

**TRANSITION IN PLACE (TIP) MODEL  
A SUMMATIVE AND FINAL EVALUATION  
REPORT**

*MARCH 2010*

Prepared for CHIP by:  
Nedra Feeley, Evaluator  
8181 Springmill Road  
Indianapolis, IN 46260  
Phone: (317) 257-2943  
FAX: (317) 254-8445  
[njfeeley@msn.com](mailto:njfeeley@msn.com)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW</b>	
	A. The Evaluation	p. 2
	B. The TIP Model	p. 3
	Families with Limited Barriers	
	The Housing Specialist	
	Employment and Financial Planning Services	
	Rental Subsidies and Financial Assistance	
<b>II.</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS</b>	
	A. Quantitative Questions	p. 7
	B. Summary of Outcomes	p. 13
	B. Qualitative Questions	p. 14
<b>III.</b>	<b>LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
	A. The HIP/TIP Model	p. 26
	B. The Housing Specialist	p. 27
	C. Rental Assistance and Emergency Funding	p. 27
	D. Families with Limited Barriers	p. 28
	E. Formal Discharge	p. 29
<b>IV.</b>	<b>CREATING A RESEARCH DATABASE</b>	
	A. Challenges	p. 29
	B. Lessons Learned	p. 30
<b>V.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	p. 32
<b>VI.</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b>	
	A. TIP Program Budget	
	B. Database Reports	

## I. OVERVIEW

### A. The Evaluation

This is a **Summative Year One and Final Evaluation Report** of the Transition in Place (TIP) model for homeless families conducted by HIP, the Homeless Initiative Program. The report covers the first year of the TIP program which began May 1, 2008, and ended on April 30, 2009. The model was designed to serve an ongoing caseload of 25 families with limited barriers during each year the program was funded. By November 2009, when the end of year-one interviews and focus group were conducted, the TIP program had completed 19 months of operations.

The premise of the TIP model was that families with limited barriers might be more easily transitioned into new housing, and that with minimum support-services, including rental assistance, TIP families would be able to remain financially independent and stabilized in their new home for one year. A TIP brochure, created by HIP, articulates the purpose of the program; provides a brief description of the model and identifies the targeted population to be served:

#### Purpose

*"The purpose of the TIP Program is to assist families with obtaining housing through a lease in their own name and to provide short-term support services and rental assistance until the family reaches a level of self-sufficiency needed to maintain housing without assistance."*

#### TIP Description

*"Transition in Place (TIP) is a permanent housing program model in which homeless families obtain housing in the community through a lease in their own name while receiving supportive services and rental assistance. The amount of assistance declines over time until the family is paying the full amount of rent and supportive services are no longer needed. Unlike typical transitional housing, families stay in the housing after completion of the program."*

#### TIP Targeted Population

*"Families with limited barriers to self-sufficiency who are living in a shelter"*

Extenuating circumstances have modified the TIP model in its second year of operations, and the funding for the program has been adjusted accordingly. The city of Indianapolis recently received a large federal grant to rapidly re-house individuals and families that are at risk of becoming homeless, and those that are already homeless. HIP is also participating in this federal program, and as a result, TIP funding has been altered to avoid duplication in this second and final year of the model. This report is not only a summative evaluation of the first year of TIP programming, it is also the final report.

Questions that are examined in this report cover only those activities that were conducted for the first year of programming, from April 2008 up to May 1st of 2009. The evaluation team compiled year-one data after 19 months of programming so that staff could reflect on their experiences and lessons learned during the first twelve months. Also, the evaluators wanted to answer the basic

question of sustainability for TIP families after being successfully transitioned into other housing. It was not feasible for families to receive services and remain housed for one year all within the first twelve months of implementing the model. Therefore, data was compiled after 19 months of services to determine how many families remained self-sufficient for one year.

Also, this report does not examine whether the TIP model can be sustained or adapted by other organizations in the future because the model had changed during its second year with the advent of new federal funding. During the first year, program activities were focused on starting a new housing program with new staff, and refining services to meet the needs of TIP families. Though there have been unanticipated alterations to the TIP model, the evaluators hope that this report will still offer valuable lessons and best practices for transitioning homeless families into safe and sustainable housing. They believe that those components of the TIP model that have worked well during its first year, as well as the lessons learned can be incorporated into other programs and new initiatives to better serve all our homeless neighbors in the Indianapolis area.

## **B. The TIP Model**

The TIP model included four significant program components.

1. It served homeless families with "limited barriers".
2. The model included the position of a Housing Specialist.
3. It provided extensive employment and financial planning services.
4. It offered short-term rental subsidies and financial assistance to help stabilize families in their new homes for one year.

These four main program components of the TIP model are explained in the following section.

### **1. Families with limited barriers**

To identify families with limited barriers, the following Acceptance Criteria were developed to determine who would benefit from the TIP program. According to the grant guidelines, targeted TIP families must have:

- Demonstrated an ability to pay at least \$50 towards rent and utilities upon obtaining housing.
- Demonstrated an ability to identify immediate and future goals.
- Had a criminal/credit history that allows them to sign a lease and access housing.
- Had a work history and the skills needed to secure a job that provides a living wage and/or a willingness to participate in pre-employment services at HIP.
- Been in recovery or engaged in health, mental health, or substance abuse treatment if applicable.
- Been willing to accept support from HIP staff and meet with staff regular intervals (weekly, monthly, quarterly) or as needed.

The TIP model also created a set of criteria for discharging successful clients from the program who had been living independently for one year. The discharge criteria were as follows:

- Families have remained successfully housed for 12 months or longer.

- Families have managed their budget including paying all rent and utilities in a timely manner for at least 6 months.
- Families have obtained and maintained employment at a living wage.
- They have achieved two goals of their Care Plan.
- They have acquired medical insurance and a primary medical care provider.
- They have developed linkages in their new community.
- They have expressed a readiness to maintain all of the above without the assistance of TIP staff.

## 2. The Housing Specialist:

A second component of the TIP model included a new staff position for the program, called the Housing Specialist. The TIP model used this position to address the challenges many homeless people face when living in a shelter and trying to move themselves into a new place of their own. These challenges included:

- Families having to find a place they can afford.
- Families having to negotiate the terms of the lease while still living in an emergency shelter.
- Families often require assistance in moving into their new home.
- After moving in, families often need support when unanticipated problems arise.

The HIP staff believed that adding this position to the TIP model has been critically important in successfully transitioning homeless families into sustainable housing. In the TIP model, the Housing Specialist was responsible for developing positive relationships with both the property managers and with the families. This person served as an advocate for both the new tenants and the landlord, negotiating any differences or misunderstandings between the property manager and the family. Having this staff position in place also made it easier to find suitable housing when clients were ready to move in. Property managers were assured that they had "back-up" support from the Housing Specialist should they experience problems with the new TIP tenants.

Several emergency shelter directors also believed that the position of a Housing Specialist and its ensuing responsibilities, are critically important to transitioning families into suitable housing. As a result, these administrators have added the responsibilities of this position to one or two of their case managers, asking them to conduct outreach to property managers as part of their agency's services.

## 3. Employment and Financial Planning Services:

The third component of the TIP model was providing a well-structured employment program and offering detailed financial planning services. In the HIP/TIP model, both Employment Specialists and the TIP Case Manager worked with the client to find a new job. While completing the employment program and finding a new job, the TIP Case Manager assisted the family in developing a realistic budget so that they would become self-sufficient and stabilized in their new home. The following describes the HIP Employment Program, which continues as a service of HIP.

This program is a structured program that has been directed by the same staff person for the past 15 years. It offers the following array of employment services.

- A two month Employment Workshop
- Employment Specialists, in addition to the HIP and/or TIP Case Managers
- Supportive employment tools
- Job search support
- Peer support
- Financial planning

Employment Specialists work with those individuals who choose to participate in the program. The program begins with an Employment Workshop that extends over two months. The Workshop is offered twice a month and is a week-long session that runs five days a week from 8:30 AM to 11:30 AM. Participants are required to attend all workshop sessions. Exceptions are made for someone's work schedule.

The Employment Workshop Sessions include something new all the time. TIP families report that they find these services to be very helpful. Information is discussed about how to dress for an interview; how to prepare a strong resume, write a cover letter and thank you notes; and how to appropriately answer questions about a past criminal history. Participants role-play by doing a mock interview. Afterwards, they discuss what it means to be a good employee and what high performance means to the employer and the company. These sessions are designed to encourage people to re-gain employment and build up their sense of hope and self-esteem.

The HIP employment program also offers supportive employment tools for clients.

- HIP has a phone bank that participants may use if they have no phone of their own.
- They can set up a private voice mail system and receive and/or retrieve personal phone messages from potential employers.
- HIP also has a fax machine and dedicated line for their employment program so that participants may send and receive facsimiles.
- Each participant has access to the computer lab and is given an email address to use.
- The HIP address, phone and fax numbers can be listed on their resumes if participants are still living in a shelter.

There is a job search component of the HIP employment program. HIP Employment Specialists assist clients in finding jobs with area businesses. The Employment Specialists serve as personal coaches, continually encouraging the participants in their efforts to find a new job. They also follow-up with the client to make sure all is going well once they have become employed.

HIP staff have developed business partnerships who will assist HIP in hiring those program participants who are qualified. The business partners also know that they can contact HIP staff should they encounter a problem with a new employee from the HIP employment program. The HIP and TIP Case Managers are also there to provide additional assistance, if a client runs into

problems. Several times staff have stepped in to offer services such as emergency transportation and child care.

Often past clients who have progressed through the HIP Employment Program and are successfully employed, are asked to return to a Workshop session and talk about their experiences to provide peer support and encouragement. Their message is that homeless individuals can succeed. Those still searching for jobs find this support very helpful.

The staff stress that there is a caveat to the HIP Employment Program. It does not work well for people with disabilities. If the structured HIP employment services do not meet the needs of some of the their disabled clients, they are referred to other programs in the city. In either case, HIP and TIP Case Managers will continue to follow their clients and add support as needed.

HIP believes it can offer this wide range of employment services because the organization is not an emergency shelter. Instead it is an umbrella organization of supportive services with a mission *"to assist homeless persons in Marion County to reach a level of self-sufficiency consistent with their goals and capabilities for health and social well-being."*

Detailed TIP Financial Planning services round out the cadre of employment support from the HIP Employment Program. It is another essential component of the TIP model. While a TIP client is progressing through the employment program, he or she is also meeting with the TIP Case Manager to create a family budget. This budgeting service is a "reality" check for families that have been under/or unemployed and are hoping to sign a new lease to become re-housed. Several clients interviewed for this report, believe that the TIP financial planning services, and learning how to manage all the expenses associated with becoming re-housed, have been very helpful. Some families reported that as a result of the TIP financial services, they have learned to better manage their money. They said that now they pay rent and utilities first, according to their budgets and then take care of other basic needs. Lastly, they said, if anything is left over they spend that on something "extra" for themselves or their children.

#### 4. Rental Subsidies and Financial Assistance:

The TIP model was originally designed to provide up to six months of rental subsidies for families who had transitioned into new housing. However, soon after starting the program, the staff decided to set higher expectations for their clients and instead, told them they would provide rental subsidies for up to three months. Surprisingly, most TIP clients were able to successfully manage their budgets and living expenses with a more limited rental subsidy. Program staff were then able to use the extra grant funds as an emergency funding to provide financial assistance for families' other unanticipated living expenses, such as extra child care needs and/or transportation issues to further stabilize TIP families in their new homes.

