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ABSTRACT
The issue of homelessness among youth today is a phenomenon that is not sufficiently acknowledged. However, it is too important to ignore. This study examines homelessness among youth in Duluth, MN, served by Life House, Inc. in the past year. The study consisted of two parts: 1) Secondary analysis of data collected through Life House housing programs; and 2) Structured interviews of youth currently utilizing resources through Life House and who had, at one time, experienced homelessness. Females and youth with minority backgrounds were over-represented in the study. The study identified a need for more affordable housing, transitional housing, and housing services to serve this vulnerable population, and to prevent the spread of long-term homelessness or chronic homelessness.

Introduction

Problem Statement
Homelessness among youth aged 16 to 21 years, in Duluth, Minnesota, appears to be a growing trend. Homeless youth seek housing services there from Life House, Inc., a non-profit organization providing housing, employment and education, teen parent education and support, mental and chemical health case management and outreach, and drop-in services; they not only face personal barriers to secure and maintain permanent housing, but they also face legislative barriers to receive necessary housing services and/or funding to assist them in obtaining housing. In order for them to get their lives back on track, homeless youth must first achieve permanent housing, because it provides a stable foundation on which to rebuild their lives. Today federal, state, and local programs, which provide funding to agencies serving the homeless population, set specific eligibility guidelines according to their definition of what is meant by “homeless.” Since 2002, the guidelines affecting who may receive “homeless” services have been narrowed considerably, eliminating many local youth who did not strictly fit the new standards.

Because of these legislative and budget reforms/changes, Life House, Inc. has lost approximately two hundred twenty thousand dollars in funding for programs assisting youth in obtaining housing stability. In addition, two entire housing programs through Life House - the Circle of Safety, and the Tenant-Landlord Liaison Programs - have been lost (Rachel Kincade, personal communication, 8-21-06). While Ms. Kincade also noted that funding was slowly returning, it has usually been attached to conditions requiring the development of new programs to fit the new funding dollars. Obtaining funding for maintenance of existing programs has been extremely difficult in this fiscal climate for many non-profit programs; with the homeless youth programs; however, this unstable and ever-shifting funding has been especially problematic. Youth just start to trust and utilize a program consistently after two to three years, and then the funding base is often cut when a program cannot maintain fiscal sustainability. This constant turnover in programming and personnel makes it harder for programs to serve homeless youth consistently.

Description of Problem Background:
“In the 1990s, Minnesota saw a significant increase in youth ages 12 to 21 seeking protective services because they had no parental, substitute, or foster homes to which they could safely go. According to the most recent data, these numbers have yet to decline” (Hooks Wayman 2006). However, funding for these services has been cut over the past few years, a movement causing a loss in shelter beds
and housing options. Recent cuts and losses in federal, state, and local funding have resulted in the disappearance of 16 shelter beds, 137 youth apartments (supportive housing units), and 48 fulltime youth case workers. It is typically assumed that youth who are homeless are able to find shelter, yet most shelters in Minnesota report turning youth away in winter due to lack of capacity for the demand (Hooks Wayman, 2006).

It has been reported, for many, that homelessness is a result of a crisis, a lack of income and a lack of affordable housing that leads to a loss of stable housing that can be overcome with time. The patterns of homelessness vary by duration or recurrence: 1) Crisis or temporary homelessness is the first episode of homelessness lasting a short time, usually less than a year; 2) Episodic homelessness is the second or third experience of homelessness lasting less than a year; and 3) Long-term or “chronic” homelessness is four or more episodes of homelessness within three years or a current episode of homelessness lasting a year or more (Working Group on Long-Term Homelessness, 2004). (For a representation of the ways in which an individual falls down the “homelessness spiral” see Appendix A.)

By passing the McKinney-Vento Act in 1987, federal legislators made initial efforts to respond to the complex issue of homelessness and its many causes. It was an official recognition by the federal government that there is “no single, simple solution to the crisis of homelessness” and of their “clear responsibility and an existing capacity to fulfill a more effective and responsible role to meet the basic human needs and to engender respect for the human dignity of the homeless” (Working Group on Long-Term Homelessness, 2004). Today, the McKinney – Vento Act works to lower the growing level of homelessness with emergency shelter, transitional housing, job training, primary health care, education and some permanent housing programs administered through The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (Minnesota Coalition for the Homeless, 2001). (For the current homeless definition guidelines for participants to enter into programs funded with 2005 grants under the McKinney-Vento Act, please see Appendix B.)

Today the complex circumstances surrounding an individual’s homelessness are resulting into programs with complex funding guidelines because of the many variations on “Who is homeless?” and “Who has the most need?” Revitalized by President Bush in 2002 and under the leadership of Executive Director Philip F. Mangano, the mission of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness has been to develop and implement a comprehensive national strategy to end chronic homelessness in the United States through interagency, intergovernmental, and intercommunity collaborations. In its initiatives, the council has partnered with federal, state, and local government, advocates, providers, and consumers to:

- Eliminate chronic homelessness within 10 years through the development and implementation of jurisdictional 10-year plans.
- Undertake prevention and intervention, using evidence-based and results-orientated approaches.
- Collaborate at the interagency, intra-agency, and intergovernmental levels.
- Identify innovation driven by data, research, and consumer preference, leading to performance-based outcomes.
- Access mainstream resources for the benefit of homeless persons and families (United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, 2005).

The recent initiatives have been designed to address a great need - chronic homelessness - but have caused programs to veer away from serving temporarily or episodically homeless individuals. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has defined chronic homelessness as “an unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more OR has had at least four (4) episodes of homelessness in the past three (3) years. To be considered chronically homeless, persons must have been sleeping in a place not meant for habitation (on the streets) or in an emergency homeless shelter during that time” (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005). A “disabling condition” has been defined by HUD as: “a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions” (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005).
This has meant that to receive services, a 16 to 21 year-old must first experience a series of traumatizing events. Many homeless youths have stayed with friends or participated in survival sex just to stay away from the streets or homeless shelters; this has put them into the category where they are considered to be “doubled-up,” not “homeless.” Because there are constant additions or changes to legal rules and eligibility for funds for homeless services, the service array for the homeless population is ambiguous, and the programs’ and services’ target populations and goals are constantly changing as well. Too often younger homeless people are falling through these regulatory and definitional cracks (Rachel Kincade, personal communication, 7-6-06).

Even if these regulatory barriers could be addressed on behalf of these youth, their personal issues have also created barriers for them in attaining permanent housing. Since 1991, every three years, the Wilder Research Center has conducted a statewide cross-sectional survey of people who are homeless or living in temporary housing programs in Minnesota. The most recent survey, recorded October 23, 2003, stated the following about Minnesota’s homeless youth:

- Thirty-eight percent had been homeless before;
- Sixteen percent had no regular place to live for more than a year;
- Thirty-eight percent had a relative who also did not have housing;
- Thirteen percent stayed in a abusive situation because they did not have other housing options;
- Thirty-four percent have considered suicide and of that number, 67% have attempted suicide;
- Forty-two percent report some type of significant mental health problem;
- Forty-six percent have been physically or sexually mistreated; thirty-eight percent physically abused; and twenty-eight percent sexually abused;
- Thirty percent had experienced parental neglect;
- Nineteen percent had been in alcohol or drug treatment;
- Fourteen percent had problems following a head injury;
- Ten percent had traded sex for shelter, food, clothing etc. (13% of girls and 4% of boys);
- Seventy-one percent had experienced placement in a foster home, group home, or corrections facility; and
- Thirty-four percent had runaway from placement (Wilder, 2003).

There have been numerous previous studies conducted about homelessness which have gathered population characteristics and statistics; many program evaluations have been designed to address the growing homeless population.

Research Purpose and Rationale:

This study differed from other recent studies because it concentrated on the experiences of youth served by a specific agency in Duluth, Minnesota. The specific research questions for this study were:

1) How have the changes since 2002 in federal legislation and related state, county, and city budget decision-making impacted housing services/programs for homeless youth aged 16 to 21 years who are served by Life House, Inc. in Duluth, Minnesota?

2) What have been the barriers to achieving and maintaining permanent housing experienced by Duluth homeless youth aged 16 to 21 served by Life House, Inc., in Duluth, Minnesota?

The study was designed to examine these questions, firstly by analyzing Life House data on youth served during July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006, and secondly, by interviewing youth served about the barriers they experienced in achieving permanent housing.

**Research Design**

**Secondary Analysis Sample**

The secondary analysis sample included all clients who received services July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 from Life House, Inc. housing programs; this included 77 total youths in three programs. They were both male and female and ranged in age from 16 to 22. There were 30 youths who identified themselves...
as ethnic or racial minorities, and twenty-eight youths were noted as having disabilities. Of the 77 clients, there were 65 (84%) who identified themselves as currently homeless.

The sample was the equivalent of a probability sample, because it included all persons available during the time frame under consideration. The sample was specifically selected to provide substantial information on population characteristics, circumstances leading to homelessness, and eligibility of individuals for services. The data was collected through the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). It was collected with the assistance of a licensed HMIS user on the Life House staff who facilitated the gathering of data. The data included characteristics collected from an individual’s client profile, universal assessment, and the accessed program assessment. Because of the set time period, the findings were generalizable only to that time period and did not represent anyone served in another time frame. No data was recorded in a manner that would identify a specific Life House housing client.

**Interview Sample**

This sample used 20 youths who were interviewed using a semi-structured interview format. There were seven males and 13 females, aged 16 to 21, who were currently being served by Life House, Inc. Half of the sample identified themselves as ethnic or racial minorities, and some youths identified themselves as having mental or chemical health issues. All youths were volunteers who agreed to participate as subjects.

This was a non-probability sample; the interviewees were specifically selected by Life House executive director and staff; all participants had to have experienced homelessness or precarious housing in the past; all had to be able to understand the questions being asked and the concept of informed consent. Youth under the influence of chemicals or actively engaged with a mental health issue were excluded. All participants had the option to choose not to be surveyed or to discontinue the interview at any time without penalty. (Refer to Appendix C for informed consent materials.)

The interviews took place over one week from July 24 to July 31, 2006. The data collection time frame limited generalizability to only the actual individuals who were interviewed.

**Research Methodology:**

**Data Collection**

The study was descriptive. According to Marlow (2005), descriptive research “describes, records, and reports phenomena” (p. 32), and it can provide fundamental information which can be used to establish or develop social programs. It was not, however, concerned with establishing causation. In examining the barriers homeless youth face in Duluth with descriptive research, there was an opportunity to uncover patterns among the youth and initiate efforts to be taken in order to address the common issues faced by youth served by Life House. This study focused on homeless youths’ experience with barriers to their obtaining housing and upon the effects of the ever-changing “homeless” definitions and program guidelines dealing with service to these youth. The design for both the interview and the secondary analysis of data was a cross sectional survey or cross sectional design (O1); each kind of data was collected only once by interview and once by examination of secondary data. There was no comparison group (Marlow, 2005).

The strengths of secondary analysis of data included the following factors: 1) it was cost-effective; 2) it was relatively efficient to conduct as the information had already been collected; and 3) it offered the agency the opportunity to use existing data for another purpose -- to answer the research question. The limitations of secondary analysis of data included: 1) the information was limited to those served in that specific time frame; 2) the researcher had no opportunity to ask follow-up or contingency questions suggested by the data; 3) the data was limited in terms of its accuracy, being dependent upon how consistently and accurately it was recorded initially (Elizabeth Blue, personal communication, April 2006 in the SO W 380 class); 4) it was time consuming and it federally mandated for the state licensed HMIS user on the Life House staff facilitate the data collection process (only licensed HMIS users may access the data base); and 5) unspecified “Other” options in the original data prevented the researcher.
from further exploration of what that meant. (See Appendix D to view secondary analysis data collection schedule that was also used as the code book for the secondary analysis.)

The strengths of semi-structured interviews included: 1) research enriched by including the personal perspective of the group served; 2) researcher access to the subject so she could clarify and ask contingency questions; and 3) subject’s opportunity to clarify questions not understood immediately. The limitations of semi-structured interviews included: 1) these interviews required more researcher time to complete; 2) because they were face-to-face, the subject might have tried to tell the researcher what he or she thinks the researcher would like to hear; and 3) this kind of data collection was relatively more expensive to conduct. (Elizabeth Blue, personal communication, April 2006 in the SO W 380 class). (Go to Appendix D for interview survey tool; also used for the interview code book.)

**Internal and External Validity**

A cross sectional design encounters numerous threats to its internal and external validity. A threat to internal validity has been defined as the extent to which the changes in the dependent variables are a result of the introduction of the independent variables and not of some other factors (Marlow, 2005). A threat to external validity has been defined as the extent to which the research results are generalizable to the wider population (Marlow, 2005).

