

NANAIMO HOUSING HUB FEASIBILITY REPORT:

TOWARDS COORDINATED ACCESS

September 30, 2018

Prepared for: Pacifica Housing and the City of Nanaimo

Prepared by: Andrew Thornton

The Justice Research Centre
@ Nanaimo Region John Howard Society

Email: justice@johnhowardnanaimio.org

PACIFICA HOUSING



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“A ‘Housing Hub’ is a feasible and desirable option in Nanaimo”

This is the clear message that came out of a research study that used facilitated focus group, interviews with 17 agencies, and in total, 30 individual service providers, managers and users of Nanaimo’s housing support systems. There are a number of similar Hub models in Canadian cities¹. For example, The Safe Communities Opportunity and Resource Centre (SORCe)² in Calgary is a multi-agency collaborative that serves a coordinating and service role for housing supports. SORCe is located in its own offices and has full-time in-kind staffing provided by local service agencies.

Key Enabling Factors

Study participants said that a key factor in creating a Nanaimo Hub is the strong relationships that individual agencies have with their specific populations. Other enabling factors include: Several agencies that already provide both housing and, or, housing supports; the work of the Homelessness Coalition which provides a site of inter-agency collaboration and action; and finally, the strong preexisting inter-agency working relationships (but with no real coherent ‘system’) for housing supports in Nanaimo. Participants saw the formalization of a systematic inter-agency approach as a desirable and key function of a Hub. As one Executive Director offered, “this would enhance the accountability and transparency of service provider’s objectives and outcomes”. Finally, participants identified that an open and centralized Hub would enable service providers to share information about program successes and failures.

Purpose and extent of a Nanaimo Housing Hub

The study also examined the purpose and extent of the Hub, and its interface with broader system changes such as Coordinated Access and Assessment (CAA) systems³. CAA is currently being developed across B.C. in conjunction with BC Housing. It was determined that the Hub would become a key component of the City’s eventual CAA system. The reach and purpose of a Hub would seem to extend beyond the needs of a CAA structure and process and there is a strong case to be made that the Hub and CAA would be mutually reinforcing systems.

¹ See also *Brandon Housing First*: <http://brandonhousingfirst.ca/>; *Burnaby Housing and Outreach Hub*: <https://www.progressivehousing.net/burnaby-housing-and-outreach-hub/>; *Housing Help* (Ottawa): <https://action-logement.ca/en/housing-help/>

² SORCe is not itself an agency, but rather a multi-agency collaborative. Working out of a single location, agencies work together to connect individuals and families experiencing or facing homelessness with programs and services that can assist them. By bringing together multiple agencies and programs in a single location, SORCe strives to connect each client to all necessary programs and services to address the individual and complex needs of each client that comes in the door. (<https://www.sorce.ca/what-is-sorce/>)

³ See for example: *What is a Coordinated Access System?* <http://caeh.ca/cas/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT	3
METHODS	7
Review of Promising Practises and Research	8
Intake & Assessment	10
KEY THEMES, DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS	11
“Some sort of centralized system”	11
“Lack of system capability”	12
Bringing the Systems up to code: Intake, Assessment & Prioritization	13
Navigating the B.C. Housing Registry	15
Enhancing Inter-Agency Communication	18
“We’re all in the same sandbox”	19
Summary Findings: A shared vision	20
Acknowledgements	20
RECOMMENDATIONS: THE NANAIMO HOUSING HUB	21
ACTION PLANS	24
REFERENCES	25
APPENDICES	27
Appendix A: List of Study Participants	28
Appendix B: Draft Intake & Referral Form	29
Appendix C: Illustrative Budget	31
Appendix D: Housing Hub Organizational Diagram	32

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This study set out to evaluate the feasibility of a 'Housing Hub' in Nanaimo which could be defined as:

A one-stop-shop that may provide shared assessment and referral mechanisms as well as administrative and social supports to people accessing social and supported housing in Nanaimo (*Call for Expressions of Interest*, Pacifica Housing, March 2018).

The purpose of a 'Housing Hub' is to provide a focal point for both housing support service users and providers. On the user side, a Housing Hub would provide a specific and managed point of entry into the (often) complex labyrinth of housing support information and programs. On the service provider side, a Housing Hub would serve a coordinating and information management function. Ideally it would minimize duplication of efforts on behalf of both users and providers especially concerning intake and assessment processes. A Housing Hub could take a number of forms which might include occupying its own physical space with staff, or it could be a more administrative, information, and documentation-based approach. In all cases a Housing Hub will be designed to improve the transparency, simplicity and accountability of housing support service provision. Chilliwack's recently created "Housing Hub" provides a good example of what this may look like:

Hub staff are actively working on several fronts at once, [Graham MacMahon, Hub Coordinator] stressed. They are procuring hub housing. They are intaking hub participants. They are supporting participants in their new homes. And finally they are building partnerships with agencies to get more supports in place, such as mental health services, employment services or counselling (<https://www.bclocalnews.com/news/housing-hub-is-helping-chronically-homeless-in-chilliwack-get-off-the-streets/>).

The economic and policy context for this study is framed by the *Nanaimo Affordable Housing Strategy and Discussion* documents (2018), *Nanaimo's Action Plan to End Homelessness, 2018-2023* (2018) and the *Homelessness in Nanaimo- Everyone Counts: 2018 Point-in-Time Count Report* (2018).⁴ All of these documents point to the necessity of systems change and the actions required to accomplish this change.

The *Nanaimo Action Plan to End Homelessness* recommends improvements in data management, service provision and staffing in order to accomplish its goals. A Housing Hub will help attain these goals and will be a visible sign to the local community of progress in finding solutions to Nanaimo's current homelessness and housing problems.