## II. Evaluation Findings

The Coalition for Homelessness Intervention and Prevention (CHIP) contracted with this evaluation team to assess the effectiveness and potential of the TIP program model and to create a Research Database to address the quantitative and qualitative questions about programmatic outcomes. This second section of the report analyzes *quantitative data from the Research Database and qualitative information* compiled from interviews and one focus group over the first year of TIP programming. The following are the findings or outcomes to 33 of the 38 proposed questions.

There are 16 quantitative questions and most can be answered from the data compiled in the Research Database from April of 2008 through October of 2009. The evaluators examined 19 months of quantitative data to determine which families remained self-sufficient for one year after being re-housed. 22 are qualitative questions of which 17 can be answered from the first twelve months of program activities. The remaining five questions focused on TIP family/tenant behavior and were beyond the scope of this evaluation. A longer period of time would be needed for analysis and answers to explore these type of questions.

In the following Section A, outcomes are reported from the quantitative information housed in the Research Database. Client names have been replaced with ID numbers to protect family privacy.

### **A. Quantitative Outcome Questions**

The answers to the following 16 quantitative questions have been generated from the Research Database. Four questions, #8 - #11, have been eliminated because they ask information about the length of time in finding employment and medical coverage. This information had not been compiled or tracked during program implementation. Other questions have been combined to create a more concise report. The original 16 questions are listed below with either an explanation of the modification, or the answers. Copies of each TIP database report is included in the appendices of this evaluation for further review.

In order to accurately address the following outcome questions, the evaluation team prepared a separate summary report, called the **TIP Population Report**, for all those families who had been referred to the TIP program prior to May 1, 2009, the end of the first year. The team then examined subsets of clients from this total population to answer the specific questions identified below.

The **TIP Population Report** has identified homeless families who were referred to the TIP program during the first year of its activities. There were 147 homeless families in total who "entered the doors" or were officially referred to the HIP/TIP program from various shelters during the first year, according to paper referral forms. 10 families were not included in this report because they were ineligible according to the basic Acceptance Criteria for the program. (**See Ineligibility Criteria Report # 14**). Therefore entire population of TIP clients in this report is 137.

When looking at the **TIP Population Report**, and the other reports generated from the Research Database, it is important to note that the *Shelter Referral Date* was not the official TIP program

enrollment date. The official enrollment date for the TIP model was much later in the process of providing services, and was the date of the *Housing Committee Meeting*. However, tracking how many homeless families in total were referred to the TIP program during the first year of operations, has defined the scope of need in our community. Comparing time lapses from the *Shelter Referral Date* and the *Housing Committee Date* - the official enrollment date -has provided the evaluation team with the actual length of time TIP clients spent in the shelter and in program activities. The following information is included in the **TIP Population Report**.

**Outcome: There were 147 total homeless families who were referred to the TIP program.**

**Outcome: 137 families who were referred met the program Acceptance Criteria. 10 did not. (See Report # 14).**

**Outcome: There were 34 homeless families out of 137 who were considered eligible and had been officially referred to the TIP program with a Housing Committee Meeting Date. These 34 families (identified in red ink with dates prior to May 1, 2009) were officially enrolled in TIP by the end of the first year.**

**Question #1: How successful is the program in placing clients in permanent housing within 45 days of initial application/intake?**

There are two reports to answer this question, depending upon whether the *Shelter Referral Date* was used as the benchmark for 45 days, or if the official *Housing Committee Meeting Date* was the benchmark date.

**Report #1** examines the length of time required from the date of the Housing Committee to place TIP families into permanent housing. By the time homeless families had met with the Housing Committee, though, they had progressed through a variety of intense TIP case management, employment, financial planning and housing services and were prepared to sign a lease. There were 23 families who had an occupancy date during the first year of programming.

**Outcome: The average length of time for 23 families to be transitioned from the official enrollment date - i.e. the *Housing Committee Meeting Date* - to the Occupancy Date was 25.43 days.**

**Report # 1B** answers this same question by examining the length of time that passed to transition 23 families into new housing from the *Shelter Referral Date* to the Occupancy date. The reason to examine this outcome data with a different benchmark is that this data includes all the core components of the TIP program services that staff provided in preparing clients to sign a lease in their own name. The time spent to help families remove barriers to self-sufficiency was a critical component of the TIP model and should be taken into consideration when looking at outcome data.

**Outcome: The average length of time for 23 homeless families to move out of the shelter - the *Shelter Intake Date* - and into a home of their own - the Occupancy Date - was 83.83 days.**

**Question #2: What percentage of household income is spent on rent/utilities at program entry and at program exit?**

It is important to note that the cost of utilities has not been tracked as a separate data point in the Research Database. This expense often varied between rental properties and the type of lease that was negotiated. Also, family income data was not collected at the time of program exit.

Therefore, **Report #2** has answered this question with the data available by first calculating the total average income for 23 transitioned clients and the total average rent payment for 23 transitioned clients. The report then determined the percentage of the two totals of average income and average rent.

**Outcome: The 23 TIP transitioned families spent on the average, 33% of their income on rent.**

This outcome is remarkably close to the standard 30% or less for the optimal ratio of family income dedicated to housing. The TIP program has done remarkably well in assisting 23 families with developing a realistic family budget and helping them find affordable housing.

**Question #3: On average, at what point are families able to take on a larger portion of their rent/utility costs?**

**Question #4: What percent of families are able to assume full rent and utilities after 6 to 9 months of participation in the program?**

**Question #5: How long do most families need a full rent subsidy?**

**Question #6: How long do most families need a shallow rent subsidy?**

To answer **Questions #3 through #6**, regarding how soon families can sustain themselves, one report was generated for all four questions. **Report #3 - #6** lists the 23 TIP families who were transitioned into new housing and then identifies the subsidies covered through grant funds for each. The report also lists the contracted lease amount for each family and the dates when each subsidy payment was made by the TIP program.

**Question #3:** Even though the program was designed to provide rental subsidies for six months, TIP families assumed financial responsibility sooner than that. Several clients needed help every month, but several only needed assistance for one or two months. This answer is slightly skewed because while all 23 families in this report had been officially enrolled before May 1, 2009, some were still in the process of achieving the 12 month goal of self-reliance by the time the data reports were generated and may have needed more assistance. However, using the data that was provided, the outcome is quite positive.

**Outcome: The average length of time the TIP model paid rental subsidies for 23 transitioned TIP families during the first year was 3.22 months.**

**Question #4:** By November 2009, the evaluation team examined the 10 families who had been successfully housed for 12 months (see **Report # 7**, red ink). Their average length of time in needing rental subsidies was 4.7 months.

**Outcome: The average length of time rental subsidies were required for both subgroups of clients was 4 months.**

**Question #5:** A manual count of this report, identified three out of the 23 transitioned families who needed a full rent subsidy. In each instance it was just one month of full subsidy in accordance with program expectations. Each family was learning how to set budgeting priorities that placed payment of housing expenses as a priority. Partial rental assistance was provided as well as emergency funding for unanticipated living expenses so that families successfully remained housed for one year.

**Outcome: As a general policy full subsidies were not offered. However there were three exceptions.**

**Question #6:** This same report answers this question by examining the 10 TIP families who remained housed for one year, and needed rental assistance beyond six months. There were three families who needed rental assistance beyond 6 months.

**Outcome: 7 out of 10 successfully housed TIP families were able to resume full responsibility for their rent and utilities after the sixth month. Three needed subsidies beyond 6 months.**

**Question #7: How many families remain housed for 12 months?**

The answer to this outcome question is an important indicator to the overall success of the TIP model. **Report #7** identifies the Housing Committee Date for each of the 23 transitioned TIP families, their Occupancy Date and a Discharge Date, where there is one. Successful families have been identified in red ink in this report. To review this report, one has to assume that those without a discharge date are still in the TIP program.

**Outcome: 10 of the 23 transitioned TIP families have remained successfully housed for 12 months by the end of November 2009, when this evaluation was prepared.**

In this same report, there are six families who had a formal discharge date identified prior to 12 months. The remaining seven have not yet reached their one year benchmark when examining their Occupancy Date. The scope of a first-year evaluation did not examine why these families were discharged early.

**Outcome: 6 families have dropped out of the program after being re-housed.**

**Question #8: How many families are able to obtain employment within 3 months of participation in the program?**

**Question #9: How many families secure employment at, or above, \$8.50 per hour within 3 months of placement into housing?**

**Questions #8 and #9** involved employment information and were combined into one so that the question read as follows: "**How many families secure employment at, or above, \$8.50 per hour within 3 months of placement into housing?**"

There was no hourly wage data compiled during program implementation to generate a report for this question. However, the TIP model required that all families have steady employment by the time they met with the Housing Committee and were preparing to sign a lease. Employment services and financial planning were required program services for a client to become officially enrolled and transition into new housing. The answer to this question does not come from data, but rather from the policies and procedures of the TIP model. The answer, using the **TIP Population Report**, is that 34 TIP families had secured employment because they had a *Housing Committee Meeting Date* established.

**Answer: The TIP model required families to secure employment by the time they were housed, rather than 3 months after being housed. Therefore 34 families who had an established *Housing Committee Meeting Date* had secured employment.**

**Question #10: How many families apply for medical insurance within 60 days of program entry?**

**Question #11: How many families receive medical insurance within 60 days of program entry?**

There are no reports for **Questions #10 and #11** about medical coverage because this information was not tracked during program implementation. In some instances, the TIP Case Manager case notes indicated that assistance was provided for TIP families in securing entitlements, such as Hoosier Healthwise insurance for their children. However, the case notes were not detailed enough to consistently answer this question.

**Answer: There was no quantifiable data in the Research Database to address Questions #10 and #11.**

**Question #12: How much time elapses between the initial referral date and the assessment by a Housing Specialist?**

**Report #12** examines the total population referred to the TIP program - 147 and then removes two subsets of families. One subset is the 10 homeless families who did not meet the basic program criteria. Another subset was those homeless families who were referred, but never had a formal meeting date with the Housing Specialist. That leaves a total population of 99 homeless families for this report who were referred to the TIP program from a shelter and who also had a scheduled meeting date with the Housing Specialist.

**Outcome: Of the subgroup of 99 homeless families, the average length of time that lapsed before they met with the Housing Specialist was about one week, or 6.48 days.**

**Question #13: Are families decreasing the time they spend in emergency shelters as a result of expedited referrals to the TIP program?**

This answer was not captured in the Research Database because information about time spent in emergency shelters was not collected or compiled in the TIP system.

However, the evaluator answered this question by conducting a phone survey of nine shelter directors who provide emergency housing for families in Indianapolis. The answer to this question implies that the TIP model was a rapid re-housing model, but the quantitative data indicated that families were remaining in the shelter for a long time while receiving TIP services. Therefore, the evaluator asked each shelter director to provide the average length of stay for their families in 2008. All nine shelter directors responded. The length of stay for families varied from 18 days at the Julian Center, a shelter for persons fleeing domestic violence, to 120 days and 150 days respectively at the Salvation Army and Good News shelters.

**Outcome: The average length of stay for families in emergency housing programs in Indianapolis is about two months, or 59 days.**

**Outcome: The answer to this question is no. TIP families are not decreasing the time spent in an emergency shelter as a result of the TIP model. Families remain in emergency shelters for nearly 84 days while receiving supportive TIP services and are ready to be housed. (See Report 1B).**

**Outcome: The TIP model is not a rapid re-housing model.**

**Question #14: What eligibility criteria of the program disqualified the most candidates?**

**Summary Report #14** identified all 147 referrals made to the TIP program from its inception in 2008 until May 1 of 2009, and found 10 homeless families who did not qualify for the TIP model.