Because they used the same design, both studies produced similar threats to internal and external validity. These included (for internal validity) a non-random selection of the participants for both parts of the study, and the varying histories and experiences that participants in both parts of the study brought with them into the study but that could not be examined because there was no pretest in either case. The threats to external validity for both designs included selection–treatment interaction and history–treatment interaction. Again without a pre-test and with no random selection, there were issues about how typical (representative) these subjects were (Marlow, 2005).

**Measurement Validity and Reliability and Instrument Strengths and Weaknesses**

Additional issues in the study included the measuring instruments and their reliability. “Reliability indicates the extent to which a measure reveals actual differences in the phenomenon being measured rather than differences inherent in the measuring instrument itself” (Marlow, p. 188). The other measurement issue was validity, which “reflects the extent to which you are measuring what you think you are measuring” (Marlow, p. 191).

The secondary analysis data collection schedule limited the retrospective information required, clearly defined its variables, was well organized with several categories already created in the original data collection, and the data was collected in controlled and consistent manner by one researcher. In terms of its reliability, the interview instrument also limited the retrospective information required, utilized scaled or closed questions when possible, clearly defined its variables, was well organized, and data was collected in controlled and consistent manner by one researcher; finally, both surveys consisted almost completely of closed or scaled questions. Both the survey instrument and the data collection schedule had good content validity, as all relevant concepts were included; in both cases, variables were defined clearly and concretely. Each tool had at least two of the four validity issues met to ensure reliability.

The secondary analysis data collection tool’s weaknesses included the time it took to collect and transfer all the data and the possibility of the researcher making a mistake in the transfer. The weaknesses of the interview survey were the length of the tool and the time required to record and transfer all data collected. In addition, in the first interview the researcher discovered immediately that there was a need for clarification on the “first time homeless” question; the researcher adjusted the interview tool to collect the youths’ “first time homeless” in regards to whether they were homeless without permanent housing (doubled-up) or homeless staying in places not meant for human habitation (shelter, streets).

**Ethical and Human Diversity and Social Justice Issues**

The first ethical issue that was discussed with the community sponsor was that the researcher was an employee of the agency and might have to report something the agency might not want to hear. The
agency executive director understood the possible boundary issues and supported the researcher in producing an accurate and honest study. Other ethical issues addressed for this study included confidentiality, potential harm to subjects, informed consent and voluntary participation. All were addressed through the process of submitting a proposal for approval to the UW Superior Institutional Review Board for Protection of Human Subjects. Life House, Inc., as an agency, strives to protect the youth served and would not support any type of exploitation of their youth. The research design and final paper were reviewed by the executive director to ensure the safety and privacy of their clients was preserved.

Finally, by even examining this issue, Life House has made a contribution to what is known about the topic and produced data that can be used to better represent the needs of this vulnerable group.

**Research Results:**

**Subject Characteristics**

There were 77 clients served by the three primary housing programs of the Life House, Inc. (see Appendix E for diagram fund distribution), from July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006. A number of these clients were served by more than one program. Twenty-eight (36%) of the youth were served by two of the programs, and three youth were served by all three programs. The Family Homeless Prevention Assistance Program (FHPAP) served 27 youth (35%). The Emergency Services Grant Program (ESGP) served 54 of the clients (70%), and the Transitional Housing Program (THP) served 30 youth (39%). In addition, to this recorded data there was an additional 44 individual referrals to the male transitional housing program through Life House, Proctor House for Youth. There were 69 household referrals to the female (with or without children) transitional housing program, Harbor House for Youth. These referrals to both transitional housing programs were unable to be served because either the individual did not fit the criteria to be served or the program was full (Erich Lutz, personal communication, 8-4-06). Finally, there were 57 households that received referrals to other services by the Life House Housing Services Program because they were ineligible, services fitting their needs were appropriately provided elsewhere, or the youth did not return for further assistance (LeAnn Littlewolf, personal communication, 8-10-06). For more information on Life House, Inc. please see Appendix F.

Table 1: Characteristics of the Entire Client Group Sample (All Three Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Race Identified</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>16 - 17</td>
<td>18 - 19</td>
<td>20 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ethnic or Racial Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 27 men (35%) and 50 women (65%) who participated as clients in the three programs during this time period. The group ranged in age from 16 years to 22 years (this was true for both men.

1 The age data for one young man was not recorded. He was not a minority person.
and women). The average age of the entire group was 19 years (for men it was 19.2 years and for women 18.9 years).

There were a total of 30 youth (39%) who identified themselves as ethnic or racial minorities. Fifty-three youth identified Caucasian as their primary race. Nine youth identified African American as their primary race. Nine others identified American Indian or Alaska Native as their primary race. Three said their primary race was “multiracial” and three identified as an unspecified “other”. One Native American youth identified a second racial identity of Caucasian. Another Native American identified as well with his African American heritage. Five of the Caucasians also secondarily identified themselves as Native American, and one unspecified other race identified secondarily with Native American. Six said they were Hispanic (three who said they were primarily an unspecified “other” and three who related to other racial groups).

### Table 2: Characteristics of the FHPAP Clients for the Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Race Identified</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were far more women than men who participated in this program during the time period of concern (78% of the entire FHPAP group). Thirty-seven percent of the FHPAP group was minority youth. The persons in the FHPAP group ranged in age from 17 years to 21 years. The average age of the FHPAP group was 19.5 years.

### Table 3: Characteristics of the ESGP Clients for the Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Race Identified</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were more women than men who participated in this program during the time period of concern (59% of the entire ESGP group). Thirty-nine percent of the ESGP group was minority youth. Members of the ESGP group ranged in age from 16 years to 22 years. The average age of the ESGP group was 18.6 years.

### Table 4: Characteristics of the THP Clients for the Time Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Race Identified</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ethnic or Racial Minority Person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were more women than men who participated in this program during the time period of concern (60% of the entire THP group). Thirty-seven percent of the THP group was minority youth. The members of the THP group ranged in age from 16 years to 22 years. The average age of the THP group was 18.7 years.

Table 5: Most Recent Living Situation by Minority Status and Gender and by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Recent Living Situation</th>
<th>Male Subjects ♂</th>
<th>Female Subjects ♀</th>
<th>FHPAP</th>
<th>ESGP</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>20 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Tx/ Detox</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care/ Group Home</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail/ Prison/ Juvenile Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Friends</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental House/ Apt</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place not Meant for Habitation</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing for Homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>14 (18%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>34 (44%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>54 (70%)</td>
<td>30 (39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
% = % of the total number (77)  
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

- Overall, the top three places that youth had lived most recently were family, friends, and shelter facilities.
- For persons utilizing the FHPAP the top three places the youth had lived most recently were: family, rental house or apartment, and friends.
- For persons utilizing the ESGP the top three places lived most recently were: emergency shelter, family and friends.
- For THP, the top three places lived most recently were family, friends and shelter.
For minority youth the top three places lived most recently was family, friends and shelter.
For males the top three places lived most recently were emergency shelter, friends and family.
For females the top three places lived most recently were family, friends, and rental house or apartment.

Table 6: Length of Time (in Most Recent Living Situation) by Minority Status and Gender and by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th># (%) Male Subjects</th>
<th># (%) Female Subjects</th>
<th># (%) FHPAP</th>
<th># (%) ESGP</th>
<th># (%) THP</th>
<th># (%) All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Week or Less</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>20 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than One Week but Less than One Month</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to Three Months</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Three Months but Less than One Year</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year or Longer</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority
% = % of the total number (77)
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

Overall, the top three time span categories that youth had stayed in their most recent living situation were “one week or less”, “more than one week but less than one month”, and “one to three months”. This represented 74% of all the youth in the study.
Fifty-two percent of the participants from all three programs had been in their most recent living situation for less than one month.
Fifty-two percent of the FHPAP participants had lived in their most recent residence for three months or less and one third for less than a month.
Sixty-five percent of the ESGP participants had lived in their most recent residence for less than one month. Eighty-seven percent of the ESGP clients were in the most recent residence for three months or less.
Fifty-seven percent of the THP clients lived in their most recent residence for less than a month and 83% for three months or less.
Twenty of the 30 minority youth (67%) had lived at their most recent place of residence for three months or less.
Twenty-two of the 27 men (82%) had lived in their most recent residence for three months or less.
Seventy percent of the young women had lived in their most recent place of residence for three months or less.
Household sizes for these participants ranged from a low of one person to a high of four persons. Fifty-two or 67% were in a single person household; 16 or 21% were in a two-person household; six or 8% were in three-person households; and three (4%) were in a four-person household. The average size household was 1.5 people. There were 32 (non-client) minors who lived in these households. There were 24 households with minor children. Eighteen households had one minor, four had two minors, and two had three minors. When a 17 year old was noted, he or she was counted as an adult, if he or she was the head of a household. There were 22 households that were female headed, which had minor children in the household. There were eleven households where the head was a minority person with child/ren.

Next the study identified whether or not any of the participants had a disability of long duration or disabling condition. Long duration meant that the disability had been diagnosed and was a chronic condition. Twenty-six of the 77 youth (35%) had such a long term disability; forty-four of the 77 youth (59%) did not have a diagnosed long term disability; five (7%) did not know whether they had a disability of long duration (had not yet been diagnosed for a suspected issue or did not know if a possible condition was chronic). Two did not share this information as part of the intake.

Next the intake format identified whether a youth entered the program(s) with any of the 11 possible disabilities. These were identified disabilities, but were not necessarily formally diagnosed and identified as chronic disabilities.

Table 7: Identified Disability by Minority Status and Gender and by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th># (%), Male Subjects</th>
<th># (%), Female Subjects</th>
<th># (%), FHPAP</th>
<th># (%), ESGP</th>
<th># (%), THP</th>
<th># (%), All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M NM M NM</td>
<td>M NM M NM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>1 (1%) 1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (3%) 3 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>1 (1%) 3 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (5%) 5 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td>1 (1%) 1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Medical Disability</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>2 (3%) 2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%) 2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Diagnosis (MICD)</td>
<td>3 (4%) 2 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2 (3%) 12 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (13%) 12 (16%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>28 (36%)</td>
<td>11 (14%)</td>
<td>28 of 77 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes: M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority
% = % of the total number (77)
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

A “disabling condition” is defined by HUD as follows: “a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions” (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005).
There were 28 persons who were noted as having disabilities; seven of them noted more than one. There were 21 persons with one disability, six with two, and one with three.

Mental illness was an identified disability by 13 youth (46% of the 28 who noted having a disability); mental illness was also the highest disability identified by males (four), females (nine), minority (five), FHPAP (seven), and ESGP (seven).

Dual diagnosis of MI/CD was the most frequent disability identified by youth accessing THP (four).

Of the six youth who identified alcohol abuse as a disability five were female; two minorities and three non-minorities.

Of the six youth who identified drug abuse as a disability four were female; two minorities and two non-minorities.

Next the income of the youth was collected from the intake data. Of the 77 youth there were four that did not have a record of their monthly incomes; the remaining 73 youth had monthly income levels that ranged from $0.00 to $1581.00. The average monthly income for these 73 youth was $381.00. In addition, 37 (50% of the 73) of the youth had a monthly income equal to or less than $250.00. In fact, 15 youth (21% of the 73) noted that they had no income at all.

To examine the monthly income further, the youth’s income was compared to the 2006 City of Duluth HUD income guidelines that were effective as of March 8, 2006. The youth were assigned to categories according to their monthly income level and household size. The following table will break down the findings in this comparison. For further description of these guidelines, please refer to appendix G.

**Table 8: Income Categories by Minority Status and Gender and by Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>M (Male Subjects)</th>
<th>NM (Female Subjects)</th>
<th>FHPAP</th>
<th>ESGP</th>
<th>THP</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low-income</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>15 (19%)</td>
<td>28 (36%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>46 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>16 (21%)</td>
<td>31 (40%)</td>
<td>27 (35%)</td>
<td>50 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
% = % of the total number (77)  
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

- All 26 males who noted a monthly income fell into the Very Low-income category.
- Of the 47 females who noted a monthly income 43 (91% of the total females to note an income) fell into the Very Low-income category.
- One female minority fit into the Low-income category.
- All youth in the FHPAP program fell into the Very-Low income category.
- All but four of the ESGP clients fit into the Very-Low income category.
- All but one of the THP participants fit into the Very-Low income category.

The next piece of data analyzed was the youths’ extent of homelessness according to the State of
Minnesota’s definition: “being without a permanent place to live that is fit for human habitation” (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005).