Not only do these documents provide context, they are also *enabling factors* for the creation of a

⁴ Assessing any potentials for change in Nanaimo's current homelessness and housing situation should also take into account the Federal government's ten year plan to address homelessness as outlined in *Reaching Home: Canada's Homelessness Strategy* (June 2018), the BC Government's *Homeless Prevention Program* (HPP) and *Homes for B.C.: A 30 point Plan for Housing Affordability in British Columbia*.

Housing Hub and a streamlined housing support system. They are current; contain relevant data and a solid basis for developing new policy and practice. *Nanaimo's Plan to End Homelessness* and *Affordable Housing Strategy* were developed in tandem and demonstrate a commitment on the part of the City and Service agencies to create improvements.

Another enabling factor identified by most study participants is the ongoing work by the Nanaimo Homelessness Coalition. The Coalition has been a key driver of City policy and has provided ongoing stewardship of the national *Homelessness Partnering Strategy* (renamed *Reaching Home*) funding. Many informants felt the Coalition could be more effective if it had its own funding and a more formal coordination and planning status.

A key contextualizing factor for this study, identified in all of the documents noted above, is the fact that Nanaimo's homeless population is on the rise and the cost of housing of all kinds is also rising, largely unchecked. *The Point in Time Count (2018)* provides evidence to the effect that as of April there are over 300 absolutely homeless persons in Nanaimo. The *Affordable Housing Strategy* provides the most up to date information on housing and housing affordability in Nanaimo. This document makes it clear that there are high numbers of households in Nanaimo that spend inordinate amounts of their income on housing. It is estimated that 14 % of all households in Nanaimo are in "Core Housing Need", that is, spending over 30% of their income on housing (City of Nanaimo, 2018, p.37). The *Affordable Housing Strategy* also makes it clear that while there have been efforts to provide social and supportive housing, there is an urgent need for housing across the spectrum in Nanaimo. In such a context, the need for a Housing Hub to support the homeless and at risk, is warranted.

It is important to acknowledge that there has been a 25 year history of a withdrawal by all levels of government from housing investment.⁵ Based on conversations with service providers and as reported at various public meetings, the system capacity for serving the homeless and at-risk populations is at or beyond capacity. As stated on page 5 of the *Nanaimo Plan to End Homelessness*;

"Put bluntly, Nanaimo faces pressures that threaten the integrity and sustainability of the current service system if not addressed".

The most pressing evidence of this capacity problem is the ongoing 'Discontent City' which, as of mid-September, is occupied by approximately 300, largely homeless, residents. The service providers interviewed estimate that there are another 200 or more camped out in other parts of the city. Indeed Discontent City has since its inception placed another large and unexpected burden on local service provision. Another example of Nanaimo's overburdened systems is the Housing First, and Rent Subsidies

⁵ Since the withdrawal of the federal government's investment in affordable housing, starting in the early 1990s, communities have struggled to respond. Declining wages (even minimum wage has not kept up with inflation in any jurisdiction in Canada), reduced benefit levels—including pensions and social assistance – and a shrinking supply of affordable housing have placed more and more Canadians at risk of homelessness. (p.3); Stephen Gaetz, Tanya Gulliver, & Tim Richter (2014). *The State of Homelessness in Canada: 2014*. Toronto: The Homeless Hub Press. (<http://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/SOHC2014.pdf>)

programs being run by the Nanaimo Region John Howard Society (NRJHS). Collectively these programs have a waiting list of 200 and as of March, 2018 they have stopped accepting applications to the program.

Based on the most recent count of homelessness in Nanaimo 0.37 % of the population are Homeless (Table 1). This percentage is similar to Victoria’s figure of 0.40 % and Vancouver’s 0.35 %.

Table 1: Homelessness to Population Ratio⁶

City	Homeless population	Total Population	% Homeless	Hidden Homeless or Registry Week
City of Nanaimo	335	90,504	0.37	No
Comox Valley	117	66,527	0.18	Yes
Kelowna	286	129, 500	0.22	Yes
Victoria CRD	1525	387,400	0.40	Yes
City of Vancouver	2181	631,486	0.35	Yes
St John’s (NL)	165	219, 207	0.08	Yes

However, both Vancouver and Victoria included “Hidden Homelessness” in their counts and Nanaimo did not, which would result in an underestimate of persons experiencing homelessness. (Based on estimates from RCMP and Service Providers the total number of Homeless in Nanaimo could easily double the reported figure of 335). It is widely accepted that all Homelessness counts underestimate the total numbers involved. Acknowledging these limitations, Nanaimo has a homelessness density that is *comparable to or worse than* Victoria and Vancouver’s, but far worse than other Homelessness

⁶ Sources of data: **Nanaimo**: Point in Time Count (2018): https://www.nanaimo.ca/docs/social-culture-environment/community-social-service-programs/nanaimo-pit-count-report-2018_final_june-6.pdf; Nanaimo Population: <https://www.rdn.bc.ca/population-statistics>; **Comox Valley**: Point in Time Count 2018: http://www.uwcnvi.ca/web_documents/2018_point_in_time_count_report__comox_valley_coalition_to_end_homelessness.pdf; Comox Valley Population: <https://discovercomoxvalley.com/news-centre/comox-valley-bc-2016-population-data-from-the-statistics-canada-census/>; **Kelowna** Point in Time Count (2018): http://www.centralokanaganfoundation.org/application/files/9915/2884/5444/COF_PiT_Report_2018_FINAL.pdf; Kelowna Population: <https://www.kelowna.ca/our-community/about>; **Victoria** Population: https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/regional-planning-pdf/population/population-pdfs/popestimate_17.pdf?sfvrsn=d00003ca_4 ; Victoria Point in Time Count (2018); <http://victoriahomelessness.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2018-PiT-Count-Community-Report-FINAL.pdf>; **Vancouver**: Point in Time Count: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/vancouver-homeless-count-2018-final-report.pdf>; Vancouver Population: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=5915022&Geo2=PR&Code2=59&Data=Count&SearchText=Vancouver&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=5915022&TABID=1> ; **St. John’s (NL)**: Point in Time Count: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/newfoundland-labrador/st-johns-homelessness-report-tallies-homeless-1.4727950>; St. John’s Population: http://www.stats.gov.nl.ca/Statistics/Population/PDF/Population_Estimates_CDCMA.pdf ;

Partnering Strategy Designated cities of Kelowna, Comox Valley and St. John's (NL).