**There were three main reasons:**

- **Two families had too many evictions.**
- **One had too lengthy a criminal history.**
- **Seven referrals were for homeless people that were not really considered an "intact" family - i.e. members who were still living together, as opposed to separated or legally divorced.**

There were a total of 137 homeless families were referred to the TIP program during the first year from area shelters who had met TIP program criteria.

**Outcome: There were three program criteria (see above) that disqualified 10 of the 147 families referred to the TIP program.**

**Question #15: How long do families need case management?**

**Question #16: What percentage of families need case management support after one year of program participation?**

These two case management questions were combined into one report because in the TIP model, no services were provided after the client had been housed for one year. Therefore **Question #16** cannot be fully answered.

**Report #15 and #16** is skewed because not every one of the 23 successfully enrolled TIP clients had a data point when case management services were terminated. To answer this question, the evaluators reviewed the data that was available for 21 families.

The subset of 137 homeless families was used to identify those clients with a Shelter/Intake Date, a Housing Committee Date and also a Case Management Discharge Date. This subset of 21 families had all three dates recorded in the Research Database, and some had been discharged from the program earlier than twelve months. For this subset of 21 families, **Report #15 - #16** calculated the time spent from the Shelter/Intake Date to the Discharge Date.

**Outcome: The average length of time spent in case management services for this subset of TIP clients was 209 days, or about seven months.**

**B. Summary of Outcomes for the First Year of the TIP model**

Based on the 16 quantitative questions and the TIP population report from the TIP Research Database, the following is a summary list of the 17 outcomes from the first year of program implementation. These findings, derived from a mechanized data system, provide clarity about what the strengths and challenges have been of the TIP model.

- 1. Outcome: There were 147 total homeless families who were referred to the TIP program.**
- 2. Outcome: 137 families who were referred met the program Acceptance Criteria. 10 did not. (See Report # 14).**
- 3. Outcome: There were 34 homeless families out of 137 who were considered eligible and had been referred to the TIP program. These 34 were officially enrolled in TIP by the end of the first year. (See TIP Population Report).**

4. **Outcome:** The average length of time to be transitioned from the enrollment date -i.e. the Housing Committee Meeting Date to the Occupancy Date was 25.43 days.
5. **Outcome:** The average length of time for 23 homeless families to move out of the shelter - the Shelter Intake Date - and into a home of their own - the Occupancy Date - was 83.83 days.
6. **Outcome:** The 23 TIP transitioned families spent on the average, 33% of their income on rent.
7. **Outcome:** The average length of time the TIP model paid rental subsidies for 23 transitioned TIP families was 4.3 months.
8. **Outcome:** The average length of time rental subsidies were required for both subgroups of clients - those housed for 12 months and those who were transitioned into housing - was 4.5 months.
9. **Outcome:** As a general policy full subsidies were not offered. However there were three exceptions.
10. **Outcome:** All 10 successfully housed TIP families were able to resume full responsibility for their rent and utilities after the sixth month.
11. **Outcome:** 10 of the 23 transitioned TIP families have remained successfully housed for 12 months by the end of November 2009, when this evaluation was prepared.
12. **Outcome:** 6 families have dropped out of the program after being re-housed.
13. **Of the subgroup of 99 homeless families, the average length of time that lapsed before they met with the Housing Specialist was about one week, or 6.48 days.**
14. **Outcome:** The average length of stay for families in emergency housing programs in Indianapolis is about two months, or 59 days.
15. **Outcome:** The TIP model is not a rapid re-housing model.
16. **Outcome:** TIP families are not decreasing the time spent in an emergency shelter as a result of the TIP model. Families remain in emergency shelters for nearly 84 days while receiving supportive TIP services and are ready to be housed. (See Report 1B).
17. **Outcome:** There were three program criteria that disqualified 10 of the 147 families referred to TIP.
  - Two families had too many evictions.

- **One had too lengthy a criminal history.**
- **Seven referrals were for homeless people that were not really considered an "intact" family - i.e. members who were still living together, as opposed to separated or legally divorced.**

**18. Outcome: The average length of time spent in case management services for this subset of TIP clients was 209 days, or about seven months.**

### **C. Qualitative Questions from Interviews and One Focus Group**

The information gathered to answer these qualitative questions for the first year evaluation was compiled from a series of interviews with families, staff and one focus group of TIP clients over a period of 19 months. Specifically, the evaluators conducted the following activities:

- Interviewed 4 HIP staff - once at the start of the program and again after the first year of program operations at the 19th month of implementation.
- Interviewed 5 Emergency Shelter Directors after the first year of operations.
- Interviewed 5 successfully transitioned families - two who were part of a focus group.
- Interviewed 3 potential TIP clients who had not yet met with the Housing Committee.
- Interviewed 2 property managers
- Met with 2 CHIP staff – the Associate Program Director and the Executive Director of CHIP
- Met with one chronically homeless person (not enrolled in the TIP program) and followed up with him several times via phone interviews. He had been successfully re-housed for over one year with assistance from the HIP agency.

However, as mentioned earlier, the scope of a first year evaluation limited the findings for several of the qualitative questions which would require additional years of programming and more examination to answer. The following section of this report, addresses the qualitative findings of the first-year evaluation.

#### **Question #1: Are clients being placed in appropriate, sustainable units?**

**Answer: Yes, with one exception, 23 TIP clients were placed in appropriate, sustainable units.**

The evaluator conducted five interviews with successfully-placed families out of the 23 that had been re-housed. All but one family was very pleased with their new living arrangements. The remaining four families were quite pleased with their new homes, appreciating the freshly painted walls, and in some cases, new carpeting and appliances. They spoke of the Housing Specialist as their "guardian angel", because he could find them much nicer places than what they could have found on their own.

One TIP family, however, had a completely different and unhappy experience with their new housing. This family was transitioned from the shelter into roach-infested living quarters with a brand new infant and a toddler. The family was very disappointed with their new living

arrangements and therefore the TIP program, because neither the property manager nor the TIP Housing Specialist seemed to be able to remedy this situation after 10 months into their first year of the program.

Even the TIP Case Manager who maintained contact with the family and was quite sympathetic, was unable to resolve the situation. The evaluator understood their predicament when a roach climbed up her shoe as she sat in the living room to conduct the interview. The parents were very embarrassed and sprayed the insect. However, their problems continued for another month before the evaluator learned that staff had taken additional steps to remedy this situation. There was obviously a break-down in communications between the client and TIP staff with this particular problem - which was eventually resolved by December of 2009.

**Question #2: Using HUD definitions are rents affordable at time of housing placement (considering the TIP subsidy?)**

**Answer: Using HUD definitions for Reasonableness of Rent and Habitability, 22 out of 23 TIP clients were placed in affordable and habitable housing.**

With the one exception mentioned above, staff reported that each TIP family was placed in suitable, clean, safe housing in an area of the city they preferred to live. The HUD definitions for *Reasonableness of Rent* are that subsidized rents are reasonable, as determined in two ways. First, the rent for the voucher unit must be a comparable rate to unassisted units in the market place. Secondly, the rent charged for one unit must be similar to other units on the premises.<sup>1</sup>

For *Habitability*, HUD requires that "housing be in compliance with all applicable state and local housing codes, licensing requirements, and any other requirements in the jurisdiction for which housing is located, regarding the condition of the structure and the operation of housing services."<sup>2</sup>

The TIP Housing Specialist did inspect each apartment. He attended the lease signing meeting with the property manager and TIP family, and at that time, walked through the apartment with the TIP client to inspect and review its conditions according to the lease agreement. While the TIP grant did not require staff to conduct such inspections, the staff believed that they have appropriately placed TIP families in safe and suitable housing, even when the program offered rental subsidies. The staff reported that they have used the same apartment complexes for the TIP program that they have used for other housing programs, and the Housing Specialist did conduct a visual inspection of the premises with each client before they moved in.

The housing placements were affordable for TIP families as well when examining the standard benchmark used by financial institutions for mortgage lending. The cost of housing should be

---

<sup>1</sup> Housing Choice Voucher Program Guide Book -HUD, Chapter 9.1, January 10, 2008

<sup>2</sup> Department of Housing and Urban Development, (Docket No. FR-5307-N-01), March 19, 2009

30% or less than a family's annual income. According to the Research Database, **Report #2** found that for the 23 families transitioned into new housing, their average rent was 33% of their average income.

**Question #3: At what point (in the program) are families able to take on a larger portion of their rent/utility costs?**

**Answer: On the average, all successfully transitioned 23 TIP families sustained their living arrangements at 3.22 months. Those who were housed for one year needed a longer period 0- 4.7 months of assistance.**

According to the data compiled in the Research Database, (**Report #3- #6**) most TIP families, on the average, could sustain a larger portion of their rent/utilities expense with three months of assistance. Of the 10 that were successfully self-sufficient for one year, three families received assistance past the sixth month, pushing their average amount of assistance to 4.7 months. This data is not complete for all that were housed, however, because seven families have not yet reached the one year bench mark to sustainability within the first 19 months of programming.

**Question #4: How successful is the program in identifying and assessing each family's barriers to self-sufficiency?**

**Answer: The TIP model has been very successful.**

Staff worked diligently to address each family's barriers to self-sufficiency even though they did not really know what all the barriers might be for each client until they began working with them. However, the staff continued to prepare each client to become self-sufficient as they progressed through the core program components of the TIP model.

According to the Research Database (**Report #1B**) TIP staff spent an average of 84 days with each family removing barriers to becoming re-housed. The program staff provided employment services, financial planning, housing and case management services to ensure that each client would be ready to sign a lease in their own name - before they were transitioned into new housing. TIP staff even offered emergency childcare and/or transportation and negotiated entitlements as needed to ensure a family could remain stabilized for one year.

As of the end of November 2009, ten of the 23 TIP families who transitioned into new housing had remained housed and self-sufficient for one year. Six could not sustain their new housing. However, there were seven more families who might have met their one year mark of self-sufficiency by April 2010, when the TIP model concluded its services.

**Question #5: Do families address other needs that contributed to their homelessness?**

**Answer: Yes, 23 of 34 families who were officially enrolled in the TIP program had addressed their issues of homelessness.**

The 23 families who remained in the TIP program were motivated to work with TIP staff and address their issues of homelessness and sign a new lease. If clients missed a meeting, they were expected to contact the staff and reschedule. If they had other problems with some of their assignments, they were expected to contact TIP staff and let them know right away. The staff continually assured their TIP families that they would not be judgmental, no matter what the problem was. Staff explained to each family that they were there to help, but that the TIP model was not a program for three months of free rent. TIP families were expected to address those conditions that led up to their homelessness, and TIP staff would gladly assist them for as long as it took to prepare them to sign a lease in their own name.

In the TIP model, families were required to meet regularly with the TIP Case Manager, TIP Housing Specialist and HIP employment staff to prepare themselves for transitioning into a permanent place of their own. Individual issues varied but were addressed through case management, employment, housing and financial services. Each TIP family was required to bring \$50 to the lease signing event so that the lease and utilities would be in their name - even though TIP staff agreed to provide rental subsidies to support their transition into a new home. The intent of the TIP model has always been to move the family to self-sufficiency as quickly as possible.

**Question #6: Do families acquire skills and/or income that allow for greater self-sufficiency over time?**

**Answer: Yes, 10 of 23 families acquired skills that enabled them to remain self-sufficient for one year at the end of 18 months of programming.**

Ten of the 23 TIP families who were re-housed, were able to sustain themselves for one year and had acquired greater self-sufficiency over time. They learned to use their income to pay rent and utilities first, then take care of basic needs, and save anything left over from their budget for the "extras."