Table 9: Extent of Homelessness by Minority Status and Gender and by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Homelessness</th>
<th>#(%), Male Subjects</th>
<th>#(%), Female Subjects</th>
<th>#(%), FHPAP</th>
<th>#(%), ESGP</th>
<th>#(%), THP</th>
<th>#(%), All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Currently Homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Homeless and Less than One Year Homeless</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Times Homeless but Not Long-term Homeless</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(14%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Homeless³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(44%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
% = % of the total number (77)  
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

- All 12 youth who were identified as Not Currently Homeless were FHPAP clients; nine were also female (75% of the 12).
- Thirty-three (43%) had identified themselves to be First Time Homeless and Less than one year homeless (temporary homeless); 26 ESGP clients, 17 THP participants, and 7 FHPAP clients. Twenty were female (61% of the 33) and 11 were minority (33% of the 33).
- Twenty-four (31%) had identified themselves to be Multiple Times Homeless but Not Long-term Homeless (episodic homeless); 16 female (63% of the 24) and nine minority (38% of the 24).
- Eight youth (10%) identified as Long-term Homeless ("chronic" if unaccompanied and has a diagnosed “disabling condition”); five female (63% of the eight) and three minority (38% of the 8).

Then the youth were identified as whether or not they were homeless according to HUD’s federal definition. HUD defines the following living situations as homelessness: (1) Places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, abandoned buildings (on the streets). (2) Emergency shelter. (3) Transitional housing for homeless persons who originally came from the streets or emergency shelters. (4) Any of the above places but is spending a short time (up to 30 consecutive days) in a hospital or other institution. (5) Being evicted within a week from a private dwelling unit and no subsequent residence has

³State of Minnesota definition of Long-Term Homeless: “being without a home for a year or more OR has had at least four (4) episodes of homelessness in the past three (3) years. Time spent in institutions (incl. transitional housing, prison/jail, treatment, hospitals, foster care, refugee camps, and prison or jail) should be left out of considerations – not counted as either homeless or housed. Doubling-up is considered homeless if that arrangement has persisted less than one (1) year (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005).
been identified and lacks resources and support networks needed to obtain housing. (6) Being discharged within a week from an institution, such as a mental health or substance abuse treatment facility or a jail/prison, in which the person has been a resident for more than 30 consecutive days and subsequent residence has been identified and the person lacks the resources and support networks needed to obtain housing. (7) Fleeing a domestic violence housing situation and no subsequent residence has been identified and lacks the resources and support networks needed to obtain housing. Note that HUD’s definition generally does not include doubling-up, unless the situation is a lease violation” (Minnesota Homeless Management Information System [HMIS] Assessment Form, 2005).

**Table 10: Homeless by HUD definition by Minority Status and Gender and by Program**

| Homeless by HUD definition | #(%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                           | # (%)
|                           | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM |
| Yes                      | 13 (17%) | 10 (13%) | 10 (13%) | 23 (30%) | 6 (8%) | 53 (69%) | 30 (39%) | 56 (73%) |
| No                       | 1 (1%) | 3 (4%) | 6 (8%) | 11 (14%) | 21 (27%) | 1 (1%) | 21 (27%) |
| All                      | 14 (18%) | 13 (17%) | 16 (21%) | 34 (44%) | 27 (35%) | 54 (70%) | 30 (39%) | 77 (100%) |

Table Notes: M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority
% = % of the total number (77)
The % of the total for the three programs is greater than 100% when added together because of overlap that occurred when a youth was in more than one program as a participant.

- Fifty-six youth (73%) were identified as being homeless by HUD’s definition of homelessness; 33 female (59% of the 56) and 23 minority youth (41% of the 56).
- Six of the 27 FHPAP clients (22%), 53 of the 54 ESGP clients (98%), and all 30 THP participants (100%) were homeless according to HUD’s criteria.

**Table 11: Reasons for Homelessness by Minority Status and Gender and by Program**

| Reasons for Homelessness | #(%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                          | # (%)
|                          | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM | M | NM |
| Eviction: Non-payment of Rent | 2 (3%) | 3 (4%) | 5 (6%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 3 (4%) | 6 (8%) | 7 (9%) | 8 (10%) | 8 (10%) | 13 (17%) |
| Eviction: Other than Non-payment of Rent | 2 (3%) | 3 (4%) | 6 (8%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 3 (4%) | 12 (16%) | 9 (12%) | 21 (27%) | 20 (26%) | 27 (35%) |
| Domestic Violence        | 1 (1%) | 1 (1%) | 3 (4%) | 2 (3%) | 3 (4%) | 2 (3%) | 1 (1%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) |
| Cannot find Affordable Housing | 5 (6%) | 5 (6%) | 9 (12%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) | 2 (3%) |
The top four reasons identified by the youth, in order, were: “cannot find affordable housing”, “asked or told to leave home”, “eviction for other than non-payment of rent”, and “CD or MI issues”.

Seven of the 12 (58%) who identified CD/MI issues and four of the five (80%) who identified relationship problems as a reasons for homelessness, were female.

Three youth identified domestic violence as a reason; two of three (67%) were female and two of three (67%) had a minority backgrounds.

Four youth noted fleeing unsafe neighborhood as a reason; three of four (75%) were female and three of four (75%) had a minority background.

Five youth reported “previous home substandard” as a reason; four of five (80%) were female and three of five (60%) had a minority background.

Two of the two (100%) who identified “current health problems/medical bills” and two of the three (67%) who identified “physical disability of client/family with client” as reasons for homelessness had a minority background.

Three youth reported, “previous home overcrowded” as a reason to homelessness; two of the three (67%) had a minority background and two of the three (67%) were male.

Nine of the 27 FHPAP clients (33%) identified “cannot find affordable housing” as a reason for being homeless; Eight of the 27 FHPAP clients (30%) identified “asked or told to leave home” as a reason for being homeless.
- All youth who identified “eviction for non-payment of rent” (five), “lost employment” (two), “fleeing unsafe neighborhood” (four), “previous home substandard” (five), and “utility shut-off” (two) as reasons for homelessness were participants of the FHPAP program.
- The top three categories for ESGP and THP clients were, in order: “cannot find affordable housing”, “asked or told to leave home”, and “CD or MI issues”.
- The one youth who identified “leaving facility” as a reason to homelessness was an ESGP participant and accessed THP; client was also female.
- All three individuals who identified “domestic violence” as a reason for homelessness were an ESGP participant and two of the three (67%) accessed THP.
- Two of the three (67%) to identify “physical disability of client/family with client” as a reason to homeless was an ESGP client.

On the Universal Assessment (common information that is gathered for all the programs), individuals were asked who referred them to services. All 77 youth responded and 28 (36%) identified “self” as the referral source. Eleven (14%) reported that their “counselor or social worker” referred them to housing services. Another 10 youth (13%) identified “other shelter or housing program” as the referral source. There were eight individuals (10%) that identified “housing program staff”; seven (9%) identified “friend”; and six identified “outreach worker” as the referral source. Finally, the remaining seven (9%) youth identified “family” (four), unspecified “somewhere else/other” (two), and “criminal justice system/officer” (one) as the referral source to housing services.

For youth that were assisted through FHPAP, the services provided by a FHPAP funded housing program needs to meet at least one of the four FHPAP set goals/outcomes. The four FHPAP goals are: (1) “Eviction prevention – stabilize in home” (2) “Re-house immediately without a single day of homelessness” (3) “Reduce length of homelessness” (4) “Eliminate repeat episodes of homelessness” (LeAnn Littlewolf, personal communication, 7-24-06). Fifteen of the 27 (56%) were assisted in order to eliminate repeat episodes of homelessness. Another six (22%) were assisted in eviction prevention and stabilized in the home they currently resided. There were five (19%) assisted in being re-housed immediately without having to spending one day homeless. Finally, one youth (4%) was assisted in order to reduce the length of time that individual would spend being homeless.

All of the 27 FHPAP participants were in need of temporary assistance to help stabilize the household. Thirteen of the 27 (48%) were currently housed at the time of services request. Of the 13 youth who were currently housed 10 (77%) had spent 35% or less of their income on housing. Another two (15%) had spent 66% to 80% of their income on housing and one youth (8%) had spent 36% to 50% of their income on their housing. There were 14 of the 27 FHPAP youth (52%) that were not currently housed at the time of services request. Three of the 14 (21%) were not able to spend any money on housing and another three (21%) were able to spend $201.00 to $250.00 on housing. There were two (14%) that were able to spend $1.00 to $100.00 and another two (14%) that were able to spend $451.00 to $500.00 on housing. The remaining four individuals were able to spend on housing, as follows: 1) $151.00 to $200.00; 2) $251.00 to $300.00; 3) $351.00 to $400.00; and 4) $501.00 to $550.00.

The final aspect included in the FHPAP program assessment was examining the barriers the youth experienced in achieving housing stability and the overall effect the identified barrier had on the individual’s ability to secure and maintain housing in their community. The overall effect was recorded as “minimal”, “moderate”, or “major” effect.

### Table 12: Tenant Screening Barriers by Minority Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant Screening Barriers</th>
<th># (%) Male Subjects</th>
<th># (%) Female Subjects</th>
<th># (%) All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental History</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credit History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 (11%)</th>
<th>3 (11%)</th>
<th>1 (4%)</th>
<th>2 (7%)</th>
<th>9 (33%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
- M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
- % = % of the total number in FHPAP (27)  
- Youth may identify may identify more than one of these barriers

- All 27 FHPAP clients identified at least one tenant screening barrier for their housing stability; 25 (92%) identified “rental history” as a barrier.
- Nineteen of the 21 females (90%) identified “rental history” as a barrier.
- All six males (100%) identified “rental history” and “credit history” as a barrier and four of the six males (67%) identified “criminal history” as a barrier.
- Nine of the 10 youth (90%) with a minority background identified “rental history” as a barrier (36% of the 25).
- Four of the 10 youth (40%) with a minority background identified “credit history” as a barrier (44% of the 9).
- Three of the 10 youth (30%) with a minority background identified “criminal history” as a barrier (38% of the 8 who identified the barrier).

All of the six males (100%) who were clients of the FHPAP program identified two or more tenant screening barriers; four of the six (67%) identified three barriers. In addition, three of the six males (50%) recognized these barriers as having a major effect on their ability to attain housing in their community. There were 19 of the 21 females (90%), who were clients of the FHPAP program, which identified two or more barriers; four (19%) identified three barriers. Finally, 17 of the 21 females (81%) identified the barriers to have a moderate or major effect on their ability to attain housing in their community; five of the 17 (29%) had a minority background.

### Table 13: Personal Barriers by Minority Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Barriers</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># (%)</td>
<td># (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Subjects</td>
<td>Female Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Health</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
- M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
- % = % of the total number in FHPAP (27)  
- Youth may identify may identify more than one of these barriers

- Eight of the 27 FHPAP clients (30%) identified at least one personal barrier in achieving housing stability.
- All three clients (100%) to identify “mental health” as a personal barrier were female; one of the three (33%) had a minority background.
- All five clients (100%) who reported “domestic violence” as a barrier were female; two of the five (40%) had a minority background.

There was one of the six males (17%) that identified one personal barrier and recognized the barrier to have a moderate affect on his ability to secure housing. Seven of the 21 females (33%) identified at least
one personal barrier; two (10%) identified two barriers. Three of these seven females (43%) recognized the barriers to have a major affect on their ability to secure housing.

Table 14: Income Barriers by Minority Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Barriers</th>
<th># (%)</th>
<th># (%)</th>
<th># (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Subjects</td>
<td>Female Subjects</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks Fulltime Employment</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks High School Diploma or GED</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Reliable Transportation</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Reliable Affordable Child Care</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:  
M = Minority and NM = Non-Minority  
% = % of the total number in FHPAP (27)  
Youth may identify may identify more than one of these barriers

- All 27 FHPAP participants identified at least one income barrier to accessing and maintaining housing.
- Twenty-three youth identified “lacks fulltime employment” as an income barrier; four of the six males (67%), 19 of the 21 females (90%), and 10 of the 10 minority youth (100%).
- Of the 16 youth who identified “lacks high school diploma or GED” as an income barrier there were three of the six males (50%), 13 of the 21 females (62%), and seven of the 10 minority youth (70%).
- Seventeen youth reported “lack of reliable transportation” as a barrier; four of the six males (67%), 13 of the 21 females (62%), and eight of the 10 youth (80%) who had a minority background.
- All 10 youth who identified “lack of reliable affordable child care” were female (48% of the 21 total females) and 7 (70%) had a minority background (70% of the 10 total minority youth).

Three of the six males (50%) identified two or more income barriers; two of the three (67%) have a minority background. In addition three of the six males (50%) recognized the barriers to have a major affect on their ability to secure housing, and these individuals had a minority background. Sixteen of the 21 females (76%) acknowledged two or more income barriers. All seven female minority youth (100%), who were participants of the FHPAP program, acknowledged three or more income barriers. Thirteen of the 21 females (62%) recognized the income barriers to have a major affect on their ability to secure housing in their community; five of the seven minority females (71%) recognized the income barriers to have a major affect, as well.