This high ratio of homelessness has put overwhelming pressure on service provision in Nanaimo. It points to an urgent need for expanded service provision, in particular, as many interviewees pointed out, in the supply of outreach support workers.

Furthermore, Nanaimo is experiencing sustained population growth. Between 2017 and 2041 the Nanaimo region is expected to grow by an additional 30,000 people⁷, all of whom will need to be housed. This factor alone will continue to increase pressure on the housing supply and support systems in Nanaimo.

The business case for a Housing Hub is straightforward (See Appendix C for an Illustrative Budget). Given that all agencies and staff are at or beyond their current capacities there needs to be additional funding and staffing dedicated to developing and running a centralized coordinated 'Hub'. The specifics of the costing can only be determined, in any detail, once the shape and functions of such a Hub are determined.

⁷ *BC Stats* population estimates: Retrieved from: <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/people-population-community/population/population-estimates>

METHODS

This study aspires to be part of an ongoing wider process of social change by drawing on the *principles* of participatory action research (Hall, 1981). While not fulfilling all of the requirements of participatory research methodology this study's intent is to combine education, research and collective action to transform the conditions of oppressed groups (Greenwood, Whyte & Harkavy, 1993; Hall, 1975). In this study, service providers are conceived of as community organizers serving to change the lives of at risk and homeless populations for the better.

The knowledge generated in this way is intended to help solve practical problems within a community and, ultimately, contribute to a fairer and more just society. The primary purpose of participatory action research is to encourage marginalized populations and *those that work with them* to generate and control their own knowledge (Hall, 1981; Tandon, 1981). The development of a Housing Hub as such will be directly informed by the ongoing input and participation of community members. It will be best served by putting the everyday knowledge of service providers and users to work in finding and implementing solutions.

The data for this project is derived from interviews with service providers, and other community members working in and around housing supports and homelessness in Nanaimo (See Appendix A). Semi-structured interviews were conducted and extensive notes were taken in the process. A total of 17 interviews were conducted involving 30 individuals in total. These data were reviewed in order to identify key themes and issues. Some themes and comments are drawn from a facilitated focus group involving various agencies and community members that was conducted on September 12th, 2018. A goal of the study was to ensure that the voices of the informants were the main source of insight. To further fulfill this requirement, participant feedback was sought on drafts of the report and included in the final document.

The interviews were part of a learning process for everyone involved, not an attempt to uncover the 'truth' about Nanaimo's housing systems. The discussions in the interviews, while not all reflected here, provide a platform for future discussions concerning service delivery in Nanaimo. The final document is part of a larger process of community engagement; it is intended to be a working document that supports a process of change.

One methodological limitation worth noting was the relatively short time frame for data collection which hindered the participation of potential stakeholders. Despite these limitations, this is an initial attempt to capture learnings at a single point in time. Future research can build on this analysis complementing it with broader stakeholder selection. There is some input from populations with lived experience of homelessness but this is a source of data and learning that should be expanded upon in future planning and research on housing supports in Nanaimo.

Review of Promising Practice and Research

This section provides a brief overview of the policy approaches and research on systematic transformations in housing service provision. A comprehensive review of relevant literature on homelessness, housing, and attempts to create systems to respond to homelessness is beyond the scope of this study.

Of immediate relevance is Norman and Pauly's (2015) evaluation of the Centralized Access to Supported Housing (CASH) developed in Victoria, B.C. The current situation in Nanaimo seems almost identical to the situation that faced Victoria and its CASH system. Primary among the common factors: a deep lack of housing stock, increasing numbers of homeless and at risk of homelessness, increased acuity of service users' needs, overburdened service provision, long waitlists for available housing supports and a lack of cohesion among service agencies and stakeholders.

The goal of the CASH system was to create a single, efficient and equitable point of entry and assessment into supported housing. Norman and Pauly (2015) point out that the system resulted in a number of outcomes--some positive, some negative. Primary among the negative effects were very long waitlists. Indeed, Norman and Pauly suggest that, "CASH may be more clearly termed a process to access the waitlist for supported housing rather than a process to access supported housing" (2015, p.20).

Another major problem was the lack of direct involvement by populations being served in developing solutions (Norman and Pauly, 2015, p.21). On the positive side the CASH system did create an agreed upon process and prioritization mechanism and allowed the City to gather relevant and systematic data. It also had the effect of creating greater collaboration among partner agencies. Norman and Pauly's (2016) review outlines, in many ways, the features of a template for the formation of a Housing Hub in Nanaimo.

