk of homelessness. Most of these households will not enter the homeless system. Prevention rental assistance will be more targeted to high-risk households most likely to become homeless, beginning in 2014.

There were 52 people in 14 households who were living in emergency shelter during the 2013 count and 90 people in 29 transitional housing units. These households likely would benefit from some level of housing assistance to help them exit the homeless system and achieve stability. This represents a total of 43 sheltered households with children in need of housing assistance. Some of these could easily be families with a veteran. There were 24 sheltered homeless veterans and 16 unsheltered homeless veterans. Most of these households are single individuals who do not meet the question criteria, but who could nevertheless benefit from housing assistance. There were also two families with eight individuals who were living out of doors, and who could benefit from housing assistance.

If the homeless households are summed together and multiplied by a factor of 2.14, which is the methodology employed by Washington State Department of Commerce to obtain a year-round estimate of need, then there are approximately 96 households with children (sheltered and unsheltered homeless) over the course of a year that would benefit from housing assistance.

**Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.**

## **Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.**

Families with children comprise approximately 46.5% of the homeless population in Cowlitz County, but they represent 58.0% of the sheltered homeless, which indicates a local emphasis on sheltering and housing families. Most of the sheltered families are in transitional housing programs. In 2013, this population was 142 persons in 43 households.

Childless adults (either singles or couples) represent 53.5% of the homeless population, but represent only 42.0% of the sheltered population. In 2013 this population was 103 persons in 99 households. About 40% of homeless adults are unsheltered and living on the streets. Singles represent the overwhelming majority of unsheltered homeless, at 89.6% (69 persons in 2013) while only 9.4% of persons in families were unsheltered (eight persons in two households). The majority of people considered at-risk of homelessness (doubled up) are also adults.

### **Discussion:**

The 2010 Cowlitz Homeless Housing Needs Study identified a need for:

- 249 units of permanent supportive housing for disabled homeless persons.
- 51 units of transitional housing to serve people in addiction recovery, ex-offenders, and youth housing.
- 555 units of affordable housing.

## NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (b,d)

### Introduction

#### **Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:**

The chart below indicates the number of persons who receive publicly funded services for special needs, due to their income or life circumstance. About 8.2% of the Longview population needed behavioral health services during FY 2012, the latest data available. Kelso had a higher usage rate for behavioral health, at 11.2% of the population. Support for developmental disabilities is needed for about 1.3% of the population, for vocational rehabilitation it averages around 0.5%, while aging/senior services are provided to approximately 2% of the general population. By far the most utilized public services are economic services (about half the population of Longview and two-thirds the population of Kelso) and medical assistance (about one-third of Longview's population and 44% of Kelso's).

#### DSHS Services by Category FY 2012

Longview Programs: (Population: 36,580)

Alcohol & Substance Abuse: 672 clients (1.8%); \$1,457,210 dollars spent; \$2,168 per client.

Developmental Disabilities: 457 clients (1.2%); \$7,514,874 dollars spent; \$16,444 per client.

Mental Health Services: 2,332 clients (6.4%); \$7,549,441 dollars spent; \$3,237 per client.

Aging & Adult Services: 845 clients (2.3%); \$15,175,839 dollars spent; \$17,960 per client.

Vocational Rehabilitation: 177 clients (0.5%); \$337,550 dollars spent; \$1,339 per client.

Medical Assistance: 13,060 clients (35.7%)

Economic Services: 18,987 clients (51.9%); \$25,423,422 dollars spent; \$1,339 per client.

Juvenile Rehabilitation: 33 clients (0.1%); \$421,509 dollars spent; \$12,773 per client.

Kelso Programs: (Population: 11,810)



Alcohol & Substance Abuse: 348 clients (2.9%); \$812,473 dollars spent; \$2,335 per client.

Developmental Disabilities: 149 clients (1.3%); \$2,140,689 dollars spent; \$14,367 per client.

Mental Health Services: 985 clients (8.3%); \$4,632,895 dollars spent; \$4,703 per client.

Aging & Adult Services: 172 clients (1.5%) \$2,571,020 dollars spent; \$14,948 per client.

Vocational Rehabilitation: 78 clients (0.7%); \$137,006 dollars spent; \$1,756 per client.

Medical Assistance: 5,173 clients (43.8%)

Economic Services: 7,783 clients (65.9%); \$10,771,412 dollars spent; \$1,384 per client.

Juvenile Rehabilitation: 7 clients (0.1%); \$73,217 dollars spent; \$10,460 per client.

### **What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?**

DSHS conducts assessments to determine needs for the supportive services described above. During a focus group of area service and housing providers, several needs of these populations were identified and are described below.

- Vulnerable people can become targets for others.
- ADA compliance in housing units for physically disabled.
- Housing availability for registered sex offenders.
- Landlords who are willing to work with clients with bad tenant/credit histories.
- Legal issues that present barriers to housing and services.
- People with a high risk condition or dual diagnosis may not qualify for disability but are unable to work, though they have the same housing needs and fewer resources.
- Employment services for special populations that are tailored to meet their needs.