For the ESGP assessment data was collected on the type of residence into which the participant was assisted. Of the 54 ESGP clients 34 (69%) were assisted in accessing a “single room occupancy residency” (i.e. transitional housing, single room efficiency). Ten (19%) were assisted in securing a “scattered site apartment” (an apartment that is not specifically designated into one area or building). Eight youth (15%) were assisted in “other” (unspecified). One youth was assisted into a “group/large home” (i.e. board and lodge facility, assisted living). Finally, one individual was assisted into a “single family detached house” (house not connected to another housing unit).
Secondary Analysis Conclusions

Overall, the secondary data analysis highlighted that females make up a large portion of the homeless youth served by Life House in Duluth. The number of youth with minority backgrounds was an overrepresentation; compared to the wider population in the community as well. Individuals aged 19 appeared to have housing stability issues more so than any other age. The top three places in which individuals had most recently resided were with family, friends, and shelter facilities; a large portion (74%) stayed in the most recent residence for a time span not lasting more than three months. Nearly all (84%) clients were currently homeless by Minnesota definition, and 73% of the youth were homeless by HUD definition. All youth served were in the “low-income” or “very low-income” category according to the HUD income guidelines. Twenty-eight individuals noted they had at least one disability. The reasons most often selected for why someone was homeless were: “cannot find affordable housing”, “asked or told to leave”, “eviction for reasons other than non-payment”, and “CD/MI issues”.

According to this secondary analysis, there appears to be a gap in the in services for which individuals are eligible, depending on the source of the program – whether it is a federal, state, or local program. Definitions are out of sync with one another. An individual, who is defined as homeless by the state of Minnesota and eligible under that definition, may not be eligible for a Minnesota transitional housing program funded by federal program funds, because that program requires an individual to be homeless by the HUD definition. While these programs are supposed to be designed to assist “most in need”, there are serious numbers of youth unwilling to stay on the streets or at the local homeless shelters in order to qualify under the HUD rules for receiving services. The study also confirmed that there were not enough affordable, transitional, or supportive housing units to meet the need of homeless youth served by the Life House, Inc.

Interview Survey

Subject Demographics

There were 20 subjects who participated in the semi-structured interview process. There were seven men (35% of the sample) and 13 young women (65% of the sample). Overall, the subjects ranged in age from 16 years to 21 years of age; young male subjects ranged in age from 17 to 20 years; the young women ranged in age from 16 to 21 years. The average age of the entire group was 18.4 years; the young men’s average age was 19.1 years; the young women’s average age was 18 years. Table 1 presents an overview of the entire group.

Table 15: Characteristics of Subjects: Gender by Age Category by Primary Identified Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Race Identified</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were more women than men;

- The single largest age group was the 16 and 17 years olds with one boy and seven girls in the category;
- By far, the single largest race category was Caucasian, with 15 youth in the category, six boys and nine girls;
- It appears that only five youth (25%) come from minority backgrounds.

The picture changes quite a bit when multiculturality is considered. When the youth were asked about race, it was the race with which they primarily identified at the time. They were also asked if they considered themselves to be multi-racial. Seven of them (35%) said they did. Three more of the 15 Caucasian youth also identified themselves as Native American or Alaskan Native. The Asian youth identified as both Caucasian and Asian American. Altogether there were eight youth who identified with a second race other than Caucasian. This was 40% of the group, which means that minority youth were over represented proportionally in this sample far more than they are in the larger Duluth population.

Six of the multiracial youth also identified themselves as Hispanic. Two were Caucasian-Hispanic mix, and the rest were all persons from a minority who identified as Hispanic. When persons identifying as Hispanic are added to the mix, a total of 10 of 20 subjects (50%) had some sort of minority identity.

Table 16: Sample Characteristics: Minority Status by Gender by Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Status</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Half the minority youth were male and half were female;
- 40% of them were 20 or older;
- 70% were 18 or older.

School Statuses

Eleven of the subjects were currently attending school, while four (20%) had graduated or received a GED. Seventy-five percent of the subjects had a positive record of educational achievement of some sort.

Homeless Statuses

All twenty said they had experienced periods of homelessness; six (30%) said they were homeless at the time of the interview. When these six were asked how long they had been homeless, their replies varied. Some had been homeless for as little as a month, and the maximum length noted by one was 36 months. On an average they had been homeless for 11.2 months. Boys were homeless on an average of 10.3 months and girls for 13 months. Five of the six homeless youth were minority status youth who were homeless for an average of 8.6 months.

The next series of questions were about the two categories of homelessness; one matched the federal definition of homelessness –living in a place not meant for habitation (streets, emergency shelter).
The other category was homeless youth who did not have permanent housing or were precariously housed (staying with friends for example). Then each youth was asked how many times she or he had been in either or both categories and how old they were the first time they were in such a category. Table 3 provides an overview of this of those without permanent housing and Table 4 an overview of those living in a place not meant for habitation.

Table 17: Subjects without Permanent Housing (PH) by Gender and by Minority Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times w/o PH</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3 0 3</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>4 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>3 5 8</td>
<td>4 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>5 8 13</td>
<td>10 10 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 50% of these youth had been without permanent housing on 16 or more occasions in their lives.
- 80% of those without permanent housing 16 or more times were girls.
- 40% of those without permanent housing 16 or more times were minority youth.

All 20 youth fit into this category, noting that at some time they had been without permanent housing. For 15 of them, the number of times ranged from a low of once to a high of 30 times. The average number of times that these 15 youth had been without permanent housing in their lifetimes; they could not, however, estimate a number of times they had been without permanent housing, because they had never had permanent housing consistently; this put them into the 16+ times category. Because they did not have a specific number, the average number of times noted here was artificially low.

Table 18: Subjects Who Have Lived in Places Not Meant for Habitation (NMFH) by Gender and by Minority Status (Federal Definition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times w/ NMFH</th>
<th>Male Subjects</th>
<th>Female Subjects</th>
<th>All Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
<td>Minority Non-Minoritiy All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2 0 2</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
<td>3 5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>4 7 11</td>
<td>9 9 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 73% of the youth (13) found themselves in this situation more than three times in their lifetimes.
- More females (61%) found themselves in this position than did males.
- Minority youth were very much over-represented in this category (50%), when one considers how many minority people there are in Duluth itself.
- 44% of the respondents reported 16 or more episodes.

Eighteen of the 20 youth interviewed (90%) fit into this category, revealing that sometimes they had been staying in places not meant for habitation (like emergency shelter, the streets, cars, abandoned
buildings). For thirteen of them the number of times they found themselves in this situation ranged from one to 30 times. The average number of times that these 13 youth had stayed in places not meant for habitation was 9.6 times. For the other five youth in the category, there was no numerical estimate of times in the situation available because they had literally found themselves in the situation countless times in their lifetimes. This put them into the 16+ category. Because they did not provide a specific number, the average number of times noted here was artificially low once again.

Table 19: Age at Which Youth Found Themselves Homeless for the First Time by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Categories</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Permanent Housing</td>
<td>14.7 years old</td>
<td>12.5 years old</td>
<td>13.3 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Places not Meant for Habitation</td>
<td>16.3 years old</td>
<td>12.3 years old</td>
<td>13.8 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On an average, girls were younger than boys the first time they found themselves in either or both of these homeless categories.
- Two of the youth who fit into the without permanent housing category said they were under five when this first occurred. In the living in places not meant for habitation category one youth first fit in the category under the age of five.
- The modal ages at which youth reported they first were without permanent housing was 13 and 16 years with five youth stating each age. The modal ages at which youth first reported having been forced to live in places not meant for habitation were 12 and 16 years with three youth stating each age.

Youth were asked to describe how they came to be without permanent housing that very first time; adult substance abuse, youth substance abuse, dysfunctional family dynamics, physical abuse of the youth, and violence between adults in the home were repeated themes found in their answers to this question.

- Mom and step dad kicked me out because of personality conflict (arguing); mom was smoking marijuana, and I was partying, drinking, and staying gone for days at a time.
- I’ve never had a place to call home. I have been constantly going from family members or friends with mom and siblings all my life and state-to-state as well. [Since in permanent supportive housing program for young mothers] – It’s the closest thing I’ve had to call home.
- I decided I was not going home; I felt I was old enough to be on my own. There was lots of arguing going on at home with my parents and myself and I was suffering from undiagnosed depression. I went to stay with friends.
- Mother and step-dad kicked me out because we were arguing constantly and it escalated into physical fighting sometimes. I was able to stay with friends.
- I ran away from home while living with dad and step-mom. Dad was an alcoholic and drank all the time- don’t have many memories when dad was not drinking, starting first thing in the morning. Dad was physically abusive towards step-mom and verbally abusive towards me. I wasn’t going to tolerate it anymore and went to stay with friends.
- Fled from California because of the threat of violence for myself. I was involved with gangs and I was not safe. Moved north to stay with a boyfriend I met online.

---

4 The comments to open-ended items are close paraphrases that were checked out with the study participants.
• Mom kicked me out because mom was actively using crack cocaine. I went to stay with an older acquaintance, where I was exposed to the drug activity anyway.
• I asked my mom to emancipate me and she refused, so I left home. I did not like her rules and felt that her restrictions were harsh- I was unable to leave my room or home for any reason other than chores or school. There was constant arguing and some physical abuse from mom. I went and stayed with friends.
• I was living with adoptive parents and had sexual activity issues/engagements with younger and older girls, aged 12-16 years old, and the state services placed me at Northwoods.
• My mom kicked me out because I told her that I did not approve of her boyfriend at the time. I told her I did not like him abusing her and how he made sexually inappropriate comments to me.
• I was living with parents and there was a lot of arguing and physical fighting going on (history of anger issues in the family). I had recently been sexually assaulted that was causing more stress between the family; my mom kicked me out at the same time that I had chosen to leave home.
• I was out partying and “kicking it” all night for days at a time and mom kicked me out for it. After she kicked me out she called me in as a runaway. I went to stay with friends.
• I ran away from home because of physical abuse suffered by adoptive father. I stayed with friends and then tried to return home, but parents did not want me back. I stayed with friends, and my parents called me in as a runaway.
• I ran away from mom’s house because I was seeking drugs (cocaine and heroin) to feed an addiction. I stayed with friends.
• I ran away from mom’s house because I wouldn’t put up with her rules anymore. I was able to stay with friends.
• I was fighting with mom and step-dad, at times the fighting was physical, I decided to leave and I went to stay with friends.
• Dad was recently released from jail and came to the house; my mom told him he couldn’t stay there. Dad tried getting in anyway by cutting the window screens and so mom called the police. Dad went to jail for the night and was to be released the next day; mom took my younger brother and I out of town to stay with our family.
• I ran away form mom and step-dad’s because I couldn’t tell them I was gay- I was insecure about telling them. I went to stay with my Aunt.
• I ran away from my dad’s because he and his friends were drinking all the time over there and I wanted to get away from it. I stayed with friends.
• Ran away from foster home because I was a victim of abuse by foster siblings and foster parents would not intervene. I was picked up by the police and grandma came to the police station to pick me up and I went to stay with her.

Youth were also asked to describe how they came to be living in a situation not meant for habitation that very first time; being told to leave home by an adult, being on the run (away from home without permission), and verbal and physical fighting between the client and adult/s in the household and between the adults were repeated themes found in their answers to this question.
• Was back at mom and step dad’s; was partying more; violent behavior (mine) increased; began breaking windows, punching doors, being violent towards my brother; mom kicked me out; was unable to find place to stay; ended up on the streets for a week and a half; stayed on benches at Play-front and Park Point.
• [Along with mom and siblings] I’ve stayed in shelters, relative’s vehicles, hallways because there was no other place to stay or no room for the whole family at friends’ and relatives’. Mom sporadically had apartments but within a short time she’d be evicted and the cycle would begin again.
• I was staying with friends after leaving my parents home and decided to stay out instead of returning to my friend’s house. While on the streets I slept in the library chairs (when it was still open all night), skywalk, and stairways in various parking lots.
- My family was evicted by the landlord due to a messy house. We ended up in a shelter. Dad kicked me out and then went to stay with mom, but then mom kicked me out. Mom was bringing me back to dad’s and I jumped out of my mom’s car as it was moving. I went Miller Dwan Crisis Center and they tried to mediate between me and my parents. My mom did not want me to stay with her and I refused to go back to my dad’s so my mom brought me to Bethany Crisis Shelter and I was signed into the [Runaway youth self-referral program].

- I was staying with friends and they kicked me out because I was dating another female and they did not approve of it. I made phone calls and was able to find shelter at a local woman’s shelter.

- I was unable to find anywhere to stay the night and ended up sleeping in a near by park.

- I was staying with a friend and he did not want me to stay with him because of anticipated drug (meth) activity that night. I had no other options so I slept on the streets; have slept in cars on car dealer’s lot; and under bridges.