Most cities in Canada and the United States have been intensively involved in searching for solutions to housing and homelessness service provision for close to 20 years. This process has been driven by the deepening crisis in housing affordability and the resulting increase in homelessness. A search of municipal websites will turn up a variety of strategies and initiatives⁸. Cities in the province of Alberta, as it turns out, have developed some of the most innovative and successful programs for addressing homelessness and housing. This is illustrated by Turner and Roger's (2016) review of Medicine Hat's experience entitled, "The First City to End Homelessness". Turner and Roger provide a schema of *5 Key Lessons Learned* from the Medicine Hat experience that could support the organization of a Housing Hub in Nanaimo. In their most brief form they are:

1. Shared community ownership;

⁸ S. John's (NL) Affordable Housing Business Plan (2014-17) – Creating Opportunities, Housing Our Community, <http://stjohns.ca/publications/affordable-housing-business-plan>; Business Plan 2018-2022: Red Deer Housing Authority, <https://reddeerhousingauthority.ca/images/pdfs/RDHA-Plan-2018-2022.pdf>; Housing Vancouver Strategy, <https://council.vancouver.ca/20171128/documents/rr1appendixa.pdf>

2. The right people, at the right time;
3. A focus on data, performance and continuous improvement;
4. An intentional community-wide system planning approach;
5. A nimble coordinating body.

The formation of the *7 Cities on Housing and Homelessness* is another example of how Canadian communities are collaborating to create structures that work to end homelessness. *7 Cities* is a coalition of cities in Alberta formed to share resources and best practice for ending homelessness. It suggests that *regional* strategies that go beyond single city responses may be very useful in the development of strategies to enhance service provision. A regional strategy for the area surrounding Nanaimo anchored by a series of local 'Hubs' would seem to be a good option to explore.

In response to the need for tools to address homeless servicing systems, a number of key research and policy resources have developed in Canada. First among these is the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness (COH), and Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness (CAEH). The research arm of the COH has developed the massive online presence of *The Homeless Hub* (<http://homelesshub.ca/>).

A foundation in finding solutions to homelessness is the principle of Housing First.

Housing First is a recovery-oriented approach to homelessness that involves moving people who experience homelessness into independent and permanent housing as quickly as possible, with no preconditions, and then providing them with additional services and supports as needed. The underlying principle of Housing First is that people are more successful in moving forward with their lives if they are first housed (Gaetz, 2013, p.2).

Well established as both a program and a philosophical approach, Housing First has been evaluated and adopted as a policy by both federal and provincial levels of government in Canada (MacNaughton, Nelson, Worton, Tsemberis, Stergiopoulos, Aubry, Hasford, Distasio and Goering, 2018). The deployment of Housing First as an operational and philosophical sign post has numerous effects:

Though local evidence did not exist at the time, other studies, particularly from the United States, confirmed that Housing First was less costly to provide housing and supports to end long-term homelessness as opposed to relying on emergency responses which led to expensive use of shelters, emergency health services, police and jails (Turner and Rogers 2016, p. 502).

The deliberate use of data in progress reports to showcase cost savings of Housing First to public systems made the argument for increased investment and overall support for the [Medicine Hat] plan transparent and rational (Turner and Roger 2016, p. 506).

In the United States there are numerous efforts at the state and federal level to develop strategies and structures to end homelessness. *Built for Zero* is one of the widest reaching and most effective and claims as its major successes:

- Housed more than 75,000 people in participating communities since January 2015, including more than 40,000 veterans
- Seven communities have measurably and sustainably ended veteran homelessness
- *Three communities have measurably and sustainably ended chronic homelessness*
- More than 50 participating communities have now achieved real time, by-name data on their local homeless populations (<https://www.community.solutions/what-we-do/built-for-zero>)

What is important here is that the general principles of developing effective mechanisms to decrease or end homelessness are generally agreed upon and well understood. They include a commitment to Housing First principles, mechanisms for effective data gathering and management, short, mid and long term goal setting and outcome measurement, inclusion of people with lived experience in the planning and delivery of housing provision, and innovative collaborations between local, provincial and national governments (Turner 2014; Gaetz 2012; Gaetz, Scott and Gulliver, 2013; OrgCode, 2017). However, as Turner and Roger (2016) point out there will be difficult conversations and decisions during these systems changes. They suggest there is every possibility that some service providers may opt out of new practices as they may not be able to meet the requirements of new systems or may simply not have the resources to take part. This process may leave gaps in service provision that existing agencies in Nanaimo will need to fill.

Intake and Assessment

It is now widely agreed that success is attained by having a single agreed upon assessment tool or process. This includes a standard set of questions (and forms) used by all agencies and organizations in a community that allows the local team to quickly assess people based on their unique circumstances and needs. Additionally, it helps outreach workers and service providers find the best housing match to fit these needs.

Common intake and assessment data creates the foundation of an informed coordinated system. It offers a birds eye view (and a thumbnail sketch) of everyone experiencing homelessness in a community and provides a way to connect each person to the most appropriate housing option. As reported in *the 100,000 Homes campaign* in the United States:

Experience has shown us that a community cannot gather the necessary information to house its homeless neighbors solely by counting them anonymously once a year. As New Orleans' successful drive to end veteran homelessness has shown, a local team must know the names and unique needs of every person on its streets and in its shelters (Gibbs, 2015).

Clearly a Housing Hub *alone* will not be able to end homelessness in Nanaimo, but it may serve as an important linchpin in the wider processes involved. Bergen County, Vermont the first city in the U.S. to claim to have effectively ended homeless suggests that a ‘hub’ type entity is crucial to success:

First, the County *created a one-stop model* designed to increase collaboration across its multiple housing and service providers. Most communities have more than one group working to respond to homelessness, but often, these groups work in isolation or at cross purposes....Orlando, [the program director,] a trained disaster response professional, *likens the model to a command center*. [emphasis added]
(<https://www.community.solutions/blog/bergen-county-ends-chronic-homelessness-first-usa>).

As such there seems to be solid support from leading practitioners in housing support for the idea of something resembling a ‘command centre’, such as a Housing Hub.

KEY THEMES: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

“Some sort of centralized system...”