These self-reliant families also learned that their relationship with TIP staff could help them overcome an emergency situation so they would remain housed. One family had its food stamps drastically reduced because the mother had been given a small raise with her new job. She tried to resolve the problem herself, but met bureaucratic resistance. She immediately contacted the TIP Case Manager so that she would not fall behind on her rent. The Case Manager was able to re-negotiate the original amount of food stamps to ensure the family remained self-sufficient.

Another TIP family's car broke down, and they needed assistance with the repairs in order to get to work and keep their job. Learning how to budget and how to ask for help when needed were the skills that enabled 10 families to remain self-sufficient for one year.

**Question #7: How successful is the program at helping participants' address health/mental health/substance abuse issues?**

**Answer:** This information was not readily available in case notes nor in the Research Database and cannot be answered for this report.

**Question # 8: Are families decreasing the time they spend in emergency shelters as a result of expedited referrals to the TIP program? If yes, why? If no, why?**

**Answer:** No, families are not reducing the length of time spent in emergency shelters as a result of the TIP program.

The average length of stay for families in our city shelters is 59 days, **(See Section A., Question #13)**, and the average length of stay for TIP families during the first year of operating the TIP model was 84 days. **(See Report #1B)**. The reason for this extended length of time was that in the TIP model, families remained in a shelter while working with TIP staff to remove all the necessary barriers to becoming re-housed and be prepared to sign a lease in their own name. Issues of homelessness were removed *before* families were transitioned into new living arrangements. The TIP model was not a rapid re-housing or housing first model. Instead it was a program to help families become re-housed with a lease in their own name and remain stabilized for one year.

**Question #9: Is the program able to identify 25 homeless families that meet all the eligibility criteria:**

- Ability to pay \$50 a month toward rent/utilities
- Ability to identify immediate and future goals
- Have a tenancy/criminal/credit history that allows them to sign a lease and access housing
- Have a work history and skills needed to secure a job that provides a living wage
- Be in recovery or engaged in health, mental health or in substance abuse treatment

**Answer:** Yes, the TIP model had 137 referrals from shelters and identified 34 families who met the model criteria by meeting with the Housing Committee. 23 were successfully re-housed.

There are several ways to answer this question, though, regarding how the eligibility criteria was used. The first answer is that using the Acceptance Criteria, TIP staff successfully enrolled 34 homeless families into the program with the *Housing Committee Date*. By this stage of the program these families had successfully removed barriers to housing stability according to the criteria and were prepared to sign a lease in their own name. 23 actually moved into new housing.

However, another possible answer to this question is that only ten families were considered *ineligible* for the program - **(See Summary Report #14)** - leaving 137 homeless families who were considered eligible and had been referred to TIP from the shelters.

The challenge for the program staff was in verifying that families had actually met the Acceptance Criteria once they had been referred from the shelters. Staff were not aware of all

their clients' issues of homelessness until they began working with them to become re-housed. Therefore, program staff implemented TIP services for all those referred unless they discovered that a client was ineligible for the program - i.e. not an intact family, too many evictions or a serious past criminal history. Other potential TIP families left the program of their own volition.

**Second Answer: The criteria became a tool for staff to decide when families were ready to be re-housed and could be officially enrolled in the program with a *Housing Committee Meeting Date*.**

In actual practice, the Acceptance Criteria was used as a final checklist in the last steps of the TIP model after a client had progressed through all the core services of housing, employment, case management and financial planning. By the time families had removed their barriers to housing stability, they had also met the Acceptance Criteria and were officially enrolled in the TIP program to meet with the Housing Committee.

**Question # 10: What strategies do staff (Housing Specialists) use to place households in appropriate, sustainable units?**

**Answer: The Housing Specialist used a variety of strategies that included developing strong relationships, and providing facilitation and mediation services on behalf of the family and the property manager.**

There was one Housing Specialist for the TIP program, but he had done a remarkable job of placing TIP families in safe, clean and affordable apartments in the area of the city they preferred during the first year of programming. With one exception, everyone who had worked with the Housing Specialist, both property managers and homeless families, believed he has had their best interests at heart. The specific strategies he used to make successful placements included the following:

- Assisted the TIP clients in finding suitable housing in the area of the city they prefer to live.
- Provided TIP Orientation Sessions to prospective property managers to explain the program and encourage them to participate.
- Developed a trust with both families and property managers by listening to the needs of each.
- Made frequent calls on both the TIP family and the property manager to be sure everything is going well.
- Resolved family complaints with the landlord (with one exception).
- Resolved landlord complaints with TIP families.
- Provided emergency assistance as needed to make sure each month's rent is paid.
- Provided spontaneous baby-sitting and even moving services, to be sure TIP families were successfully re-housed.
- Checked in with those clients who had been housed to ensure they were still self-sufficient after one year.

- Conducted visual drive-by visits for those families who have ended contact with the TIP program to be sure they still have an active lease.

As a note of interest, during the second year of TIP operations, the Housing Specialist created another series of sessions called the Renter's Workshop. This workshop targeted both TIP and HIP clients who were about to be re-housed. It was a mandatory meeting for those preparing to sign a lease. The sessions ran twice a month and included a panel of property managers and successful tenants to explain expectations. This new service was not added until recently, so at the time of the year-end interviews with staff, only one session had been conducted. This type of service could provide another strategy to proactively address issues that might arise between landlords and tenants.

**Question #11: Is the Housing Specialist able to secure an adequate number of potential units to facilitate timely placement? If yes, what is their success? If no, what are the barriers?**

**Answer: For the first year of TIP programming the answer is yes.**

The Housing Specialist had successfully transitioned 23 TIP families into appropriate, safe and affordable apartments as they progressed through the TIP core services. There did not seem to be a shortage of housing during the first year of programming for this size case load, although one family was unhappy with their placement. The successful placements were due to the skills of the Housing Specialist in finding new housing in areas of the city that TIP clients preferred, and developing close working relationships with property managers to create good will between the Housing Specialist and the landlords.

Several emergency shelter directors interviewed for this report, also believed the services of a Housing Specialist would be of great assistance for all of their residents in finding appropriate housing in a timely fashion. The directors believed that it is difficult for families to re-house themselves without the support from this type of position.

**Question #12: Are landlords willing to participate in the program? If yes, what is the appeal? If no, why not?**

**Answer: Yes, landlords were willing to participate in the TIP program during the first year.**

The evaluator interviewed only two property managers during the first year of programming, so this answer is from a limited source. However, both individuals were quite willing to continue their participation in the TIP program. One was a regional manager over nine different apartment complexes. The other managed a newly refurbished complex. The appeal of the TIP model for both of these property managers was:

- Their strong working relationship with the Housing Specialist.
- TIP families had been well prepared to sign a lease and seemed capable of keeping this financial commitment.

- There was backup support from the TIP model for rent subsidies and emergency financial assistance that kept families in their apartments.

According to both managers, no TIP family had been turned down in their application for a lease during the first year of programming. The newly developed series of Renters Workshop sessions could be another effective tool in recruiting property manager participation to re-house the homeless.

**Question #13: How does the program cultivate and maintain landlord participation?**

**Answer: The TIP model developed positive, professional relationships with their landlords.**

Cultivating a growing list of willing property managers for the TIP program was the first priority of the Housing Specialist. This was very time-consuming as the program began, because Property managers share similar concerns about leasing to homeless families:

- They needed to have a stabilized source of income.
- They needed to conduct themselves in a manner acceptable to community living.
- They needed to remain drug free and/or alcohol-abuse free and avoid illicit activities.
- They could not have a felony as part of their past criminal history.

To overcome their concerns, the Housing Specialist extended an invitation to all property managers to attend an informational Orientation Meeting about the new TIP model. According to one of the managers interviewed for this report, this session was quite helpful and addressed some of his earlier reservations about participating. He was planning to recommend that others in his company also attend one of these meetings.

Other strategies by the Housing Specialist, identified in **Question #10** included regular and ongoing communication and personal visits with the landlords and property managers to ensure there were no problems developing between them and the tenant. Likewise, the Housing Specialist made regular contact and visits with the family to be sure there were no developing problems from their perspective. This staff person often stepped in to provide solutions before problems reached a crisis, thus ensuring ongoing participation by landlords in the TIP program.

**Question #14: Are there problems with tenant behavior after placement that jeopardizes their housing?**

**Answer: This question is difficult to answer because the scope of this evaluation is for the first year only.**

During the first 12 months of TIP programming, most TIP families were just transitioning into their new housing as the first year came to a close. Therefore there was scant history of tenant behavior to examine.

**Question #15: What strategies are staff able to use to avoid eviction?**

**Answer: This question is also difficult to answer since those successfully housed families did not actually move into an apartment until later in the first year of programming.**

There is little historical information to examine about evictions during the first 12 months of the TIP model.

**Question #16: What strategies is staff able to use to avoid another episode of homelessness for participating families?**

**Answer: There were two very important strategies - strong relationship and emergency funding - that TIP staff used to avoid another episode of homelessness.**

Even though there is little historical information to examine the cause of evictions during the first 12 months of the TIP model, TIP staff developed two contingency strategies to ensure clients remained self sufficient. One was the development of a strong, working relationship with their families so that if problems arose, the client would know to contact them for assistance. The strength of this relationship took time to develop and was not evidently successful until after families had been re-housed and began living on their own. None of the 23 successfully transitioned TIP families had remained self-sufficient by April 2009, the end of the first year of programming. But, by November of 2009, ten TIP families had successfully remained stabilized in their homes for one year.

The second strategy was using the emergency funds from the grant to assist TIP families with unanticipated living expenses. By November of 2009, after several families had been self-sufficient for awhile, there were several cases where both strategies were helpful. A strong client/staff relationship had been successfully developed and families re-initiated contact with TIP staff for emergency assistance. (See p. 18, Part B - **Question #6**). The staff responded with emergency funding and the families were able to continue their independent living.

**Question #17: What services are most effective at meeting a family's needs?**

**Answer: The three services that were most effective for homeless families were those that were focused on employment, financial planning and providing financial and emergency assistance when needed after families were re-housed.**

To answer this question, the evaluator defined " effective services" as those activities that successfully transitioned families into other housing, since that was the focus of the program during the first year. Using this definition, staff identified all the following "barrier buster" services they used to address issues of homelessness. While each family's circumstance varied, many of these services were offered, depending upon the individual needs:

- A. Creating a family budget

- B. Financial planning
- C. Enrolling adult in employment programs to secure better wages
- D. Providing financial assistance as needed to ensure housing stability for 12 months
- E. Finding suitable income for 12 months of sustainable housing
- F. Finding suitable and safe housing for each family
- G. Enrolling adult or child in insurance programs
- H. Locating age-appropriate and need appropriate child care
- I. Negotiating acceptable lease terms for each client
- J. Assisting with emergency child-care as needed
- K. Assisting with moving expenses, furniture, dishware, kitchen pans, tools as needed
- L. Enrolling adults in continuing education for better employment
- M. Referring families to legal assistance as needed
- N. Working with TANF case workers as needed to secure other entitlements for the family
- O. Removing past utility bills and or evictions to clear up credit history.
- P. Needing emergency assistance with unanticipated living expenses after being re-housed

Looking back over the first year of programming, staff reported that from this array of program services, the three that were most effective for homeless families were those that were focused on employment, financial planning and providing financial and emergency assistance when needed after families were re-housed.

**Question #18: If families were not successful, why weren't they successful?**

**Answer: There scope of the evaluation did not cover activities beyond the first year. More time would be needed to learn about the six families who could not successfully complete the program and remain self-sufficient for one year and to monitor the seven who had not yet met their first year benchmark.**

TIP staff tried to ensure that those families who were referred to the program were families with limited barriers and they were ready to participate and engage with staff to become re-housed. However, finding only those clients with limited barriers was difficult. Word had spread among the shelter populations that there was a program offering three months of free rent. According to the Emergency Shelter Directors interviewed for this report, many families wanted a referral into the TIP program when it first began. However, many of those who were referred dropped out of the program and simply made no more contact with the TIP staff.