- I was staying in foster home placement when I turned 18 years old and I decided to move out because of the rules, curfews, etc. I ended up staying in an apartment building laundry room. The school resource officer contacted the local Crisis Response Team and I was placed at Bridge House.

- I was out partying and “kicking it” all night for days at a time and mom kicked me out for it. After she kicked me out she called me as a runaway. As I was staying with friends cops picked me up for being on run and brought me out to Bethany Crisis Shelter.

- I ran away from home because of physical abuse suffered by adoptive father. I stayed with friends and then tried to return home, but parents did not want me back. I stayed with friends and my parents called me in as a runaway and I was picked up by the cops and placed in a shelter; following shelter placement I was also placed in lock-up and foster home placements.

- I was removed from mom’s and step-dad’s, at their request, by the sheriff. I was brought to Bethany Crisis Shelter and was further placed in Miller Dwan and different foster homes.

- I got into a fist fit with my step-dad and he kicked me out because I “was of legal age to be out.” I walked around all night and found stuff to do.

- Mom kicked me out because of fighting and then she reported me as a runaway. Cops picked me up at my friends and brought me out to Bethany.

- Mom kicked me out because were fighting verbally and physically. She called me in as a runaway and I was brought to Bethany.

- I ran away from mom and step-dad’s because they were fighting and I did not want to stay there anymore. I stayed [camped out] in the woods for some time.

- I ran away from the foster home because I wasn’t allowed to see my dad and I was a rebel wanting to party. I stayed out all night.

- My mom kicked me out because she could not take care of me. My mom took me to social services and social services took me to an emergency foster home.

Table 20: Current Living Situation at the Time of the Interview by Minority Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Independently</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Staying with Friends or Family</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing for Young Mothers</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Foster Care</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven (35%) of all youth interviewed were currently living in transitional housing programs. Of the seven youth living in transitional housing; six (86%) were female and one (14%) was male.

The second highest category recorded six youth (30%) who were temporarily staying with friends or family. Four (67%) were male, and two (33%) were female.

Only one female and one male reported that they were living independently at the time of the interview; a total of two (10%). There were no youth with minority background that were living independently at the time of the interview.

Overall 11 youth (55%) had stated that they were living in some type of supportive housing program. Of those 11 youth 10 (91%) were female, and one (9%) was male. Five (45%) were of minority background, and six (55%) did not identify with a minority background.

Next respondents were asked whether their households were female-headed; eight of the 13 women (62%) were the head of a female-headed household. They were all either single mothers or pregnant.

Next respondents were asked if they were currently at risk of being homeless; seven (35%) said they were at risk. Of these seven, three (43%) were boys and four (57%) were girls. Also of these seven, four (57%) were minority youth. One noted having to leave housing for non-payment of rent; one left a program in which he or she was housed; and five noted “other”. These “other” answers included:

- Responsibility of another county even though not currently receiving their case management services and unable to receive local county case management services until 60 consecutive days of not receiving assistance from previous county.
- Time is limited where currently staying- possibly may overstay welcome.
- On restriction in housing program; if restriction not followed- will be evicted.
- Staying with friend, who is at risk of eviction for breaking the lease by letting me stay there.
- Been asked to leave within a week and a half.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenant Screening Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No rental history/1st time renter</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>11 of 20 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous eviction/s</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1 of 20 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rental history/poor landlord reference</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0 of 20 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of property damage to previous residence</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 of 20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to pass background check</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>4 of 20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of household under age 18</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>12 of 20 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven (55%) of the youth interviewed identified “no rental history/1st time renter” as a definite or major barrier; seven (64%) of them were females and four (36%) were of minority background(s).

Of the three (15%) who identified “record of property damage to previous residence” as a definite or major barrier two (67%) were males and three (100%) were of minority background(s).

Four (20%) reported “unable to pass background check” as a definite or major barrier with two (50%) being male or female and a minority or non-minority.
Twelve (60%) of the youth reported that “head of household under age 18” was a definite or major barrier at one point in their homelessness experience(s).

Three of the 20 (15%) identified at least three definite or major barriers in this group. Another seven (35%) identified two definite or major barriers in this group. Finally the other eight (40%) identified one definite or major barrier in this category. Two others did not identify any definite or major barrier in this group.

Table 22: Criminal History Barriers: Number and Percent Choosing Items as a Definite Barrier or as a Major Barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent drug or criminal history</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>7 of 20 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released from incarceration/jail</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 of 20 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony/ies</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 of 20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven (35%) identified “recent drug or criminal history” as a definite or major barrier; Four (57%) with minority background(s) and five (71%) being male.

The two (10%) youth who reported “released from incarceration/jail” as a definite or major barrier represented equal distribution among the demographics being analyzed.

There were three (15%) youth that identified “felony/ies” as a definite or major barrier. Two of the 20 (10%) identified three definite or major barriers in this category. Another one (5%) identified at least two definite or major barriers in this category. Finally the four (20%) identified at least one definite or major barrier in this group. The remaining 13 respondents did not identify any definite or major barrier in this group.

Table 23: Fleeing Unsafe Circumstance Barriers: Number and Percent Choosing Items as a Definite Barrier or as a Major Barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fleeing Unsafe Circumstance/s Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing physical abuse</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>13 of 20 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing neglect</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>11 of 20 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing sexual abuse</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 of 20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing another’s bullying and/or threats</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>12 of 20 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing potential gang involvement/violence</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>5 of 20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the youth who participated in the interview process identified three of the five “fleeing unsafe circumstance” categories as a definite or major barrier; these youth at one time had been fleeing physical abuse, neglect, and another’s bullying and/or threats.

In all “fleeing unsafe circumstance” categories youth with minority background(s) were over represented compared to the overall population of minorities among youth; four of 13 (31%) were fleeing physical abuse, two of three (67%) were fleeing sexual assault, five of 12 (42%) were
fleeing another’s bullying and/or threats, and four of five (80%) were fleeing potential gang involvement/violence and had identified these circumstances to be a definite or major barrier.

- In all “fleeing unsafe circumstance” categories over half the youth who identified it to be a definite or major barrier are female; nine of 13 (69%) “fleeing physical abuse”, eight of 11 (73%) “fleeing neglect”, three of three (100%) “fleeing sexual abuse”, nine of 12 (75%) “fleeing another’s bullying and/or threats”, and three of five (60%) “fleeing potential gang involvement/violence”.

Three of the 20 respondents (15%) identified at least four definite or major barriers in this category. Another eight (40%) identified at least three definite or major barriers in this category. Two individuals (10%) identified two definite or major barriers in this category. Another four (20%) identified one definite or major barrier in this category. The remaining three respondents did not identify any definite or major barrier in this group.

**Table 24: Income Barriers: Number and Percent Choosing Items as a Definite Barrier or as a Major Barrier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor credit history or outstanding bills</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>5 of 20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/recent decrease or loss of income</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>12 of 20 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income not enough to afford housing</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
<td>17 of 20 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to afford 1st months rent &amp; deposit on own</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>13 of 20 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; ineligible for funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Seventeen of 20 (85%) youth identified “income not enough to afford housing” as a definite or major barrier; 11 of 17 (65%) were females and nine of 17 (53%) were with minority background(s).
- Twelve of 20 (60%) reported “unemployed/recent decrease or loss of income” as a definite or major barrier; eight of 12 (67%) female and five of 12 (42%) with minority background(s).
- Thirteen of 20 (65%) respondents identified “unable to afford 1st months rent & deposit on own & ineligible for funding” as a definite or major barrier; eight of 13 (62%) female and nine of 13 (69%) with minority background(s).

Three of the 20 respondents (15%) identified four definite or major barriers in this group. Another eight (40%) identified at least three definite or major barriers in this category. Five individuals (25%) identified two definite or major barriers in this group. Finally two identified at least one definite or major barrier in this category. The remaining two respondents did not identify any definite or major barrier in this set.
Table 25: Personal Barriers: Number and Percent Choosing Items as a Definite Barrier or as a Major Barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively using drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>11 of 20 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1 of 20 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current homelessness</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>6 of 20 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and/or writing skills level</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 of 20 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues (current or on-going)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>13 of 20 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate need for housing</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>13 of 20 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No form of identification (if required)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>4 of 20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent living skills minimal</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>6 of 20 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of all 20 respondents 11 (55%) identified “actively using drugs or alcohol” as a definite or major barrier at one point in their homelessness experience; six of 11 (55%) female and seven of 11 (64%) with minority background(s).
- “Mental health issues (current or on-going)” and “immediate need for housing” were identified by 13 of 20 (65%) youth as a definite or major barrier.
- Nine of 13 (69%) youth who identified “mental health issues (current or on-going)” as a definite or major barrier were female.
- Four of six (67%) youth, who identified “independent living skills minimal” as a definite or major barrier, have minority background(s).
- Of the 13 youth who reported “immediate need for housing” as a definite or major barrier, nine (69%) have minority background(s).

Four of the 20 respondents (20%) reported five definite or major barriers in this category. Another three (15%) identified at least four definite or major barriers in this set. One individual (5%) identified three definite or major barriers in this category. Another eight respondents (40%) reported at least two definite or major barriers in this group. In addition four (20%) identified one definite or major barrier in this set. Finally, all 20 respondents in the interview process had identified at least one definite or major barrier in the personal barrier category.
Table 26: Environmental Barriers: Number and Percent Choosing Items as a Definite Barrier or as a Major Barrier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Barriers</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18  of 20 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10  of 20 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transportation</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11  of 20 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No openings in transitional or supportive housing programs</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7   of 20 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of waiting list for subsidized housing or other housing assistance programs</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13  of 20 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unawareness of resources assisting in housing needs</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7   of 20 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Eighteen of 20 (90%) reported “lack of affordable housing” as a definite or major barrier.
- Ten of 20 (50%) reported “lack of support” as a definite or major barrier.
- Eleven of 20 (55%) reported “lack of transportation” as a definite or major barrier.
- Thirteen of 20 (65%) reported “length of waiting list for subsidized housing or other housing assistance programs” as definite or major barrier; 11 of 13 (85%) female.
- Either half or at least 40% of youth who identified any environmental category as a definite or major barrier have minority background(s).

Three of the 20 respondents (15%) identified six definite or major barriers in this group. One of the 20 youth (5%) identified five definite or major barriers in this category. Another three of the respondents (15%) identified four definite or major barriers in this group. In addition, eight of the 20 youth (42%) identified three definite or major barriers in this group. Three of the 20 respondents (15%) identified two definite or major barriers in this group. Finally, there was one of the 20 respondents (5%) who reported one definite or major barrier in this category. There were two youth who did not identify any definite or major barrier in this group.

Youth were also given an opportunity to state any other definite or major barriers, that were not mentioned, they had encountered while homeless; Social Security Income (SSI) rep payee issues, daycare issues, ineligibility and limitations on housing or public assistance programs, residency issues, lack of descent and affordable housing in safe neighborhoods, minimum wage standards and cost of living issues, and issues with local county programs eligibility criteria and program stipulations were repeated themes among the youth interviewed.

Barriers:

- Receiving SSI but because of minor status has payee; issues with payee disbursing money
- Fear of the past history repeating itself over again and be unable to break the pattern.
- When applying for assistance through county services; minimal information was given about eligible services or programs.
- Not enough sufficient, affordable, and available daycare.
- Limitations on career exploration and schooling options through the local county programs (i.e. Mothers and Families Investment Program, MFIP).
- Ineligibility for Duluth’s Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) Section 8 program due to post-secondary student status.
- Cost of living decently with current pay rate standards for minimum wage.
- Local county program (i.e. Food support, medical, cash assistance) eligibility criteria.
- The lack of Social Services follow-through on involvement in protection issues.
- Having to be “on the streets” for most housing programs.
- Inability to access county programs/services because of residency and financial responsibility of another county.
- Inability to find appropriate or trustworthy payee for SSI benefits and floating between counties: pertaining to residency.
- Lack of affordable daycare.
- Lack of good paying jobs.
- Unable to legally sign lease because I’m under 18.
- Mental health or other service programs that have “follow-through” as an expectation. [With mental health status it is difficult].
- Program stipulations required me to leave on short notice (daughter turned one year and program did not house children over one year).
- Uncomfortable in current transitional housing program.
- Trying to balance schedule (high school, college, and motherhood) to be capable of being employed.
- Daycare hours are limited (current daycare provider is not open past 4PM).
- Insufficient foster home or other placement options.
- Lack of descent affordable housing in descent neighborhoods.
- SSI payee issues.
- On MFIP 20 years old is considered to be too old to finish high school (HS) or get your GED according to the county; when requesting daycare assistance. My daycare will not be funded to complete my HS education.
- Lack of descent daycares with openings.
- Placed out of county of residence. Unable to gain county of residence and financial responsibility until after 60 consecutive days on own.
- Medication side effects.
- Vulnerability in general and on the streets- I’m too trusting and easily taken advantage of.
  The youth who participated in the interview where also asked: “When someone is homeless they have to develop survival skills or “street smarts”. Please tell me at least three of the survival skills that you have developed for your own survival?” Some commonly repeated survival skills were: learning the surroundings, having a strong and large friend network, riding the bus until it stopped running at night, walking around all night, asking for money from people- “pan-handling”, eat at a restaurant and leave before paying for the meal- “dine and dash”, selling and using drugs to make street life easier, sexual exploitation, stealing or robbing valuables, carrying protection, and going party to party to avoid sleeping on the streets, or to have a place to pass out. The comments are noted below for each person:

Person 1:
- Learning the surroundings, learning where the good parts and the bad parts are.
- Stay up all night by traveling from party to party and sleep on the street during the day (protection of broad daylight).
- Develop strong friend networks to make it on the street (food, shelter, protection).