### **Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:**

As of October 31, 2013 there were a total of 93 individuals living with HIV/AIDS in Cowlitz County. Of those, 75% are in poverty and a total of 50 residents receive services from Evergreen Wellness Advocates under Medical Case Management and 80% of those receive Food Stamps through DSHS. Five individuals are single parent households that include more than ten children. Out of the 50 residents reported by Evergreen Wellness Advocates, only eight residents are not permanently housed or homeless. In general, due to a client's health needs, they may not be able to maintain their housing, medications, and health care due to their limited income. Overall, a majority of the clients served by

Evergreen were white (74%) followed by White Hispanic and More than one race (8%), and American Indian/ Alaskan Native (4%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (4%) and Asian (2%). A majority of those residents are between 45-64 years of age followed by 25-44 years. Eight new clients entered into Evergreen.

- 28 at or below the Poverty Level
- 16 were 101-200% of the Poverty Level
- 6 were 201-300% Poverty Level
- 42 stably housed with 6 receiving TBRA

**Discussion:**

## **NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)**

### **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:**

Community meetings were held to gather ideas and identify needs.

#### Highlands:

- Emergency Shelters & Transitional Housing – Highlands
- Neighborhood-based Health Clinic – Highlands
- Archie Anderson Park – Community Center

#### Community-wide:

- Emergency Shelters and transitional housing for homeless
- Covered basketball areas
- Restrooms with showers in parks

#### Kelso:

- Emergency Shelters for homeless

#### Agency Input:

- Community House - new community space
- Youth shelter
- Emergency Shelters
- Highlands Community Center – community building
- Habitat for Humanity location in Kelso

### **How were these needs determined?**

Community meetings were held to gather ideas and identify needs. Residents were asked to brainstorm community needs, and then given a set of markers to identify their top five priorities. Those with the highest overall scores are presented. Agency input was secured during an all-day series of focus groups with area housing and service providers. They were asked for their ideas, based upon working knowledge of the population they serve.

### **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:**

Community meetings were held to gather ideas and identify needs.

Highlands:

- Street lighting throughout the neighborhood
- Sidewalk repair

Community-wide:

- Trails along dikes

Kelso:

- Crosswalk markings
- Community center – multi-purpose
- Sidewalk repairs

Agency input:

Longview:

- Water, sewer and sidewalk improvements along California Way and Industrial Way area
- County fairgrounds improvements (parking area) consistent with Fairgrounds Master Plan
- Parking along Civic Circle
- Downtown Longview streetscape projects - using arts as economic development tool
- Façade Improvement program
- Infrastructure for bicyclists and complete streets, citywide

Kelso:

- Sidewalks, curbs and gutters in Kelso's residential areas
- Replacement of Kelso's aging water and sewer infrastructure
- Roadway improvements in Kelso
- Restroom facilities in downtown Kelso
- Senior center
- Community Center/central meeting place
- Curb cutouts for accessibility
- West Kelso area improvements
- South Kelso revitalization
- Façade Improvement Program for downtown

**How were these needs determined?**

Community meetings were held to gather ideas and identify needs. Residents were asked to brainstorm community needs, and then given a set of markers to identify their top five priorities. Those with the highest overall scores are presented. Agency input was secured during an all-day series of focus groups with area housing and service providers. They were asked for their ideas, based upon working knowledge of the population they serve. Kelso city staff provided input for Kelso community development needs.

### **Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:**

#### Highlands Community Input:

- Mental health & addiction treatment
- After-school programs
- Job training & readiness programs

#### Community-wide:

- Mental health & addiction treatment
- Affordable childcare
- Transportation services
- Job readiness training
- Information coordination/dissemination to those who need it

#### Kelso:

- Mental health & addiction treatment
- Affordable childcare
- Job training

#### Agency Input:

- Increased public transit
- Assistance with housing search, mediation, communication between tenant and landlords
- Case management
- Food deserts for seniors, lack of neighborhood markets and transportation to markets
- Services to assist businesses for low cost entry; i.e. farmers' markets, pop-up shops, food trucks; legal infrastructure; land use capability
- Mentoring infrastructure
- Seniors- coordination of services between senior services, meal services, Project Read computer literacy for seniors, RSVP/SCORE- marketing of services

- Money Start curriculum for Older Adults/Vulnerable Adults
- Frail elderly- Additional support/respite for caregivers
- Caregiving to persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental, HIV/AIDS)
- Behavioral health services (mental health and addiction)

### **How were these needs determined?**

Community meetings were held to gather ideas and identify needs. Residents were asked to brainstorm community needs, and then given a set of markers to identify their top five priorities. Those with the highest overall scores are presented. Agency input was secured during an all-day series of focus groups with area housing and service providers. They were asked for their ideas, based upon working knowledge of the population they serve.