Initially there were 137 viable referrals to the TIP program, 34 who had meeting scheduled with the Housing Committee and were officially enrolled. However, only 23 remained engaged with the program to become re-housed during the first year. Staff initiated TIP services for all the families that were referred to them because they could not really discern which ones had limited barriers until they began providing services. According to TIP staff, it was the family's choice as to whether or not they wanted to continue with the program.

**Question #19: Does lack of success suggest eligibility or program design implications?**

**Answer:** There were several areas of the TIP model that lacked success and would suggest alterations in the design. However, the scope of a first-year evaluation does not provide the time or information to examine this question thoroughly.

**Question #20: What budget resources are required to effectively implement the TIP model?**

**Answer:** The budget resources needed included rental assistance, emergency funding and the position of a Housing Specialist.

The evaluator has examined the first year and a half TIP program budget to answer this question. The budget included subsidies, emergency funding and staff expenses funded by the grant. The staffing expenses for this first 18 months were **\$117,829.03** which included the Housing Specialist's salary and benefits, a critical position to the program effectiveness. This line item also included other staff expenses such as travel and some materials. Rental subsidies expended to transition and sustain 23 families in new housing over the same 18 month period were **\$41,852.32**. **\$12,347.74** had been spent on emergency assistance equaling a total of **\$54,200.06** for direct financial assistance for clients. (See TIP Program Budget in the appendices).

<b>Financial Assistance for 23 TIP Families - 18 months</b>	
Rental Subsidies	\$41,852.32
Emergency Assistance	\$12,347.74
<b>Total Financial Assistance</b>	<b>\$54,200.06</b>

The average amount of direct financial assistance for each of the 23 TIP families who were transitioned into new housing over an 18 month period was **\$2,356.59**. The average program cost, including staff expenditures, to implement the TIP model for each of the 23 transitioned clients for 18 months was **\$5,232.01** per client. **\$5,420** was spent in direct financial assistance per each of the ten TIP families who were self sufficient for one year during the first 18 months of implementation.

**Question #21: What other barriers did the program face in implementation?**

**Answer:** The biggest barrier in implementation was the premise that there would be homeless families with limited barriers.

Having experienced the model, staff believed that there are no families with limited barriers and the data supports their convictions. All homeless families have barriers, just different types, and these barriers need to be removed to prepare families for re-housing and self-sufficiency. For families who were successfully enrolled in the program, staff spent on the average, 84 days assisting them in removing barriers to being re-housed. Staff had begun serving all those 137

acceptable referrals to the TIP program because they did not realize the extent of the issues with each family's homeless situation until they began working with them.

The staff reported that homeless families are those who have exhausted all their resources. These families had been doubled-up with a friend or relative and then had to move out. Homeless families who were referred to TIP had nowhere else to go. No one would loan them money anymore; they could not move in with extended family or friends, and there was no one left to watch the kids while the adults looked for work. Staff did not find homeless families with limited barriers. Instead, staff reported that all homeless families have multiple barriers by the time they are living in a shelter, and all have required professional assistance to become re-housed.

**Question # 22: How effective is Client Track at capturing client outcomes?**

**Answer: Client Track was not used to capture the outcome questions for this evaluation. Instead a Research Database was created in Access to answer the outcome questions for this evaluation.**

**III. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Over the course of 19 months in operating the TIP model, the staff has learned some valuable lessons as they have strived to achieve the goals of this program. Their experiences have provided useful information for other housing programs and Initiatives in our city. Using staff perspective and outcome data, the evaluator offers the following lessons learned and recommendations for future consideration.

**A. The HIP/TIP Model**

**Lesson Learned: The TIP model is not a housing first, or rapid re-housing model.**

The information collected over the 19 months of TIP programming is clear. The TIP model was a housing program that transitioned families from the shelter to independent living and self-sufficiency, but not as quickly as suggested by the **Question #1** - less than 45 days. TIP was not a rapid re-housing or housing first program. The expectations for reduced shelter stay as a result of the HIP/TIP model were unrealistic. TIP families remained in the shelter while progressing through the core TIP program services, and their average length stay was 84 days, compared to the city wide average shelter stay of 59 days.

**Recommendation: Define the reduced length of time this city wants to use for implementing a rapid re-housing model or housing first model by identifying an exact number of days.**

The Blueprint to End Homelessness calls for housing first programs. HUD does also. However, both need an exact definition of number of days required to set the standard for rapidly re-housing our homeless population in this community. Programmers can consider placing clients in housing - first - and offer services while they adjust to their new surroundings.

## **B. The Housing Specialist**

**Lesson Learned: The role of a Housing Specialist is important to a successful housing program.**

The role of the Housing Specialist had been a critically important new position for transitioning families into stabilized housing. The reasons this position was so valuable are as follows:

- **Property managers appreciated the position of a Housing Specialist** as an advocate for them who they could rely on when tenant issues arose. It was not beneficial for either the homeless client or the landlord to evict a family. In such cases, the client most often becomes homeless again and the property manager has lost rental income.
- **All homeless families need the assistance of a Housing Specialist.** Homeless families need someone who can act as a "realtor" on their behalf, assisting them with finding affordable and habitable housing. Homeless families are especially challenged in locating new housing and negotiating a lease while living in a shelter. A Housing Specialist can assist in the family's transition to new housing and ensure contact with all parties involved so that families will successfully remain re-housed and not lapse into homelessness again.
- **The Housing Specialist provided outreach which assisted emergency shelter staff in finding suitable housing programs for their client.** Emergency shelter staff and residents reported that the referral process to the TIP program was greatly enhanced by the Housing Specialist who was onsite to explain the details of services and expectations. This services of this person assisted the shelters in meeting their goals to move clients into stable housing.
- **The role of the Housing Specialist can be adapted to other types of housing programs.** As mentioned earlier in this report, several emergency shelters have added this role - or its responsibilities - to one of their staff, even though they are not conducting a TIP program. They understand the tremendous benefit this position offers in transitioning homeless persons to other housing.

**Recommendation: Housing Specialists or the associated responsibilities with this role, should be considered for all housing programs to assist families in making a successful transition to permanent housing.**

## **C. Rental Assistance and Emergency Funding**

**Lesson Learned: Less rental assistance was needed to successfully re-house homeless families.**

The HIP program staff wisely decided to reduce the amount of rental subsidies they would provide to TIP families from six months of financial support, to three months. Staff reported that setting higher expectations for TIP families was a good idea because families learned to set budgeting priorities.

- **Most TIP families did not need six months of rental subsidies** to begin living independently. The quantitative data in **Report # 3 - 6** identified the average length of rental subsidies needed for 23 families was 3.22 months. The average length of rental subsidies for those families who remained housed for one year was 4.7 months.
- **With the change in expectations, families became self-sufficient sooner.** HIP staff believed that if they had delayed or not tried to offer rental subsidies, TIP families would have learned more quickly how to set priorities within their budgets and pay housing expenses first.
- **Another TIP program has verified that rental assistance may not be needed.** The Holy Family Shelter provided only emergency living assistance, rather than rental subsidies, even though their grant provided funds for several months of rent subsidies. Their TIP program encouraged families to pay housing expenses first and contact staff if they needed additional help with other unanticipated living expenses. At the time the evaluator interviewed the Executive Director of this program, none of their families had requested rental assistance. Instead monies were used in this program only for emergency funding of other living expenses.

**Recommendation: Grantors might consider making funds available for emergency living expenses, rather than rental subsidies, when funding new housing Initiatives. If offering rental subsidies consider less than six months of assistance.**

Sometimes too much assistance creates a dependency that is difficult to break. Two TIP models have been able to assist families in developing the habit of paying for their housing first - especially when there are reduced or no rental subsidies offered at all. Providing emergency funding for other living expenses encourages families to set priorities within their budgets and helps them better manage their money to remain self-sufficient.

#### **D. Families with Limited Barriers**

**Lesson Learned: All homeless families have barriers.**

Homeless families with limited barriers do not exist. The staff reported that they were providing TIP services to nearly every family that was referred to the program during the first year of implementation for as long as that family continued working with them. Quantitative data from **Report #14** identified only ten families out of 147 referred (7%) who were ineligible for the TIP program. The reason families with limited barriers do not exist is that by the time families became homeless, they had used up all the possible support and assistance from their friends and relatives.

**Recommendation: Accept all families into a re-housing programs.**

When re-housing homeless families to become self-sufficient, program planners should plan to provide services for all families and not try to target those with limited barriers. Finding homeless families with limited barriers is not feasible, because they have exhausted all personal resources and social networks by the time they have become homeless. Planners can continue to work with clients on a first-come basis until they have met their maximum caseload.

## **E. Formal Discharge**

### **Lesson Learned: A formal discharge process is impractical to use.**

The process of working with the homeless population has been a very fluid one. All 23 TIP clients who were successfully transitioned into new housing, demonstrated their new-found independence and discharged themselves by simply ending contact with program staff. When TIP staff no longer had contact with a client, they drove by the apartment for a visual confirmation that the TIP family was still living in their newly transitioned home. Program staff left notes hoping for a return call. In some cases, the Housing Specialist would contact the property manager to confirm that the TIP family still had an active lease. Several clients did contact TIP staff again for additional assistance, and the staff responded. Otherwise, there was no structured review of the formalized checklist for program discharge.

### **Recommendation: Expect that clients will discharge themselves.**

Asking clients to participate in a formal TIP program discharge process did not work. Families will discharge themselves when they believe they can remain self-sufficient and no longer need services.

## **IV. CREATING A RESEARCH DATABASE**

Creating a new Research Database to capture the programmatic outcomes for this evaluation has been a valuable learning experience for all involved. Once TIP program data had been entered into the database and had been verified for accuracy, using this mechanized format for analyzing evaluation outcomes was most helpful in providing this **Summative Year One and Final Evaluation Report**. The evaluation team is confident that the answers generated from the database are reasonable according to program practices and as accurate as the data provided.

### **A. Challenges**

There were multiple challenges in creating the TIP Research database. They were:

- Implementation of TIP activities began four months prior to the creation of a Research Database.
- Staff had to capture and compile program information immediately, while waiting for a database system, so paper forms were created to keep track of program information.
- Paper forms became the data system of choice while waiting for a mechanized data system.
- Staff had to keep track of data in three separate database systems - one for TIP and one for programs funded by HUD, in addition to the paper system for TIP.
- Once the Research Database was created in Access, data entry was inconsistent.
- Data entry needed to be consistent and kept current, requiring a lot of staff time in editing and updating fields in the Research Database .

- The first run of beta reports could not be generated for staff review until 15 months into TIP programming.
- By the 18th month of implementation, the TIP model had been adjusted and funding for it would not continue after the second year.
- The TIP Research Database became irrelevant for staff.

## **B. Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

Considering these challenges to creating a TIP Research Database, there are still valuable lessons to share for future considerations.

### **1. Lesson Learned: A mechanized system for collecting, compiling and reporting program information provides accurate reporting.**

Even under the data collection challenges involved with the TIP model, ultimately valuable, timely and accurate information was generated from the Research Database to address programmatic outcomes for the TIP model and this evaluation report. (These outcome reports are included with the appendices of this report.). Answering the outcome questions for this evaluation would not have been feasible using the paper systems generated for the TIP program. Staff also have seen the benefit of outcome reporting from mechanized systems and are now using a different community-wide database system (Client Track) to monitor their other housing programs.