Person 2:
- Given my experience I am able to go days without eating or sleeping. I was unable to sleep in shelters.
- I am able to adjust to change of climates (hot or cold) and be able to sleep fine.
- Strong-willed; able to enter a situation with drama and be able to leave the “baggage” with the situation and not carry it with me. I have been through a lot and therefore am able to disconnect or connect to emotional experiences, if I want to.
Person 3:
- Respect: Give others the respect you want it return.
- While walking the streets I scoped out the surroundings and made mental note of possible places to sleep/stay during different seasons/weather, if usual spot was taken, or if ended up in the area on night.
- Only take what you need- what you can carry all day and have clothing with many pockets- the bigger the pockets, the better.
- Eat when you can and/or when it was available.
- Have lots of friends to help you make it (food, shelter, protection).

Person 4:
- Would ride the bus until the bus stopped at 11PM and then walk around all night to avoid sleeping on the streets.
- Do “speaking gigs” for ‘Together for Youth’ at various places, about “coming out” and/or give personal testimonies about experiences regarding sexuality. I would get $20 a “gig.”
- Have a good sense of humor and am able to make people laugh and get things for it (cigs, pop, bus fair), and it would make myself feel better.

Person 5:
- At age 15 years old I would swap sex for a place to stay. I stopped at 16 years old when I became pregnant.
- I would go to parties and become intoxicated or take drugs to have a place to pass out or stay up all night. “Drugs are what keep you sane while living on the streets”- it makes things not as bad or scary, and the drugs kept you awake.
- I made many friends to keep me going. Friends give support, a place to stay, and protection on the streets.

Person 6:
- Learned how to get money from strangers- “pan-handling”.
- Go to a restaurant, order a meal, eat the meal, and leave quickly without paying the bill- “dine and dash”.
- Got used to riding the bus and walking around to keep from sleeping.
- Learned to be good at “shut up and don’t talk”, while dating my ex-boyfriend.

Person 7:
- Selling and doing drugs made street life easier- gave you a place to stay or help you stay awake to avoid sleeping on the streets or worrying about where you would stay.
- Robbed people for money or valuables in their houses or on the streets: “purse snatching.”
- Carried firearms to protect myself from the streets.

Person 8:
- “Scam the systems”- committed fraudulent acts to gain money.
- Stole wallets from intoxicated people.
- Selling and trafficking drugs.

Person 9:
- Having a large network of friends (support, food, shelter, protection).
- Innocence in appearance and nature to receive things that I need (bus fair, cigs, money, food, etc.)
- Gain affiliations with people with high street status for protection.

Person 10:
- Sexual exploitation: had sex with a guy to have a place to stay during the day while friend was gone and unable to stay there.
- Giving up a piece of privacy to have a place to stay.
- Ability to veer through system roadblocks.

Person 11:
- After sexual assault (rape) it erased the “it won’t happen to me” cliché, while staying place to place.
- Having many friends enabled me to have places to stay or hang out to avoid the streets.

Person 12:
- Sexual exploitation/striping for money.
- Assist in hustling for drug dealers- would receive some of the profit.
- “Dine and dash”.

Person 13:
- Pretend to be a hotel guest and eat continental breakfast or any other complimentary item and/or meal offered by other business establishments I would take advantage of.
- Pick agates and sell them to the “agate man” on Superior Street for money.
- Sleep in the open skywalks (learned what ones are open all night).
- Made many friends to have many options to stay or hang out.
- Drugs were a comfort (didn’t become hungry to have to eat, or tired to have sleep in the skywalk; they served as a distracter to current situation).

Person 14:
- Ability to gain money from others- “pan handling.”
- Ability to find cheap meals and/or “dine and dash.”
- Ability to shoplift or burglarize without being caught.
- Sexual exploitation of self to have a place to sleep- (participated in heterosexual and homosexual activities).
- Being able to turn “black and white”- lying, cheating, stealing, and manipulating for personal gain and not feel guilty.

Person 15:
- Always carry some protection (knife).
- Being anti-social (private): being open makes you vulnerable to street crimes (Crimes committed to those on the streets).
- Time management: making days organized to help you get off the streets and back on your feet.
- Dealing drugs to survive (money and/or places to stay).

Person 16:
- Dealing drugs (money).
- Stealing money from cars, people, etc.
- Swapping drugs for places to stay.
- Fighting to prove strength to the streets.

Person 17:
- Having a large network of friends (food, shelter, support, protection).
- Being the “middle-man” or “hook-up” for drugs- “you always get something: rides, drugs, places to stay, things to do.”
- Getting high by using drugs “makes everything good.”

Person 18:
- Stealing money or wallets from strangers on the street: “pick pocket”
- Faking an illness to sleep at the ER while waiting to see Doctor.
- Having lots of friends (food, shelter, support, and protection).
- Finding “back doors” on the DTA buses for free rides.

Person 19:
- Having a large friend network (food, shelter, support, and protection).
- Deal drugs for dealer to make profit; profit to meet needs.
- Started smoking crack to feel better about having nowhere to go and get away from reality.

Person 20:
- Having a lot of friends (food, shelter, protection, and support).
- Taking charge of my own life and getting things done.
- Learning how to hide, putting on a mask- to keep people out of my life (hide my feelings and the things I’m doing).
At the close of the interview youth participants were asked what else they would like to share about the experience of being a homeless young person in Duluth, or if there was anything else they wanted to be included in the research that they had not been able to express. The youths’ responses were made up of the following shared ideas: being homeless on the streets is scary, hard, and it sucks; causes you to do things you wouldn’t normally do— the options for homeless people are limited; all people deserve to be helped but more discretion in programs is needed; traditional services are substandard; more outreach services are needed; people providing services need to be understanding; being comfortable with someone makes receiving services easier; and that much knowledge has been gained from the experience.

- Being homeless on the streets is scary and hard; you do not know what is going to happen; it makes you feel worthless and it makes you do things you’d not normally do (crimes, drugs, violence). More outreach services and heightened awareness for homeless youth in the community are needed, because if it is not known about, it will not be accessed.

- “I don’t plan on being homeless forever.” Having support from agencies like Life House was most helpful for making steps to finding permanent housing. More non-traditional/non-profit or outreach services need to be made available- there are not as many workers as there is need. Traditional services are lacking compassion, understanding, and underestimate or undermine client (me). There is a need for respect to avoid feeling demoralized.

- If you are going to do it make sure you have one other person with you, because being alone on the streets is a very scary thing; you don’t know who or what is out there and what may happen. More actual affordable housing by lower income standards (given current minimum wage standards), and in decent neighborhoods.

- At first “its cool” because of the freedom and the ability to “do anything I want” but after awhile it gets to you and “becomes scary.” You don’t know where you’re going go; you think someone could kill you; you “feel dirty” and haven’t showered. “Most of the time” a relationship needs to be present with the agency or person providing services because your more comfortable and able to “goof off and be serious at the same time.”

- Its “really, really scary.” “There’s no place to go for young people except Bethany and they have too many rules for someone from the streets.” There is a need for more transitional housing or homeless shelters for youth with more lenient rules in Duluth.

- I have no regrets, haven been homeless I’ve become stronger, gained good support networks, and gained knowledge. It has molded me to what I want to do in life; Sociology: demographic studies. “There is good in this world, but you must search for it- it won’t come to you.” The transitional housing program is the “best thing that has happened”- I’ve learned skills that I didn’t learn from family or myself. Too many programs assume/obligate parental financial support up until a certain age, but programs need to look at an individuals’ whole situation and look at it discretely from another one’s situation.

- Options for homeless people are limited and there is a need for more local and county programs/services willing to serve the population and less time serving those not wanting services. Everyday you want to give up because you can’t take no more but you replace that feeling with something to get you through (i.e. Drugs).

- It sucked. Having a felony makes Duluth Housing and Redevelopment Authority assistance program opportunities disappear for that individual who is trying to rehabilitate their lifestyle.

- It sucks. There is a need for more outreach services and less restrictions on county funds. I was closed out in previous county and because I had received services from them I was ineligible for local county services until I was living in Duluth for 60 consecutive days in order to gain residency. Those 60 days had to be on my own- no county paid programs or they did not count. I am currently working to establish residency to receive any county services.

- It sucks and it’s hard, causing people to do things they normally wouldn’t do. Housing and county programs should not restrict college bound students (Section 8, MFIP, and Child Care Assistance).
Before becoming homeless I was completely unaware of Life House and other housing programs, and my school counselor was even unaware of these programs. Because of this, more outreach services are needed to help youth access services and bring awareness to the community.

There is a need for outreach and preventative measures/programs. There needs to be a safe house/youth shelter with fewer restrictions than traditional “crisis” shelters.

That all people deserve to receive help but their needs to be discretion. Priority on those who need and want to better their lives; rather than those choosing “the easy way out” - choosing not to work. There needs to be more family housing options and teen parent housing options.

“If people were given better options they would not be compelled to stay homeless.” To solve homeless issues; you must look at preventative measures. The on-going income gap is causality to homelessness. If someone is willing to be homeless, you must recognize their current living situation as being “God awful” - and basically you are choosing the lesser of the two evils. When there is better choices/options there will be better decisions made.

You have to watch your own back, you can’t worry about anybody else, but yourself. Life House has been the most helpful for me; it’s a safe place to find food, services, hang out, and be comfortable. When someone is seeking services, the person giving services needs to have “understanding.”

You feel hopeless. Option’s response times are not quick. Programs need to be quick and efficient to deal with housing issues. Someone that you trust or can trust to talk to is important.

“We do a lot of things we don’t want to do.” If you want to help: “Don’t talk about it- do it.”

Being homeless sucks.

It’s hard and it’s harder now with a child and making sure her needs are met first and that she’s always clean and safe.

If you can survive on your own, you can survive anything. When you’re on the streets- that’s when it hits you. You gain wisdom to share and to take with you. Don’t depend on other people. Support is needed; let there be choices; let them feel welcomed- not cornered with demands.

Interview Conclusions
The interview sample included a larger proportion of females and minorities in comparison to the larger population. Youth who were interviewed identified that they had found themselves homeless at one point, had been told to leave home or had left a dysfunctional / unconstructive environment. The majority of the interview participants had been “kicked out” or told to leave home by a parent or legal guardian. Of the youth who were interviewed 25% of the sample had found themselves homeless, under both definitions, extreme numbers of times. At the time of the interview there were only two youth who were currently living independently (outside of a supportive housing program, shelter, or residing temporarily with friends or family). The barriers reported most by the youth were: lack of affordable housing and insufficient income for housing. Although Duluth has made a great effort to bring in more affordable housing, according to these interviews, there is still a gap between the number of units available and the number needed to house these vulnerable citizens. Many youth disclosed that being homeless was frightening, made them feel hopeless, hoped they will not be homeless forever, and felt that if they were offered better options they would make better decisions. Often they viewed themselves as picking the “lesser of two evils” to survive.

Usefulness of Findings to Social Work and to the Agency
This study has made a contribution to the social work literature regarding youth homelessness and adding to the generalized understanding of how youth perceive this issue for themselves. The agency intends to use the study results in seeking funding, in arguing for changes in policy definitions, and in building community support.

Relationship to Literature Review
The study findings highlighted the issues outline in the literature review about how procedural
definitions of funders limit youth options. The barriers identified in the literature review were used to
develop the survey instruments. These turned out to be important issues these local youth were facing.
The literature had not reported comprehensively about homeless youths’ viewpoints about their
experiences. This study added to that portion of the available literature. The study findings supported the
idea that policy makers are not adequately informed about how to reach out and positively affect youth
who are homeless. The current policies, ambiguous at best, are a real disconnect for meeting the needs of
16 to 21 year olds who are still developing into adult roles. The rules appear to be made for adults, not
this age group.