Everyone who was interviewed agreed that there needs to be some sort of centralized and simplified system for housing supports in Nanaimo. One informant put it succinctly:

Ultimately we need a version of CASH [‘Centralized Access to Supported Housing’ in Victoria], whether this is a group or something else, where we share referrals. There would need to be a consent attached to every one of our referrals that would be like a shared assessment consent. We definitely need that. And then we also need a drop in place for someone to say ‘I’ll refer you anywhere” so the people know there’s one place to go to get all their referrals done (Supportive Housing Support Worker).

I think we need the same referral and intake process [for everyone]. Then we could meet with all agencies and make a priority list and *then* go to case managers (Housing Program Coordinator).

A core feature of CASH and other housing support systems are regular prioritization meetings among service providers to identify--on a community-wide basis--the most at risk, and those most in need of housing. Meetings serve a variety of functions including the collation of data, building collaboration among service providers and the creation and monitoring of a comprehensive *by name list* of the homeless and at risk populations. The process of forming such an entity in and of itself is a valuable capacity building tool (Turner 2014).

It became evident in discussion with service providers that if such a mechanism would work it would also require methods for dealing with specific populations:

[A Hub] could serve as key conduit—totally. Totally. But it needs flexibility. Each organization/group that’s dealing with a specific demographic needs to make those assessment processes *for their own group* (Indigenous Housing Support Worker).

Or as another informant suggested a key feature of service provision is the process of matching the needs of an individual to the appropriate type and level of support. This type of client centered approach would be emphasized in the Hub’s intake and assessment processes:

Clients call in for information and then we interview them so we can learn more about them, they learn about us, we show them the unit, explain the rules/responsibilities, our criteria: *it comes down to balancing the need of the individual with compatibility of what we can offer* (Youth Housing Support Worker).

“Lack of System Capability”

The major problem with housing provision in Nanaimo is a lack of housing of any kind for low income, at risk or homeless individuals and families. It has been estimated that over 8,000 households in the region were in core housing need as of 2011 which is projected to rise to a total of 11,000 by 2036 (City of Nanaimo, 2018, p.36). While there has been a ‘housing boom’ in Nanaimo in the last 5 years, all or most of this new housing is not affordable or social housing.

I think the straight up answer is the simple solve—not rocket science. The bureaucracy just needs to step up and build the damn housing—all of it. The family housing, individual housing, elder housing, the disability, the youth housing, the supportive housing—it all needs to be built (Housing Support Worker).

[The housing crisis] isn’t just impacting the most vulnerable any longer but they’re the ones who are slipping through the giant crevices in the situation (Housing Navigator).

A factor that is more under the control of service providers is tracking and supporting ‘flow’ through the housing continuum. Unfortunately, informants reported there is very little flow-through in most of the supported/supportive housing in Nanaimo. Individuals are being placed but rarely if ever moving on: This creates incredible strain on agencies as a whole and creates backlogs and long waiting lists.

Our transition time is supposed to be around 3 months, and last year we had two that were there for a year. And it was because [finding other] housing was the barrier (Indigenous Housing Support Worker).

People get into our units that are near shopping and central to downtown and services and they have a nice view of the ocean. Why would anyone want to move? I wouldn't (Mental Health Support Worker).

Clearly a Hub could contribute to the development of better mechanisms and, or, a focal point for tracking the movement and or blockages in the housing support(s) 'stream'.

Another system capability issue was the amount of time that many agencies spend dealing with tenant issues. Staff across agencies, are tasked with finding Landlords and dealing with Residential Tenancy issues:

People come too often too late to solve their current housing issue. A lot of it is education, a lot is people don't understand their rights, don't have the literacy to tackle arbitration . . . the residential tenancy branch is brutal—it's difficult for people with barriers. I do a lot of referrals to [Nanaimo] Citizens Advocacy. Clients don't understand the arbitration dispute and eviction process, they don't understand the importance of the timelines (Housing Support Worker).

Early intervention regarding tenancy issues could be improved by a central and visible response mechanism, such as the Housing Hub. This work seemed to informants to be a duplication of effort and could be better served by having a coordinated landlord liaison that served all agencies. Some agencies reported spending inordinate amounts of time just dealing with Residential Tenancy issues to the detriment of other programs.

There is a need for a Landlord Liaison either a group and, or, specialist to serve all agencies . . . We used to have a Landlord Liaison but it just disappeared. I think they got hired into another agency (Housing Support Worker).

Bringing the Systems up to code: Intake, Assessment and Prioritization

Interviewer: I think there already exists a coordinated system...

Executive Director: It's cobbled together, but it wasn't built to code, it's a shanty...

In order to have a common assessment mechanism service providers will need to have an agreed upon and common prioritization tool and process. This process needs to be data based but also include the input of specific knowledge of service providers and employ a multi-layered set of criteria (Turner, 2014). This appeared to be widely understood among informants. The BC Housing Registry, while useful, was identified by informants as not being adequately sensitive in creating prioritization. The BC Housing Registry, like the CASH mechanism analysed by Norman and Pauly (2016), seems useful for gathering information but was not entirely adequate for establishing prioritization.

Before that can happen it was suggested by a number of service providers that a common intake form be developed with a minimal amount of information taken at point of first contact. One of the problems identified by almost everyone in Nanaimo was that service users were being forced to tell and retell their stories to every agency they went to. Clients may still need to fill in multiple applications for different programs, but a common intake form would gather centralized data and also efficiently re-direct service users to the 'right door'. A centralized data base would allow service providers to more efficiently provide outreach to users, and make first contact with at least a 'thumbnail' sketch of each person's needs. (See Appendix B for a simplified intake form designed during the research focus group).