### **1. Recommendation: Funders and CHIP should continue to support and facilitate the training needed to assist all housing program staff in using a mechanized system to compile outcome data and monitor progress.**

Having easy- to-generate reports will motivate staff to move from older paper systems to mechanized systems. Several shelter staff have reported that once they had learned how to use Client Track, they found it quite helpful and planned to use it more often. HIP staff will be using Client Track for other new housing Initiatives and have helped improve its functionality for end-users.

### **2. Lesson learned: It is preferable, less time consuming and more efficient to use an existing database where one exists.**

Many Indianapolis housing programs are using Client Track, which contains data for HUD and its federal housing programs. With enough lead time for modifications, the current Client Track system could have been adapted to meet the required reports for the TIP program. There was a distinct advantage to making an adaptation to Client Track as opposed to creating a whole new and separate database system.

- HIP staff were already using Client Track and were familiar with its screens and functionalities.
- Program information could have been entered into an existing system as soon as activities began.

- HIP staff would have had more time for program management if they had been using a familiar data system, modified for the TIP model, than in generating 22 paper TIP forms.
- As more data is collected into the same community-wide database, service providers and funders will be able to address unmet needs by examining comparable programmatic information.

HIP staff reported that they had an option in what data system to use for the TIP model. They had decided to use a new and separate database for collecting TIP information because the Client Track system was not easy to manipulate for reports. However, in hind-sight they have decided that was not the best option.

**2. Recommendation: Continue to support the use of Client Track as the database of choice.**

Client Track is a robust data system that is already supporting the collection of HUD data. It is preferable to train and adapt this system for easier use than to create new databases for different housing programs. A distinct advantage of using one data system for all housing programs is that it will compile and track community-wide strategies and can inform program planners and funders of what strategies are working well and where there are areas of improvement.

**3. Recommendation: Include program staff in the design or adaptation of a mechanized data collection system.**

Whether creating a new database or using an existing database, the program staff need to be included in the creation or adaptations made to a mechanized system so that they are comfortable with the way the various screens interface and they can easily generate the necessary reports to manage their programs.

**4. Recommendation: Program staff need to be involved in the planning for evaluation services.**

Whether collecting data from a mechanized system, or from other sources, program staff should review the evaluation time line and tasks so they understand what is involved in the process and what to expect. They need to see beta reports for the evaluation early on in implementing activities so that the system becomes a useful tool for staff and for the evaluation. Evaluations will require staff time in order to provide thorough and accurate information.

**3. Lesson Learned: Using a shelter referral date captures all the services of a homeless program that are required to assist the homeless.**

The official enrollment date for the TIP model was the *Housing Committee Meeting Date*. It was not the date that clients had been referred from the shelters. Yet these two different dates greatly impacted the outcomes of the TIP model. Using the *Housing Committee Meeting Date* as the point of official enrollment, which was much later in the program, discounted all the time and effort staff dedicated to their clients in providing case management, housing and employment and financial planning assistance. Yet these strategies were the core services of the TIP model. These services were what made the program successful transitioning 23 homeless families into new housing and assisting 10 in becoming self-sufficient.

5. **Recommendation: The enrollment date for housing programs needs to be consistent across all programs. The shelter referral date is the ideal point of entry to capture program services.**

## **V. CONCLUSION**

The evaluator and her partner are pleased to present this **Summative Year One and Final Evaluation Report** of the TIP model to CHIP. The team believes they have offered an in-depth review of the successes and challenges in implementing a model program to transition homeless families into stabilized housing for one year. The evaluators have also provided answers to 33 of the 38 evaluation questions as defined by the scope of this evaluation. The data and information compiled from both the TIP Research database and from personal interviews have informed the analysis, lessons learned and recommendations that are suggested. The evaluators hope that their findings are worthy of further consideration for other housing programs as our city strives to end homelessness in Indianapolis.

5. **Recommendation: The enrollment date for housing programs needs to be consistent across all programs. The shelter referral date is the ideal point of entry to capture program services.**

## **V. CONCLUSION**

The evaluator and her partner are pleased to present this **Summative Year One and Final Evaluation Report** of the TIP model to CHIP. The team believes they have offered an in-depth review of the successes and challenges in implementing a model program to transition homeless families into stabilized housing for one year. The evaluators have also provided answers to 33 of the 38 evaluation questions as defined by the scope of this evaluation. The data and information compiled from both the TIP Research database and from personal interviews have informed the analysis, lessons learned and recommendations that are suggested. The evaluators hope that their findings are worthy of further consideration for other housing programs as our city strives to end homelessness in Indianapolis.

## TIP Program Budget - Total as of October 31, 2009

Serving \_\_\_ clients in year 1

<b>MONTH</b>	<b>RENTAL ASSISTANCE</b>	<b>BARRIER BUSTER FUNDS</b>	<b>STAFF EXPENSES</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
May-08	\$ -	\$ 69.00	\$ 2,674.04	\$ 2,743.04
Jun-08	\$ 1,603.32	\$ 526.00	\$ 3,095.89	\$ 5,225.21
Jul-08	\$ 1,939.75	\$ 7.00	\$ 3,373.75	\$ 7,968.25
Aug-08	\$ 729.30	\$ 14.00	\$ 4,488.25	\$ 5,231.55
Sep-08	\$ 559.00	\$ 780.00	\$ 2,998.53	\$ 4,337.53
Oct-08	\$ 3,888.31	\$ 815.01	\$ 3,063.70	\$ 9,569.08
Nov-08	\$ 3,592.67	\$ 1,203.81	\$ 2,923.55	\$ 7,720.03
Dec-10	\$ 3,222.48	\$ 1,526.32	\$ 6,231.10	\$ 10,979.90
Jan-09	\$ 2,523.62	\$ 455.00	\$ 11,297.87	\$ 18,699.93
Feb-09	\$ 3,595.00	\$ 810.00	\$ 7,595.17	\$ 12,000.17
Mar-09	\$ 790.14	\$ -	\$ 7,963.49	\$ 8,753.63
Apr-09	\$ 2,039.95	\$ 719.00	\$ 7,528.74	\$ 20,753.80
May-09	\$ 7,344.67	\$ -	\$ 7,610.53	\$ 14,955.20
<b>End of First Yr.</b>	<b>\$ 31,828.21</b>	<b>\$ 6,925.14</b>	<b>\$ 70,844.61</b>	<b>\$ 109,597.96</b>
Jun-09	\$ 1,609.58	\$ 202.99	\$ 9,364.10	\$ 11,176.67
Jul-09	\$ 1,897.59	\$ 75.00	\$ 9,166.82	\$ 11,139.41
Aug-09	\$ -	\$ 2,061.38	\$ 8,297.92	\$ 22,316.08
Sep-09	\$ 2,592.83	\$ 1,964.23	\$ 8,555.36	\$ 13,112.42
Oct-09	\$ 3,924.11	\$ 1,119.00	\$ 11,600.22	\$ 16,643.33
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 41,852.32</b>	<b>\$ 12,347.74</b>	<b>\$ 117,829.03</b>	<b>\$ 172,029.09</b>

# TIP Population

Data: TIP Database where Shelter Intake Date < 5/1/09

<i>UniqueID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge</i>
40294	4/6/2009			
38191	9/5/2008	10/13/2008		11/16/2008
38090	8/13/2008	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	9/12/2009
21643	10/18/2008			
36935	7/30/2008			
38368	9/8/2008			
5035	2/20/2008			
37562	10/24/2008			
10049	3/9/2009			
39491	1/9/2009			
41281	3/9/2009			8/3/2009
38174	8/17/2008	9/18/2008		11/11/2008
32655	1/29/2009	5/14/2009	10/20/2009	
39764	1/28/2009			
37209	12/8/2008	3/19/2009		3/24/2009
38275	5/13/2008			
36290	8/5/2008			
38185	6/2/2008	7/17/2008		8/25/2008
38182	8/8/2008	9/18/2008		10/25/2008
36597	8/5/2008	9/25/2008		
37571	7/23/2008	9/18/2008		12/1/2008
37525	9/29/2008			
37743	10/11/2008			
38159	11/14/2008			
9147	11/11/2008			
40470	3/17/2009			
40715	3/23/2009			
33085	2/15/2008			
37713	10/6/2008			
11538	2/15/2009			

<i>UniqueID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge</i>
39766	2/3/2009	5/14/2009	7/20/2009	
7967	12/1/2008			
36820	5/2/2008			
36813	9/3/2008			
37045	8/29/2008			
38079	3/6/2008	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	6/11/2009
35085	10/25/2008	12/16/2008	12/19/2008	
8621	5/20/2008			
38349	9/8/2008			
39006	1/5/2009			
6655	6/19/2008			
35079	10/7/2008			
35384	6/7/2008			
38947	11/30/2008	1/8/2009	1/12/2009	
38151	8/20/2008	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	10/10/2009
38766	12/9/2008			
36887	9/6/2008			
38238	5/13/2008			
40751	1/23/2009			
9294	4/22/2008			
40750	3/29/2009	4/23/2009	5/29/2009	
38711	11/21/2008			
38208	6/2/2008	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	3/16/2009
32637	1/24/2008			
37268	4/5/2008	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	6/13/2009
38656	10/6/2008	12/9/2008	12/24/2008	
37732	11/18/2008			
38370	9/8/2008			
34989	5/14/2008			
36931	9/28/2008			
12058	11/14/2008			
36479	9/16/2008			
38079	5/1/2008	9/4/2008	10/11/2008	10/11/2009

<i>UniqueID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge</i>
9970	4/24/2009			
9264	4/28/2008			
9982	1/22/2009			
39430	2/3/2009			
5000	9/8/2008			
11985	10/14/2008	3/26/2009	4/2/2009	
36482	10/27/2008			
38380	6/17/2008			
38179	7/8/2008	9/11/2008		9/24/2008
36999	8/28/2008			
37192	9/14/2008			
7351	2/3/2009			
38345	10/23/2008			
39354	12/5/2008			
38188	5/1/2008	7/10/2008	7/18/2008	8/26/2008
37324	8/23/2008			
38213	7/30/2008	10/9/2008	11/22/2008	4/13/2009
40291	1/31/2009	3/19/2009	4/17/2009	
35471	5/12/2008			
38086	7/10/2008	9/25/2008	11/14/2008	11/14/2009
34945	4/22/2008			
36279	5/24/2008			
31648	1/12/2009			
40070	1/9/2009	3/5/2009		4/6/2009
38115	9/19/2008	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	10/14/2009
39358	12/15/2008	9/17/2009	9/18/2009	
36232	7/9/2008			
38237	7/31/2007			
8060	1/22/2009	9/4/2009	10/16/2009	
38348	9/19/2008			
34966	5/29/2008			
35004	5/28/2008			
9268	4/1/2009			

<i>UniqueID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge</i>
36370	6/1/2008			
40716	3/30/2009			
42363	1/20/2009			
9163	4/20/2009			
37055	8/30/2008			
37143	9/16/2008			
38276	10/21/2008			
38351	9/8/2008	10/16/2008		
8579	7/3/2008			
40071	2/7/2009			
9372	8/29/2008			
38165	8/13/2008	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	10/13/2008
39386	4/10/2008	7/10/2008		7/14/2008
37785	9/12/2008			
37706	10/4/2008			
11175	11/17/2008	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	6/12/2009
38124	5/6/2008	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	7/1/2009
8063	2/11/2008			
40869	3/16/2009	5/14/2009	5/15/2009	
35552	5/30/2008			
40749	2/21/2009	4/27/2009	5/22/2009	
38113	7/16/2008	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	10/10/2009
35689	3/18/2008			
10445	6/25/2008			
38119	7/22/2008	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	11/11/2009
33905	4/8/2008			
36881	6/21/2008			
38352	10/10/2008			
7957	3/21/2008			
37348	9/3/2008			
11212	3/10/2007			
38301	11/11/2008			
36318	6/6/2008			