Conclusion
Summary of Major Findings: Where the Findings Agree
The research questions posed by this study were answered by the study results. The barriers
experienced by these 16 to 21 year old youth served by Life House, Inc in achieving permanent housing
were identified. The barriers most often identified in both sections of the study were lack of affordable
housing, insufficient income, poor rental histories, and being hampered by CD/MI issues. The changes in
legislation are having an obvious negative impact on these youth. Often they have reported inadequate
service responses because of eligibility issues relating to the conflicting definitions of homelessness at the
many funding levels. It appears that the youth receiving the services most often are those fitting the
federal HUD definitions for eligibility; a significant number of other youth in need have not been served
because their eligibility was hampered by the criteria governing funding for services.
Suggestions for Future Research
There are several kinds of future research on this issue that Life House could consider:
- A longitudinal study of individuals served by the Giiwe [“coming home”] mobile team.
- A needs assessment on the level of community knowledge/attitudes about youth homelessness.
  For example, conducting a pre-test, offering a program and then conducting a post-test to see if
  the program improved knowledge/attitudes.
- A case study describing how the programs have changed in response to funding demands.
- A focus group following a simulation on the issue of youth homelessness.
- Research on the housing options for individuals ages 15 – 17 years old who have serious
  persistent mental health issues and are not a fit to transitional housing and are not currently an
  active case with the local county.
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Appendix A: Homeless Spiral Downward

- Move in with family or friends—lose control of living space; unfamiliar neighborhood; no privacy. Relationship stress—asked to move out; move in with others. Constant stress.
- Financial crisis—can’t pay rent—lose apartment. Have nowhere to take furniture, etc.
- Burned bridges—loss of family and friends’ support. Too hard to find work or save money for new housing.
- No options but shelter or streets.
- Begin to acclimate to shelter culture—develop new routines. Survival depends on new roles. Focus on today—can’t plan future.
- Marge Wherley, Supervisor, Housing and Homeless Initiatives, created an “alternative” model to represent how the downward spiral of homelessness can become long-term homelessness; however, it also represents the idea of “moving up” to housing stability.
- Relationships are now with other homeless and service providers. Loss of old identity, disengaged, alienated.
- With prolonged physical and emotional stress, health and mental health erode; substance abuse increases. Loss of hope.
Appendix B: Current McKinney Act Definition

New Definition of Homelessness for participants entering programs funded with new or renewal housing grants in 2005 under the McKinney /Vento Act as applies to Permanent and Samaritan Initiative Grants

(Refer to the SuperNOFA /Federal Register pages 14273-14275 and 142777 of March 21, 2005. Also, the Federal Register cross-references HUD’s “Questions and Answers” with answers C-1 and C-6 addressing eligibility of participants for grants funded under this NOFA see the 2005 “Questions and Answers” of March 21, 2005.)

(These changes do not apply to current participants of permanent housing projects. It will apply to all new participants of projects funded with 2005 grant awards – grant numbers MN46B/C5___.)
This chart represents definitions of who may be served by the various program components funded by the McKinney Vento Program and administered by HUD for the 2005 SuperNOFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Housing and Support Services Only grants without housing</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing and Shelter Plus Care grants funded for new and renewal grants</th>
<th>Projects designed to serve only the Chronic Homeless under the Samaritan Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, and abandoned buildings;</td>
<td>1- Places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, and abandoned buildings;</td>
<td>1- In places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, and abandoned buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- In an emergency shelter; OR</td>
<td>2- In an emergency shelter; OR</td>
<td>2- In an emergency shelter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Transitional housing for homeless persons who originally came from the streets or emergency shelter</td>
<td>3- Transitional housing for homeless persons who originally came from the streets or emergency shelter</td>
<td>Chronically Homeless Person is an unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more or had at least four (4) episodes of homelessness in the past three (3) years. A disabling condition is defined as “a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions. In defining the chronically homeless, the term homeless means a person sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation (e.g. living on the streets) or in an emergency homeless shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- In addition, persons who ordinarily sleep on the street or in emergency or transitional housing but are spending a short time (30 consecutive days or less) in a hospital or other institution will also be considered eligible for assistance. <em>You may also serve persons who, but for assistance from these programs, would be living on the streets. This includes persons:</em></td>
<td>4- In addition, persons who ordinarily sleep on the street or in emergency or transitional housing but are spending a short time (30 consecutive days or less) in a hospital or other institution will also be considered eligible for assistance. Please note that a member of the household must have a severe disability that impairs their ability to live independently without support services and supportive housing in order for the household to obtain permanent housing under the Supportive Housing Program and Shelter plus Care Program of HUD. The definition of disability is referred to in the McKinney Vento Act and includes those whose primary diagnosis may include a severe chemical addiction such as alcoholism or drug abuse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) being evicted within a week from a private dwelling unit and no subsequent residence has been identified and the person lacks the resources and support networks needed to obtain housing; OR</td>
<td>A disability is not required for an individual to qualify for the Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) being discharged within a week from an institution in which the person has been a resident for more than 30 consecutive days and no subsequent residence has been identified and he/she lacks the resources and support networks needed to obtain housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ineligible persons for all three categories include but not limited to those in prison for more than 30 days, those paying more than 30% of their income for rent, those in substandard housing, those living with friends or relatives, those in over crowded housing, those who are wards of the state or in foster care, those in the state mental health system which has a discharge plan such as a Minnesota rule 36 or other programs or those in court order programs that includes housing. Refer to Section “B” of the Supportive Housing Desk guide for examples of ineligible individuals for McKinney programs. The Desk guide may also suggest how you can demonstrate third party verification of eligibility. As of August 19, the Desk guide does not account for the 2005 changes.
Appendix C: Informed Consent Materials

Researcher: Jessica Unkelhaeuser
UW-Superior Social Work Student and McNair Scholar

Community Sponsor: Rachel Kincade
Executive Director, Life House, Inc.

Faculty Mentor: Professor Elizabeth Twining Blue
UW-Superior Social Work Program

Purpose:
- Identify the factors contributing to homelessness of Duluth youth aged 16 to 21, served by Life House, Inc.
- Discover the specific barriers to finding and maintaining permanent housing for such youth.
- Use this information to inform decision makers and funders about this issue.

Procedure:
- You will be asked to participate in a face to face interview in which you will be asked to share your thoughts and experiences relating to homelessness.

Time required:
- The interview will be one session and will take up to forty-five minutes depending upon what you have to share.

Risks:
- It is not anticipated that this study will present other than minimal risk to you.
- You may feel uncomfortable recalling and sharing some of your personal history. If that occurs you are free to decide not to answer any interview question.
- There will be absolutely no loss of Life House services for you if you do decide either not to answer an item.
- You should be reminded, that as a Life House staff person, Jessica is mandated to report runaway status or any injury to yourself or someone else.
- Life House is also providing you with the opportunity to speak to staff if you need to process any part of this interview with Jessica.

Your rights as a subject:
- While Jessica will know who you are, she will not share this information with anyone else.
- The information you share will be recorded in anonymous form, so no one will know what you said specifically.
- Data or summarized results will not be released in any way that could identify you personally.
- If you want to withdraw from the study at any time, you may do so without penalty (loss of service from Life House). The information collected from you up to that point would be destroyed if you so desire.
- Also, you will be given a copy of this form to keep and once the study is completed, you may request a summary of the results.

If you have any concerns about your treatment as a subject in this study, please contact Dr. Christopher Markwood, UW-Superior Provost, (715)-394-8449. This research project has been approved by the UW-Superior Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, protocol # 203

I have read the above information and willingly consent to participate in this study.

Signed: ____________________________ Date: ________________
Appendix D: Survey, Data Collection Schedule and Code Books

SECONDARY ANALYSIS DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE

Client Number ____________________________________________

DEMOGRAPHICS
Gender □ Female □ Transgender □ Male □ Unknown
Primary Race ______________________ Secondary Race ______________________
Ethnicity __________________________ Have Minority Background? □ Yes □ No

Most Recent Living Situation ______________________ Length of Time ________________

Household Size ________________ # Adults______________ # Minors______________

Disability of long duration □ Yes □ No Disability?: ____________________________

Income Level $______________ /month Income Category: □ Very-Low □ Low
□ Moderately-Low

Extent of Homelessness (MN): □ Not currently homeless □ 1st time AND < 1 year
□ Multiple NOT LTH □ LTH (1 year or 4X in 3 years)

Homeless by HUD definition? □ Yes □ No

Reason for Homelessness (All that apply) □ Being forced out within week (out of their control)
□ Eviction: Non-payment
□ Eviction: Other non-payment
□ Fleeing domestic violence/Victim of domestic violence
□ Cannot find/lack of affordable housing
□ Lost employment or decrease in hours/unemployed
□ CD or MI issues
□ Asked or told to leave home
□ Leaving facility
□ Fleeing unsafe neighborhood
□ Previous home overcrowded
□ Relationship problem/Friction/Break-up
□ Previous home substandard/Unsafe/Condemned
□ Utility Shut-off
□ Current health problem or medical bills
□ Physical disability of client/family with client
□ Other __________________________________

Referral Source (All that apply) □ Outreach worker
□ Housing program staff
□ School staff
□ Treatment center staff
□ Criminal justice system/officer
Fit to FHPAP?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, which goal/outcome
☐ Need Temporary Assistance
☐ Housed: ________________ of income spent on housing
☐ Not Housed: Able to spend ________________ on housing

Fit to ESGP?
☐ Yes ☐ No
Type of Residence Where assisted
Accessed Transitional Housing Program (THP)?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Barriers to Achieving Housing Stability
☐ Tenant Screening Barriers; if yes, which?
☐ Rental History
☐ Credit History
☐ Criminal History
☐ Immediate need for housing
☐ Lack of openings in transitional housing programs
☐ Overall effect: ☐ Minimal ☐ Moderate ☐ Major

☐ Personal Barriers; if yes, which?
☐ Chemical Health
☐ Mental Health
☐ Domestic Violence
☐ Overall effect: ☐ Minimal ☐ Moderate ☐ Major

☐ Income Barriers; if yes, which?
☐ Lacks fulltime employment
- Lacks HS diploma or GED
- Limited English proficiency
- Lack of reliable transportation
- Lack of reliable affordable child care
- Income not a fit to housing options available

**Overall effect:** □ Minimal □ Moderate □ Major
TOO YOUNG TO BE HOMELESS INTERVIEW SURVEY

To be used as a guiding instrument in face-to-face interviews.
Are you _____Male _____Female
Age________
Ethnicity: Hispanic or Non-Hispanic
Please self-identify your race:
_____Caucasian
_____Asian
_____Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
_____African American
_____American Indian/Alaskan Native
_____Other (not identified above): __________________________
Multi-race
_____American Indian/Alaskan Native & Caucasian
_____American Indian/Alaskan Native & African American
_____African American & Caucasian
_____Asian & Caucasian
_____Other (not identified above): __________________________
Do you attend school?    Yes or No
Did you graduate or receive your GED?    Yes or No
Have you ever been homeless?    Yes or No
    If yes, how long have you been homeless?____________________________________
How many times have you been homeless (not having permanent housing)? ______
    How old were you the first time?_______
How many times have you been homeless (living on the streets, emergency shelter or staying in a place not meant for habitation)? ______
    How old were you the first time?_______

Please tell how you came to be homeless that very first time:

    Without permanent housing?

    Staying in places not meant for habitation?

What is your current living situation?
_____Living independently
_____Living with family or friends
_____Out of home placement
_____Temporarily staying with family or friends
_____Couch hopping (staying place to place on a nightly basis)
_____Emergency shelter
_____Transitional housing
_____Treatment facility
_____Board and lodge
____ Group home
____ On the streets or in places not meant for habitation (e.g. cars, abandoned buildings, etc.)
____ Other: ______________________________________________________

Is your household female headed?    Yes or No
Are you currently at-risk of being homeless?    Yes or No

If yes, please identify which best describes your current situation:
____ Being forced out of your current living situation within a week by circumstances beyond your control?
____ Being evicted from your current residence within a week?
____ Non-payment of rent?
____ Leaving facility or other program?
____ Recently lost employment or other income?
____ Residing in an unsafe environment?
____ Other: _____________________________________________________________

Other: _____________________________________________________________

Please rate the following barriers affecting your ability to find and maintain housing. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Little or no barrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>Somewhat a barrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>Barrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>Major or very large barrier</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____ No rental history/1st time renter
____ Previous eviction(s)
____ Poor rental history/poor landlord reference
____ Record of property damage to previous residence
____ Head of household under age 18
____ Recent drug or criminal history
____ Released from incarceration/jail
____ Fleeing physical abuse
____ Fleeing neglect
____ Fleeing sexual abuse
____ Fleeing another’s bullying and threats
____ Fleeing potential gang involvement/violence
____ Actively using drugs or alcohol
____ Poor credit history or outstanding bills
____ Felony(ies)
____ Unemployed/recent decrease or loss of income
____ Income not enough to afford housing
____ Lack of affordable housing
____ Lack of support
____ Physical disability
____ Current homelessness
____ Reading and/or writing skills level
____ Mental health issues (current or on-going)
____ Lack of transportation
____ Immediate need for housing
____ No openings in transitional or supportive housing programs
____ Length of waiting lists for subsidized housing or other housing assistance programs
____ No form of identification (if required)
____ Unable to pass background check
____ Unable to afford 1st months rent & deposit on own & ineligible for funding
____ Unaware of resources assisting in housing needs
Independent living skills minimal

Please identify and rate any other barriers not mentioned that affect your ability to secure and maintain housing:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

When someone is homeless, they have to develop survival skills or "street smarts"; please tell me about at least three of the survival skills that you have developed for your own survival.