There are common assessment tools used across Canada⁹; primarily SPDAT, VI-SPDAT and the Vulnerability Assessment Tool (VAT). However, "BC Housing is now requiring and supporting all communities across BC to use the Vulnerability Assessment Tool to inform prioritized access to BC Housing funded supportive housing programs" (CAEH, 2018, p. 7). Informants reported that they do have some staff trained in using the VAT, but as a whole the community does not currently have as many trained staff as will be needed. A number also reported that they were aware that their staff should be using VAT but some staff previously trained had left the organizations and others had yet to receive the mandated training from BC Housing. The Hub could take the lead on training people in using the VAT and function as the site of information sharing in that regard.

Intake and Assessment are the most important features of housing support systems. The advice from leading experts and cities which have had success reducing homelessness is that there should be a *common intake and assessment process* for all agencies and service providers involved (Turner, 2014). This system does not yet exist in Nanaimo though there appear to be components that would enable this to happen. From conversations with service providers, what does work is a type of informal Insider knowledge that that allows the current housing support systems to work as efficiently as they can.

None of us have trouble getting referrals—it's about whether we're getting them all
(Supportive Housing Workers).

While there are existing referral mechanisms between various agencies it was reported that the referral process is often based on the built up expertise of staff. Staff makes a variety of decisions in directing service users that do not get documented, but nonetheless make the system work. This knowledge cannot be formalized, but it could perhaps be put to better use. For example, one housing support worker pointed out:

We find that even with a holistic program and wrap-around services, *each program worker has some (informal) information on each family and that allows us to get all the pieces together*, and figure out what is going to be more effective for this family. *That relationship is a huge thing*. That's what makes our programs work. [Going to another agency] that does not have that relationship...ends up being a disaster (Indigenous Housing Support Worker).

⁹ <http://caeh.ca/wp-content/uploads/BACKGROUND-ASSESSMENT-TOOLS-IN-USE-IN-CANADA.pdf>

Nanaimo will not be starting from scratch as it moves towards a more coordinated system. The sharing of informal knowledge within the Hub will improve service. Numerous interviewees pointed out that they do have strong working relationships with each other but that they could be better, and perhaps more formalized. In many ways the housing support systems in Nanaimo depend on the developed knowledge of local practitioners. This acquired knowledge is important and will provide a solid basis for the formation of the Hub.

What was also reported in equal measure was that some Individuals who were housed via “Housing First” principles often did not want or need high levels of support after their initial placements. What is needed according to some informants is an *ongoing* assessment and monitoring of clients support needs and an adjustment of supports by providers based on that assessment. This type of monitoring mechanism could be served by the Hub.

Navigating the BC Housing Registry

One of the informants for this study, a recently housed person, reported that a main point of contact would have been very helpful when he was homeless:

I went to every place in town and filled out all the forms and applications. Some of them took like 2 hours or so. I didn't know what else to do. I never heard back from any of them, never heard back from BC Housing. Only ever heard back from one program and that's the one program that helped me out.

Among other issues this example shows the need for concerted follow up with service users. The primary reason this individual got results was due to one service provider doing outreach and follow up. This is not to suggest that outreach is not being done in Nanaimo. Most service providers in their interviews said that there was a desperate need for many more outreach workers to ensure that clients do not fall through the cracks.

There was a pervasive sense of frustration among service providers with existing application and intake mechanisms, in particular the BC Housing Registry. Agencies in Nanaimo use a variety of intake forms and track data both centrally (via reporting to BC Housing) and in house. While openly acknowledging the need for a mechanism to enter the housing support system, it was stated that the online application for the Housing Registry itself is burdensome-- for both users and staff. It was a cause of confusion for users who often assume that once registered it would merely be a matter of time before housing materialized for them. (Norman and Pauly (2015) found similar problems in Victoria). The overall frustrations of service providers are summed up well by these comments:

We have literacy issues with parents as well and having online access. And/or they just don't understand, they're anxiety filled as well; it's not a friendly process. I have more

success when I do the applications with them, myself.

I've spent hours on the phone with BC Housing getting information on just the registry piece because it's such a long, complex process. I can't even imagine for someone with multiple barriers. They need to simplify it (Housing Support Worker).

If you don't put in the [right] codes for which community and /or units you're willing to live in—if you haven't filled it in adequately and they call and say we have a unit in Kelowna, and you say you can't move there—they drop you off the register. And you have to start all over again. That system needs an overhaul. [emphasis added] (Indigenous Housing Support Worker).

As noted above, support workers report that the application process, on its own, has caused damage to the relationships that are so central to working successfully with clients. This was a common problem especially for those dealing with clients at risk of homelessness with/in families. Homeless adults with children are extremely wary of engaging with government mechanisms because of the (justified) fear that children will be removed from the parents' control if they are identified as homeless:

The hidden homeless feel at risk with their kids ending up within the system, and then having to try and extract themselves from all of that because that's so tricky, even if the kids don't end up taken into care, having a file open is daunting for our young families who are staying with friends or family.

It was also noted that, in particular, that Indigenous populations have a different relationship with housing and family that simply does not work well with the current systems. The complexity of this issue has been acknowledged by the development of a specific definition for Indigenous homeless that is comprised of 12 dimensions.¹⁰

If I were to go with a really formal process it would shut my clients down. For example, asking pointed questions from a sheet. For our indigenous clients it's always about that relationship, 'who are you' 'where are you from' 'who's your family'; that's the number one thing that anchors our clientele. You've got to know where people are from; *you can't just dig in their business and not understand their family connections* (Indigenous Housing Support Worker).

As such a Housing Hub could help to support specialist practitioner's work, in particular, by providing referral to culturally appropriate service for Indigenous clients. The scope for a non-standard approach would also hold true for clients from other specified populations: Seniors, LGBTQ2S, Transgender, Women, and Youth.