<i>UniqueID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge</i>
40691	3/25/2009			
38346	9/19/2008			
34755	5/7/2008			
39770	2/13/2009			
35457	6/2/2008			
36889	8/28/2008			
37276	4/4/2008	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	7/3/2009
38277	11/10/2008			
<b># Households</b>	<b>137</b>	<b># Housing Committee Meetings</b>	<b>39</b>	
		<b># Meetings 1st program year</b>	<b>34</b>	

# Question 1

*How successful is the program in placing clients in permanent housing within 45 days of initial application/intake*

Data: TIP Database, households where Housing Committee Meeting Date and Occupancy Dates are not NULL and Housing Committee Dates between 5/1/08 and 4/30/09

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Hsg Cmte Mtg Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i># Days</i>
38090	10/16/2008	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	37
38079	5/22/2008	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	20
35085	12/16/2008	12/16/2008	12/19/2008	3
38947	1/8/2009	1/8/2009	1/12/2009	4
38151	9/8/2008	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	32
40750	4/23/2009	4/23/2009	5/29/2009	36
38208	6/19/2008	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	34
37268	6/9/2008	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	4
38656	12/9/2008	12/9/2008	12/24/2008	15
38079	9/4/2008	9/4/2008	10/11/2008	37
11985	3/26/2009	3/26/2009	4/2/2009	7
38188	7/10/2008	7/10/2008	7/18/2008	8
38213	10/9/2008	10/9/2008	11/22/2008	44
40291	3/19/2009	3/19/2009	4/17/2009	29
38086	9/25/2008	9/25/2008	11/14/2008	50
38115	10/13/2008	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	1
38165	9/11/2008	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	29
11175	1/26/2009	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	5
38124	6/5/2008	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	26
40749	4/27/2009	4/27/2009	5/22/2009	25
38113	9/4/2008	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	36
38119	8/28/2008	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	75
37276	6/5/2008	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	28
<b># Households</b>			<b>Avg Days</b>	<b>25.43</b>

## **Question 1b** *Average days between shelter intake and occupancy*

**Data:** TIP Database, households where Occupancy Date is not NULL and Housing Committee date between 5/1/08 and 4/30/09  
**Calculates** number of days between occupancy date and shelter intake date

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Date of Shelter Intake</i>	<i>Date of Meeting with Housing Committee</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>NoDays</i>
38090	8/13/2008	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	101
38079	3/6/2008	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	97
35085	10/25/2008	12/16/2008	12/19/2008	55
38947	11/30/2008	1/8/2009	1/12/2009	43
38151	8/20/2008	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	51
40750	3/29/2009	4/23/2009	5/29/2009	61
38208	6/2/2008	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	51
37268	4/5/2008	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	69
38656	10/6/2008	12/9/2008	12/24/2008	79
38079	5/1/2008	9/4/2008	10/11/2008	163
11985	10/14/2008	3/26/2009	4/2/2009	170
38188	5/1/2008	7/10/2008	7/18/2008	78
38213	7/30/2008	10/9/2008	11/22/2008	115
40291	1/31/2009	3/19/2009	4/17/2009	76
38086	7/10/2008	9/25/2008	11/14/2008	127
38115	9/19/2008	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	25
38165	8/13/2008	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	58
11175	11/17/2008	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	75
38124	5/6/2008	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	56
40749	2/21/2009	4/27/2009	5/22/2009	90
38113	7/16/2008	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	86
38119	7/22/2008	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	112
37276	4/4/2008	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	90
<b># Households</b>	<b>23</b>		<b>Average:</b>	<b>83.83</b>

## Question 2

What percentage of household income is spent on rent/utilities at program entry and at program exit? - Standard 30% of Income

Data: TIP Database, households where Occupancy Date is not NULL and Housing Committee Date between 5/1/08 and 4/30/09

-There is no exit income information nor data on utilities spending

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Income at Intake</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>%Income at Entry</i>	<i>Exit Date</i>	<i>Income at Exit</i>	<i>%Income at Exit</i>
38090	11/22/2008	\$139.00	\$410.00	294.96%	9/12/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38079	6/11/2008	\$550.00	\$499.00	90.73%	6/11/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
35085	12/19/2008	\$10,800.00	\$369.00	3.42%		\$0.00	0.00%
38947	1/12/2009	\$900.00	\$474.00	52.67%		\$0.00	0.00%
38151	10/10/2008	\$1,720.00	\$509.00	29.59%	10/10/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
40750	5/29/2009	\$1,600.00	\$350.00	21.88%		\$0.00	0.00%
38208	7/23/2008	\$0.00	\$509.00	0.00%	3/16/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
37268	6/13/2008	\$1,524.00	\$300.00	19.69%	6/13/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38656	12/24/2008	\$1,280.00	\$321.00	25.08%		\$0.00	0.00%
38079	10/11/2008	\$1,400.00	\$619.00	44.21%	10/11/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
11985	4/2/2009	\$1,400.00	\$485.00	34.64%		\$0.00	0.00%
38188	7/18/2008	\$990.00	\$435.00	43.94%	8/26/2008	\$0.00	0.00%
38213	11/22/2008	\$921.77	\$460.00	49.90%	4/13/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
40291	4/17/2009	\$840.00	\$399.00	47.50%		\$0.00	0.00%
38086	11/14/2008	\$819.00	\$460.00	56.17%	11/14/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38115	10/14/2008	\$1,400.00	\$499.00	35.64%	10/14/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38165	10/10/2008	\$1,200.00	\$525.00	43.75%	10/13/2008	\$0.00	0.00%
11175	1/31/2009	\$800.00	\$744.00	93.00%	6/12/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38124	7/1/2008	\$800.00	\$300.00	37.50%	7/1/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
40749	5/22/2009	\$1,200.00	\$545.00	45.42%		\$0.00	0.00%
38113	10/10/2008	\$229.00	\$450.00	196.51%	10/10/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
38119	11/11/2008	\$0.00	\$619.00	0.00%	11/11/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
37276	7/3/2008	\$2,200.00	\$365.00	16.59%	7/3/2009	\$0.00	0.00%
<b># Households</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>\$1,422.29</b>	<b>\$462.87</b>	<b>32.54%</b>			

## Questions 3-6b

Data: TIP Database, all Rent payments where HC date between 5/1/08 and 4/30/09

3. On average, at what point are families able to take on a larger portion of their rent/utility costs?
4. What percent of families are able to assume full rent and utilities after 6 to 9 months of participation in the program?
5. How long do most families need a full rent subsidy?
6. How long do most families need a shallow rent subsidy?

Additional filters can be added to eliminate expense categories if needed

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
<b>38090</b>	10/16/2008	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	\$410.00		9/12/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	1/29/2008	\$360.00				
	1/29/2008	\$360.00				
	11/17/2008	\$344.00				
	11/24/2008	\$200.00				
	12/5/2008	\$160.00				
	1/1/2009	\$360.00				
	1/29/2009	\$360.00				
	2/26/2009	\$360.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$2,504.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>8</b>		
<b>38079</b>	5/22/2008	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	\$499.00		6/11/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	6/11/2008	\$332.66				
	7/29/2008	\$243.70				
	8/28/2008	\$243.70				

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
	9/2/2008	\$243.70				
	3/27/2009	\$290.50				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$1,354.26</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>35085</b>	12/16/2008	12/16/2008	12/19/2008	\$369.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	1/29/2008	\$318.78				
	12/17/2008	\$341.23				
	1/29/2009	\$318.78				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$978.79</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>38947</b>	1/8/2009	1/8/2009	1/12/2009	\$474.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	1/29/2008	\$50.00				
	1/9/2009	\$316.00				
	1/9/2009	\$616.00				
	1/29/2009	\$50.00				
	2/26/2009	\$50.00				
	4/3/2009	\$474.00				
	5/27/2009	\$424.00				
	6/23/2009	\$233.08				
	7/24/2009	\$274.00				
	8/31/2009	\$194.00				
	9/29/2009	\$75.00				

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$2,756.08</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>11</b>		
<b>38151</b>	9/8/2008	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	\$509.00		10/10/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	10/8/2008	\$294.81				
	10/31/2008	\$459.00				
	11/24/2008	\$250.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$1,003.81</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>40750</b>	4/23/2009	4/23/2009	5/29/2009	\$350.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	6/23/2009	\$50.00				
	7/6/2009	\$250.00				
	7/28/2009	\$50.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$350.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>38208</b>	6/19/2008	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	\$509.00		3/16/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	7/23/2008	\$249.00				
	7/23/2008	\$130.00				
	9/3/2008	\$459.00				
	10/6/2008	\$86.30				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$924.30</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>4</b>		

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
<b>37268</b>	6/9/2008	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	\$300.00		6/13/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	6/12/2008	\$180.00				
	7/23/2008	\$50.00				
	7/30/2008	\$50.00				
	8/27/2008	\$50.00				
	9/18/2008	\$100.00				
	11/11/2008	\$100.00				
	3/19/2009	\$100.00				
	5/1/2009	\$142.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$772.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>8</b>		
<b>38656</b>	12/9/2008	12/9/2008	12/24/2008	\$321.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	12/24/2008	\$306.60				
	1/29/2009	\$50.00				
	1/29/2009	\$50.00				
	3/27/2009	\$100.00				
	5/27/2009	\$271.00				
	6/23/2009	\$160.50				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$938.10</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>6</b>		
<b>38079</b>	9/4/2008	9/4/2008	10/11/2008	\$619.00		10/11/2009

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	10/8/2008	\$369.32				
	10/31/2008	\$569.00				
	11/24/2008	\$309.50				
	12/23/2008	\$350.00				
	5/11/2009	\$125.00				
	7/7/2009	\$400.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$2,122.82</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>6</b>		
<b>11985</b>	3/26/2009		3/26/2009	4/2/2009	\$485.00	
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	3/31/2009	\$49.00				
	4/28/2009	\$50.00				
	5/26/2009	\$165.50				
	7/24/2009	\$485.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$749.50</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>4</b>		
<b>38188</b>	7/10/2008		7/10/2008	7/18/2008	\$435.00	8/26/2008
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	7/18/2008	\$196.45				
	7/23/2008	\$385.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$581.45</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>2</b>		
<b>38213</b>	10/9/2008		10/9/2008	11/22/2008	\$460.00	4/13/2009

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	11/24/2008	\$448.00				
	1/5/2009	\$360.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$808.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>2</b>		
<b>40291</b>	3/19/2009	3/19/2009	4/17/2009	\$399.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	4/13/2009	\$186.20				
	5/26/2009	\$349.00				
	6/23/2009	\$199.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$734.20</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>38086</b>	9/25/2008	9/25/2008	11/14/2008	\$460.00		11/14/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	11/11/2008	\$230.00				
	11/24/2008	\$230.00				
	12/24/2008	\$360.00				
	2/2/2009	\$100.00				
	2/2/2009	\$100.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$1,020.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>38115</b>	10/13/2008	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	\$499.00		10/14/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	10/13/2008	\$290.00				