Having gone through this interview, what else would you like to tell me about the experience of being a homeless young person in Duluth? What should be considered when developing youth housing programs?
Appendix E: Life House Housing Programs and Funding Diagram

(Represents where grants are establish and at what level of government they are distributed)
Appendix F: Life House Brochure 2005

102 West First Street
Duluth, MN  55802

Life House, Inc. is a registered 501(c)3 corporation. Your donations are tax-deductible.

Life House: Opening doors for kids on the streets
For almost 15 years, Life House has existed to serve low-income, high-risk and homeless youth, ages 14-21, by assuring access to education, employment and housing opportunities.

These kids need your support…
Thanks to the hard work and contributions of others, Life House has seen countless success stories in its first fifteen years.

◊ Success is keeping a kid alive when he or she feels that nobody cares.
◊ Success is seeing a young man who has never been able to control his anger say, “Give me five minutes to calm down.”
◊ Success is knowing kids have access to the same rights and resources as others.
◊ Success is helping someone gain the simple social skills needed to survive in the world.
◊ Success is watching a young person get a G.E.D. and then enter college.
◊ Success is helping someone stay off drugs, one day at a time.
◊ Success is keeping the doors open. Please open your heart to Life House and to the kids who need your help.

From all the young people who have ever needed a safe place to rest, thank you to the original funders of Life House.

• The Northland Foundation
• The Ordean Foundation
• The Duluth-Superior Area Community Foundation

A special thank you goes out to those contributors who continue to support Life House programs:
Beim Foundation, Ben & Jeanne Overman Charitable Trust, Catholic Diocese of Duluth, City of Duluth Community Development Block Grant Program, City of Duluth Emergency Shelter Grant Program, Community Action Duluth, Department of Children, Families & Learning, Department of Housing & Urban Development, Department of Human Services, Duluth/Superior Area Community Foundation, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Calligher Realty Inc., Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Minnesota Housing Partnership, Minnesota Power, Northland Foundation, Norwest Foundation, Open Your Heart to the Hungry & Homeless Foundation, Ordean Foundation, Pilgrim Congregational Fund, St. Louis County, St. Louis County Community Development
Block Grant Program, St. Louis County Emergency Shelter Grant Program, United Way, and all other community organizations, individuals and businesses that helped Life continue “Opening doors to kids on the streets.”

**Thanks to the contributors who made the Lifeline Project a reality:**
Bush Foundation, City of Duluth Community Development Block Grant and HOME Programs, Department of Housing & Urban Development, Duluth Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Knight Foundation, Mardag Foundation, McKnight Foundation, Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Open Your Heart to the Hungry & Homeless Foundation, Ordean Foundation, Phillips Foundation, and all of the community members who supported this project.

What does hope look like?
For hundreds of our Duluth area youth, the programs at Life House – a local nonprofit agency whose mission is “providing a safe harbor that enhances the lives of youth at risk” – provide the hope they never dreamed possible. Read on to learn the difference these programs made in the life of one young man.

* * * * * * *

Matt was four years old when he taught himself how to cook. He made Ramen Noodles by looking at the pictures on the package. His mom couldn’t cook for him; she was drunk, she was high, she was anywhere the drugs would take her. His dad couldn’t help, either, from inside his prison cell.

So Matt cooked. And when his mother was coming down from her high, Matt took the beatings and the humiliation and the screams. And he held it all in. Matt didn’t go out and play with the neighborhood kids; they teased him, and they beat him. And he held that in, too. After a while, Matt couldn’t hold on any longer.

At nine, he tried to hang himself. He ended up in treatment, and he fought it hard. He felt frightened and alone. It’s no wonder the drugs he turned to made him feel better. Soon, the drugs didn’t let him feel anything at all.

And then a door was opened up to him. Matt was the first resident of Proctor House, a transitional housing program for homeless males who have nowhere else to turn. Here, he began to deal with his anger and explore the possibilities life held for him. He started going to school again. He got a good job doing something he loved to do: cooking at a local restaurant. He learned a few life skills, like budgeting and fiscal responsibility.

On the outside, Matt was getting his life back together. On the inside, however, everything was falling apart. The scope of his anger was greater than his ability to manage it, and violent fights became commonplace. He was losing his fight against drugs, as well. And, although no one at Proctor House was willing to give up on him, he was the first person to give up on himself.

Matt walked out of Proctor House and into a darker world than he’d ever been in before. He began selling drugs for income. He got high a hundred ways. He started to deteriorate, and, at 18, he was a gaunt 120 pounds.

And, again, a door was opened up to him.
“I was like walking death when I hitchhiked my way back to Proctor House. I knew they were the only people who cared, and I knew I’d go crazy without them. They helped me begin the healing process, and I’m amazed I’ve gained this much sanity.

“I know I’ll never be like everyone else in the world. I’ll always be different. But I’ve got a great job – I’m head broiler cook at a really good restaurant in town – and I’ve got money in the bank. I have no idea where I want to be in life, but I do know where I don’t want to be.

“I owe my sanity to this place.”

--Matt

These aren’t bad kids; these are kids in bad situations.

When Mary Robillard’s son brought home a friend who had been kicked out of his house, she made room. When he brought home more friends suffering the same disadvantage, she made a change. She sought help from Rachel Kincade, an outreach worker who literally swept the streets looking for homeless youth.

Together, Mary, Rachel, Karen Oleson and a part-time foster grandparent, Florence Skadsberg, went to work to get young people off the streets and out of danger. They wrote grants, solicited funds and finally, with a miniscule operating budget, opened a youth center on First Street.

That was Life House, and it was only the beginning.

Since opening its doors in 1991, Life House has helped thousands of at-risk youth access the rights other kids take for granted. Things like shelter, love and self-worth.

Today, Life House offers a variety of programs designed to stop the cycle of poverty, abuse and isolation many young people face. What’s more, it provides countless activities to help get kids involved in the community, which helps keep them from being ignored by it.

Life House Youth Center

- a safe, drug-free, supervised environment for young people, ages 14-21
- a place where kids are free to be kids
- access to essential youth services
- education and support groups from the PAVSA (Girlz Only), Boyz II Dadz, Men As Peacemakers, and Alcoholics and Narcotics Anonymous
- weekly cooking and nutrition classes
- library and computer services
- tutoring services from local colleges
- access to a homeless teacher/advocate to help keep kids in school
- access to mental health assessments
- transportation and child-care services
- foster grandma services for nurturing, games and support
- celebrations for birthdays and all of the young people’s accomplishments

In 2004, over 700 individuals accessed the services Life House Youth Center provides.
Life House Teen Parent Center

- support and education for teen parents (ages 14-21) and their children
- help for very low-income and homeless young parents at risk of losing their children
- G.E.D. and diploma classes
- weekly Early Childhood Family Education and Positive Parenting classes
- nutrition classes from the Minnesota Extension Office
- mentoring from contact with women from many different career fields
- foster grandma services
- emergency supplies, such as diapers, formula, household goods and clothing.

In 2004, over 100 young parents regularly accessed the services Life House Teen Parent Center provides.

Housing Services & the Family Homeless Prevention & Assistance Program

- six months of intensive case management for young people/families who are, or are at risk of becoming homeless
- six months of follow-up services ensure youth are stable in their housing
- direct referral services: which services are available, their full housing options, & other necessary information to make informed decisions regarding their stabilization and independent living
- partnership with the Salvation Army, CHUM and the Housing Connection
- tenant education session topics offered at the Youth Center to promote successful independent living (i.e., “How to Find Housing,” “Skills to Life Independently,” and “Maintaining Housing”)

In 2004, 140 individuals/families were served by the program.

Proctor House Transitional Housing Program

- housing, supervision and support services for homeless males, ages 16-21
- help for homeless young men who have no other options
- independent living skills training, including budgeting, food preparation and other services to help youth become self-reliant
- case management, advocacy and referral
- independent living plans
- tenants complete high school and move on to either post-secondary schooling or employment
- help with chemical/mental health issues

In 2004, 12 young men lived at Proctor House. Several residents completed their high school education. Others began post-secondary classes and/or gained full- or part-time employment. All 12 residents increased their income while in the program.

Harbor House Transitional Housing Program

- similar to Proctor House, providing housing, supervision, case management and support services to homeless young women with or without children
- independent living skills training, parenting education and support
• assistance for young mothers in keeping their children
• opportunities to work toward regaining their children

In 2004, 20 young women with 10 children lived at Harbor House. Of those whose high school education was not complete, 75% actively worked on completing it while in the program. Two graduated, 1 received her G.E.D., and 4 were enrolled in post-secondary education classes. 17 (85%) of the young women increased their income while in the program.

**Kids to Adult Transitional Program (KATS)**

• provide outreach to youth, ages 16-21, who have mental health concerns
• build relationships and provide emotional support
• provide referrals to essential services (mental/chemical health, financial, legal, shelter) and other KATS Team services (psychiatry, therapy, case management)

In 2004, outreach was provided to 800 youth; 131 were youth new this year and significant relationships were maintained with approximately 170 youth from 2003.

**Futures**

• participants must be willing to work on goals that will lead to self-sufficiency
• goals may include finishing high school, connecting with tutoring services, enrolling in employment/training programs, or addressing chemical, anger or mental health issues
• Individual Education & Employment Plan (IEEP) will be developed with each youth to assess/address daily living skills, educational levels, employment skills and access to programs and resources
• in-house and community referrals will be made as needed by Futures Case Manager

This program was initiated in late 2005. No statistics at this point in time.

**School Outside of a School**

• collaborative effort among 3 partners: Duluth Public Schools, City of Duluth WorkForce Center Youth Employment Services (Y.E.S.) Program, and Life House, Inc.
• creates a process for the cross-system coordination of educational programming currently in place for at-risk youth, ages 16-21
• formally recognizes, supports and expands the granting of elective course credit for youth who successfully complete educational programming currently taking place in off-campus, less traditional locations
• encourages disenfranchised youth to reconnect with credit bearing educational programming through the development of an open entry/open exit system with a variety of segmented instructional/learning opportunities
• instruction will be provided through individual tutoring, small group discussions/presentations offered at two informal locations: Life House, Inc. and/or the Y.E.S. Duluth program facilities

This program was initiated in late 2005. No statistics at this point in time.
The Lifeline Project

Life House opened in the LIFELINE Building in June 2001. At this location, Life House and Lutheran Social Services (LSS) make an effort to collaboratively meet the needs of low-income, high-risk and homeless youth in our area. Life House operates its Housing Services on the ground floor and the Youth/Teen Parent Centers are located on the first floor.

The second floor of the building house the LSS short-term transitional housing program, Renaissance, and the LSS Street Outreach Program office. Staffed around the clock, Renaissance provides housing & support services to 6 homeless youth (male & female) at a time. Street Outreach serves approximately 200 homeless youth per year, meeting them on the streets & providing for their basic needs and connecting them to appropriate community services. A Wellness Center has opened and provides basic health care.
DATE: March 8, 2006

TO: All Agencies and Individuals participating in the City of Duluth HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funded projects and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funded homeownership projects.

FROM: Keith Hamre, Manager

RE: 2006 CITY OF DULUTH HUD INCOME GUIDELINES

The 2006 CITY OF DULUTH MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME is $55,700 per HUD calculations.

ANNUAL INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>VERY LOW- INCOME 30% of the Median</th>
<th>LOW-INCOME 50% of the Median</th>
<th>LOW-MODERATE INCOME 80% of the Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,350</td>
<td>$22,300</td>
<td>$35,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,050</td>
<td>$25,050</td>
<td>$40,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$16,700</td>
<td>$27,850</td>
<td>$44,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$18,050</td>
<td>$30,100</td>
<td>$48,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$19,350</td>
<td>$32,300</td>
<td>$51,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$20,700</td>
<td>$34,550</td>
<td>$55,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$22,050</td>
<td>$36,750</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discontinue previous income guidelines and use the above guidelines until such time as they are revised again by HUD.

Received – March 8, 2006
Effective – March 8, 2006