¹⁰ *Definition of Indigenous Homelessness in Canada*, Jesse Thistle (2017). Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press. Retrieved from: <http://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/COHIndigenousHomelessnessDefinition.pdf>

There is also a common perception that BC Housing does not work consistently or equitably. It is unclear whether this is a lack of transparency or simply a matter of a system that does not work as efficiently as it could:

I've seen a ton of movement on other fronts, for example, the creation of seniors housing [recently]. It's frustrating with those on the front lines having to deal with people who have nothing. And watching how BC Housing chooses who they fast track through is crazy-making; people with very similar situations who've been on the registry 3 months--another [one] 3 years--the new one gets in first (Housing Navigator).

Transparency and accountability of individual agencies was felt to be a factor that contributed to a sense that the current mechanisms do not work well and are not equitable. By providing a mechanism for coordination of monitoring outcomes the Hub would aid in the transparency of the housing support systems in Nanaimo. An important point was made by a Service provider whose core population is women:

I actually think a more formal centralized system will help our clientele because in the current systems women as a group tend to be marginalized by the processes because the various programs are not gender sensitive or not focused on women [as an identifiable group]. For example, most definitions of homelessness assume a genderless person (Women's Housing Support Staff).

Further to this issue it was pointed out that the VAT (the BC Housing mandated assessment tool) is not adequately sensitive to women's experience. Though a study commissioned by BC Housing suggests that there were no significant differences in total VAT scores based upon age and gender (Pathways PtH Housing First & The Centre for Research on Educational and Community Services, University of Ottawa, 2017, p.2)¹¹. Nonetheless the point remains that the VAT may not be *adequately sensitive* to women's relationship with homelessness. Another systemic gap was found in trying to place clients who move out or 'age out' of eligibility for a given program:

I haven't found any housing tailored for 30-50 year olds . . . A gap in my knowledge is I wouldn't know who to contact to try and find someone [who is over 30] a home out there (Youth Support Worker).

The goal of the Hub would be to aide both staff and service users in navigating their way through the BC Housing Registry and other bureaucratic mechanisms.

¹¹ See the full report: http://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/Pathways_VAT.pdf

Enhancing Inter-Agency Communication

We were [previously] talking about a group of us coming together and being able to share our *current* resources more efficiently (Housing Support Worker).

The coalition is great, but we need something so much bigger, like a housing provider, *without funders sitting there* –a central place where there’s a list of referrals etc., and mandatory that others come to once a month. We need this, and it’s got to be client-centred (Housing Support Worker).

A number of interviewees suggested that there was a need for greater inter-agency communication and collaboration. In particular, one support worker said he felt it would be extremely useful to have cross agency discussions and see who was having the most success in housing people and why that was so: “*What is it some agencies and programs are doing that leads to success?*” The Housing Hub could serve this function as a subset of its coordinating role. However an equal number of informants pointed out that there is competition among service providers for housing resources that mitigates this type of sharing:

What would be beneficial would be some kind of focus group with all the housing providers so people kind of get a feel for “I’ve got a mandate” “these are our challenges” and then coming up with solutions . . . We’re doing that on a smaller scale—but it would be so beneficial if it was larger. Because there are so many services out there that we don’t know about (Indigenous Supports worker).

Just providing a house isn’t really enough, especially if the programs have an upper age limit. And most tenants in general don’t know what their rights/responsibilities are when they are in housing.

I’ve been trying to reach out a lot with different organizations. *Housing programs can have a silo effect. There’s a lot to be said with multi-lateral approaches.* In my case I mainly work with MCFD and Tillicum. In any event tenants need supports once they’re placed that I may not be able to provide or find [Italics added] (Youth Support Worker).

One agency staff pointed out that her service program and supportive housing providers lack a formal relationship. According to this coordinator, there are clients who are not ready for, nor suited, to private market rentals which her program services, but the clients could be placed in Social and or Supportive Housing. However there is no mechanism for ‘transferring’ clients across the boundaries of these programs. A Housing Hub could serve as a mechanism to enable this type of inter-agency coordination.

“We’re all in the same sandbox.”

It is abundantly clear that most staff and agencies are actively seeking solutions to their support systems problems. However, they also expressed openness to accepting guidance and direction. Although the agencies appear to be working in collaboration, there are barriers and challenges that might be resolved by the provision clear goals and direction:

Maybe we need something from the top, to say we’re sending all this money out, and it’s time for everyone to work together—that’s part of the solution. Right now we’re working in little isolated pockets.

And when you’re (working in isolated pockets) we’re all very busy, and I think that’s one of the barriers. To get all of us sitting at a table together and making that commitment and having somebody to coordinate it for us (Housing Support Worker).

There were also a number of informants that suggested that all levels of government need to provide the direction and priorities, but to step back when designing actual service provision:

Why are you going to tell [Service Providers] how to operate a housing program, when they have no idea how it should work. They should say we need to create the situation to do it—then let’s negotiate how that will happen. You need a line between governance and operations. When governance strays too far into operations usually things come apart. The crazy part is that none of this is ground-breaking (Mental Health Housing Support Worker).

According to some informants the current systems and structures are dealing with a Nanaimo that does not exist anymore. For example, Nanaimo has gone from a handful--to several hundred--at risk and homeless people:

What we’re seeing right now is the failure of several streams, whether it be government housing decisions over decades, public health policy over decades, all are, unfortunately, culminating right now. It will take decades to get out of it, but we have to build that plan and realize in the big scheme it isn’t only about the currently homeless, it’s about those in youth care today, those not fallen upon hard times yet (Mental Health and Addictions Staff).

A Hub then would support the policy decisions of all levels of governments but be designed and run by service providers based on their knowledge of clients and best practice from other cities and practitioners.