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
	10/31/2008	\$49.00				
	11/24/2008	\$249.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$588.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>38165</b>	9/11/2008	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	\$525.00		10/13/2008
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	10/8/2008	\$230.00				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$230.00</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>11175</b>	1/26/2009	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	\$744.00		6/12/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	2/2/2008	\$522.00				
	2/2/2009	\$522.00				
	2/26/2009	\$629.00				
	3/31/2009	\$405.75				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$2,078.75</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>4</b>		
<b>38124</b>	6/5/2008	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	\$300.00		7/1/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	6/27/2008	\$250.00				
	7/23/2008	\$120.60				
	8/27/2008	\$120.60				
	<b><i>Household Total</i></b>	<b>\$491.20</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>3</b>		

	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
<b>40749</b>	4/27/2009	4/27/2009	5/22/2009	\$545.00		
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	5/19/2009	\$374.81				
	6/23/2009	\$346.00				
	<b>Household Total</b>	<b>\$720.81</b>	<b>Number Months</b>	<b>2</b>		
<b>38113</b>	9/4/2008	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	\$450.00		10/10/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	10/8/2008	\$175.00				
	10/31/2008	\$109.68				
	11/24/2008	\$400.00				
	12/24/2008	\$375.00				
	<b>Household Total</b>	<b>\$1,059.68</b>	<b>Number Months</b>	<b>4</b>		
<b>38119</b>	8/28/2008	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	\$619.00		11/11/2009
	<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	11/11/2008	\$262.67				
	11/24/2008	\$309.50				
	12/24/2008	\$275.00				
	2/26/2009	\$257.00				
	<b>Household Total</b>	<b>\$1,104.17</b>	<b>Number Months</b>	<b>4</b>		
<b>37276</b>	6/5/2008	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	\$365.00		7/3/2009

<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Enrollment Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Monthly Contracted Rent</i>	<i>Date of Final Rent Payment by TIP</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
<i>Current month's rent</i>					
	6/27/2008		\$290.66		
	7/28/2008		\$365.00		
	8/27/2008		\$315.00		
	10/6/2008		\$278.60		
	10/31/2008		\$278.60		
	12/2/2008		\$265.00		
<b><i>Household Total</i></b>			<b>\$1,792.86</b>	<b><i>Number Months</i></b>	<b>6</b>
<b><i>Average Months Rental Subsidy</i></b>	<b>3.22</b>				

## Question 7

How many families remain housed for 12 months?

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Discharge Date</i>	<i>#Days</i>
38090	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	9/12/2009	294
38079	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	6/11/2009	365
35085	12/16/2008	12/19/2008		
38947	1/8/2009	1/12/2009		
38151	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	10/10/2009	365
40750	4/23/2009	5/29/2009		
38208	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	3/16/2009	236
37268	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	6/13/2009	365
38656	12/9/2008	12/24/2008		
38079	9/4/2008	10/11/2008	10/11/2009	365
11985	3/26/2009	4/2/2009		
38188	7/10/2008	7/18/2008	8/26/2008	39
38213	10/9/2008	11/22/2008	4/13/2009	142
40291	3/19/2009	4/17/2009		
38086	9/25/2008	11/14/2008	11/14/2009	365
38115	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	10/14/2009	365
38165	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	10/13/2008	3
11175	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	6/12/2009	132
38124	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	7/1/2009	365
40749	4/27/2009	5/22/2009		
38113	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	10/10/2009	365
38119	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	11/11/2009	365
37276	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	7/3/2009	365
<i># Households</i>	23		<i># Housed for 12 months</i>	10

**Question 12** *How much time elapses between the initial referral date and the assessment by a Housing Specialist?*

Data: TIP Database, households where Shelter Intake Date between 5/1/08 and 4/30/09 and Initial Meeting Date is not NULL

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Date of TIP Referral</i>	<i>Date of Initial Meeting with Housing Spec.</i>	<i>#Days</i>
40294	4/30/2009	5/4/2009	4
38191	9/18/2008	9/18/2008	0
38090	9/29/2008	9/30/2008	1
21643	10/28/2008	11/3/2008	6
36935	8/27/2008	8/27/2008	0
37562	10/31/2008	11/11/2008	11
10049	3/11/2009	3/13/2009	2
39491	1/22/2009	2/10/2009	19
41281	4/23/2009	5/6/2009	13
38174	9/5/2008	9/8/2008	3
32655	3/17/2009	3/18/2009	1
39764	2/12/2009	2/16/2009	4
37209	2/23/2009	2/26/2009	3
38275	5/16/2008	5/23/2008	7
38185	7/8/2008	7/10/2008	2
38182	9/2/2008	9/5/2008	3
36597	8/28/2008	9/8/2008	11
37571	8/27/2008	9/2/2008	6
37743	10/29/2008	11/3/2008	5
9147	11/24/2008	12/1/2008	7
40470	4/3/2009	4/3/2009	0
40715	4/3/2009	4/3/2009	0
37713	10/10/2008	10/14/2008	4
11538	6/24/2009	6/29/2009	5
39766	2/13/2009	3/23/2009	38
7967	12/8/2009	12/30/2008	-343

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Date of TIP Referral</i>	<i>Date of Initial Meeting with Housing Spec.</i>	<i>#Days</i>
36820	5/21/2008	5/23/2008	2
36813	9/19/2008	9/22/2008	3
35085	11/11/2008	12/9/2008	28
38349	9/17/2008	10/2/2008	15
39006	2/13/2009	2/18/2009	5
6655	7/28/2008	8/5/2008	8
35384	6/9/2008	6/19/2008	10
38947	12/18/2008	12/18/2008	0
38151	8/25/2008	8/25/2008	0
38238	5/16/2008	5/23/2008	7
40751	4/2/2009	4/3/2009	1
40750	4/2/2009	4/3/2009	1
38711	11/21/2008	11/21/2008	0
38208	6/3/2008	6/6/2008	3
38656	11/13/2008	11/13/2008	0
37732	11/18/2008	11/21/2008	3
38370	9/8/2008	9/8/2008	0
34989	6/20/2008	6/25/2008	5
36479	9/19/2008	9/23/2008	4
38079	8/12/2008	8/22/2008	10
9970	4/7/2009	4/7/2009	0
9982	3/5/2009	3/9/2009	4
39430	2/17/2009	2/26/2009	9
11985	3/10/2009	3/17/2009	7
36482	6/19/2009	6/23/2009	4
38380	6/18/2008	6/19/2008	1
38179	7/30/2008	8/5/2008	6
37192	10/2/2008	10/6/2008	4
7351	2/6/2009	2/16/2009	10

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Date of TIP Referral</i>	<i>Date of Initial Meeting with Housing Spec.</i>	<i>#Days</i>
39354	1/15/2008	2/10/2009	392
38188	6/13/2008	6/19/2008	6
37324	8/28/2008	9/4/2008	7
38213	9/6/2008	9/8/2008	2
40291	2/25/2009	2/25/2009	0
35471	5/29/2008	6/12/2008	14
38086	9/11/2008	9/15/2008	4
36279	5/29/2008	6/12/2008	14
31648	1/14/2009	1/14/2009	0
40070	2/13/2009	2/16/2009	3
38115	10/1/2008	10/1/2008	0
39358	1/15/2009	2/5/2009	21
36232	7/24/2008	8/5/2008	12
8060	6/10/2009	6/10/2009	0
38348	9/19/2008	9/22/2008	3
34966	5/29/2008	5/30/2008	1
35004	6/2/2008	6/9/2008	7
9268	4/8/2009	4/9/2009	1
40716	4/3/2009	4/7/2009	4
42363	6/16/2009	6/23/2009	7
9163	6/10/2009	6/29/2009	19
37143	9/25/2008	10/13/2008	18
38276	10/27/2008	11/3/2008	7
38351	9/8/2008	9/8/2008	0
8579	8/4/2008	8/4/2008	0
40071	2/11/2009	2/19/2009	8
38165	8/21/2008	9/3/2008	13
37785	9/19/2008	9/22/2008	3
37706	10/23/2008	10/23/2008	0

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Date of TIP Referral</i>	<i>Date of Initial Meeting with Housing Spec.</i>	<i>#Days</i>
11175	11/20/2008	11/21/2008	1
38124	5/14/2008	5/22/2008	8
40869	4/10/2009	4/14/2009	4
40749	3/9/2009	4/6/2009	28
38113	8/26/2008	8/26/2008	0
10445	8/21/2008	8/22/2008	1
38119	7/25/2008	7/25/2008	0
36881	7/3/2008	7/25/2008	22
38352	11/6/2008	11/24/2008	18
37348	9/18/2008	9/24/2008	6
38301	11/12/2008	11/19/2008	7
40691	4/2/2009	4/6/2009	4
34755	6/6/2008	6/19/2008	13
36889	9/10/2008	9/11/2008	1
38277	11/20/2008	11/21/2008	1
<b><i># Households</i></b>	<b>99</b>	<b><i>Avg Days</i></b>	<b>6.48</b>

## **Question 14** *What eligibility criteria of the program disqualified the most candidates?*

**Data:** TIP Database, count of records by Enrollment Barrier Type in the Enrollment Barriers table where Shelter Intake Date < 5/1/09

<b><i>Enrollment Barrier</i></b>	<b><i>Count</i></b>
Evictions - too many	2
Single - unattached family/deper	7
Criminal history barriers	1

# Questions 15 and 16b

*How long do families need case management?*

**Data:** TIP Database, households where Shelter Intake Date and Housing Committee Date and Case Management Term Date is not NULL. Calculates number of days between Shelter Intake date and case management discharge.

*Some households have program discharge dates with no case management termination date*

<i>Unique ID</i>	<i>Shelter Intake Date</i>	<i>Housing Committee Date</i>	<i>Occupancy Date</i>	<i>Case Mgt Termination Date</i>	<i>#Days in Case Mgmt</i>	<i>Program Discharge Date</i>
38191	9/5/2008	10/13/2008		12/2/2008	88	11/16/2008
38090	8/13/2008	10/16/2008	11/22/2008	5/22/2009	282	9/12/2009
38185	6/2/2008	7/17/2008		8/20/2009	444	8/25/2008
38182	8/8/2008	9/18/2008		11/7/2008	91	10/25/2008
37571	7/23/2008	9/18/2008		12/6/2008	136	12/1/2008
38079	3/6/2008	5/22/2008	6/11/2008	12/11/2008	280	6/11/2009
38151	8/20/2008	9/8/2008	10/10/2008	4/11/2009	234	10/10/2009
38208	6/2/2008	6/19/2008	7/23/2008	1/3/2009	215	3/16/2009
37268	4/5/2008	6/9/2008	6/13/2008	12/13/2008	252	6/13/2009
38179	7/8/2008	9/11/2008		9/26/2008	80	9/24/2008
38188	5/1/2008	7/10/2008	7/18/2008	8/15/2008	106	8/26/2008
38213	7/30/2008	10/9/2008	11/22/2008	4/8/2009	252	4/13/2009
40070	1/9/2009	3/5/2009		4/7/2009	88	4/6/2009
38115	9/19/2008	10/13/2008	10/14/2008	4/14/2009	207	10/14/2009
38165	8/13/2008	9/11/2008	10/10/2008	10/7/2008	55	10/13/2008
39386	4/10/2008	7/10/2008		12/15/2008	249	7/14/2008
11175	11/17/2008	1/26/2009	1/31/2009	7/24/2009	249	6/12/2009
38124	5/6/2008	6/5/2008	7/1/2008	1/1/2009	240	7/1/2009
38113	7/16/2008	9/4/2008	10/10/2008	4/13/2009	271	10/10/2009
38119	7/22/2008	8/28/2008	11/11/2008	5/11/2009	293	11/11/2009
37276	4/4/2008	6/5/2008	7/3/2008	1/3/2009	274	7/3/2009
<b># Households</b>	<b>21</b>			<b>Avg Days</b>	<b>209</b>	