Summary Findings: A shared vision

A close look at the feedback from study participants revealed a number of common themes. Taken as a whole they paint a picture of a housing support system that requires improvements, but not an entire overhaul. The absence of adequate housing supply (and rent supplements or subsidies) was identified as the major system capability issue. Service providers are struggling with their caseloads in large part due to the extremely high level of need for housing.

There was widespread support for a centralized and simplified mechanism like a Housing Hub. And although there are, in varying degrees, good working relationships among service providers it was agreed that there needs to be some formalization of the processes to enhance inter-agency collaboration. It was pointed out that in the process of formalization and standardization, care needs to be taken to not supplant staff's built-up knowledge and learning with a rigid bureaucratic mechanism. As was expressed by numerous study participants it is precisely the bureaucratic mechanisms (like the BC Housing Registry) that cause many of their problems. Methods to better serve clients in this regard were welcomed by everyone.

Finally a Housing Hub would aid the development of long term goals and a systematic change to service provision. These problems have long histories, and the solutions will be equally as long term. As noted by more than one study participant, "We're all in the same sandbox". By creating a shared community vision of the future, focussed (in part) by the Housing Hub, we can provide better service to those in need.

Acknowledgements:

Thanks to the many service providers who gave their time without which the study wouldn't have been possible. Thanks to Megan Terepocki, independent researcher/writer for technical and editorial support. Thanks to Louise Stern and John McCormick, Research Advisory Committee for the Justice Research Centre @ Nanaimo Region John Howard Society, for comments on earlier drafts and support throughout the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS: THE NANAIMO HOUSING HUB

“A collaborative space to gather community agencies together and break down boundaries and bring people together.”

Based on the points raised in interviews and a focus group with service providers, the following recommendations provide support for the feasibility of a Housing Hub in Nanaimo. As a starting point it was recommended by almost all informants there needs to be buy in from all agencies involved.

Start chatting. Get all the housing coordinators together. That would be a good first step. Once you have a list of interested parties—for us to meet and have a facilitated meeting, an outside facilitator, sit down with us and create some goals—because if we just all sit down by ourselves we’re going to just talk about the same old things (Housing Support Worker).

To start this process it was recommended that a single all agency Housing Services Intake and Referral form be developed. The purpose of this form would be to minimize duplication and help direct clients to the appropriate agencies and programs. One form would be used by all agencies and deposited at the Housing Hub (See Appendix D). The Housing Hub would then collate the data and begin to track across all agencies what is going on with clients. It would start the process of creating a real time data base and monitoring clients’ status in various programs. It would help outreach teams in ensuring clients are still attached to programs/wait lists and to monitor changes in client’s situations. Substantial changes in client situations would lead to a re-assessment, which might lead to the client getting different levels of housing support. It was reported by more than one service provider that this type of service responsiveness was not currently feasible.

The Housing Hub would require dedicated staff and the support of in-kind staffing from partnering agencies. The details of this would need to be worked out but different approaches have worked in different Canadian cities. As mentioned previously, in-kind staffing is the model used at *SORCe* in Calgary. On the other hand, the newly formed Housing Hub in Chilliwack has a full-time housing coordinator, and a full-time tenant support worker.

A Housing Hub, according to several interviewees, should have its own physical location with staff and an array of services that might (ideally) also include showers, public access to computers, phones and printers (among other things) as well as being a central location for access to information on housing supports and service providers. A Housing Hub would serve as the administrative site of a structured Intake Process coordinated by Hub staff.

Ideally some felt that the Housing Hub could be led by two (full-time) staff: One ‘Client Coordinator’ to work in concert with Housing Providers such as Uplands Walk (Pacifica Housing), Nanaimo Affordable

Housing Society, and Wesley Street (CMHA), and one to function as a Systems Coordinator working with homeless support agencies, such as the various Housing Outreach Support Teams, Homeless Coalition, the RCMP, the Women’s Resource Centre and the Salvation Army. This structure will require considerable ongoing funding. (An Illustrative Budget is provided in Appendix C). While two full-time staff may not be financially realistic at this time, the hub would need something in place to fill these roles.

It was recommended that the Hub have 3 interconnected functions:

- 1: Intake and Assessment
- 2: Coordination
- 3: Training and Education

The intake and assessment function would be served by the *Client Coordinator* and an ‘Intake Team’ formed from a collaborative of agency staff, which would also be connected to Housing Outreach Support teams. The intake team would identify clients and their needs and which agencies and programs would be a best fit for which clients. The Intake team would gather and collate the standardized intake form data.

The Systems Coordinator Staff would organize Triage and Prioritization meetings and provide the data to support the staff in making prioritization decisions. The Systems Coordinator (or function) would provide for inter-agency communication and provide a contact point for landlords, different levels of government and the public. The Systems Coordinator would also apply for funding to sustain and support the growth of the Hub.

Lastly, the Hub would serve the function of training and education: It would train agency staff in the standardized Intake and Assessment process. It would also serve to provide public education on the purpose and activities of the Housing Hub (in concert with other organizations, such as the Homelessness Coalition). It would also as a connector between business, schools, neighborhood associations and service agencies.

An important innovation in service provision that emerged from the study was the recommendation that the Housing Hub become a site of training volunteers to support the recently housed. The suggestion is that volunteers from the community would be trained to form “circles of support” for the recently housed. This method would engage communities directly in the process of social integration of the homeless and at risk (who are socially marginalized) and relieve pressure on service providers. And most importantly it will enhance the chances for success and health of those recently housed. The basis for this model is derived from the practice of ‘Therapeutic Communities’ (DeLeon, 2000). Members of a therapeutic community achieve better social outcomes because they are sustained through a community of concerned people working together to help themselves and each other. These ‘Circles of Support’ working with the newly housed would in effect be small Therapeutic Communities.

One outreach worker pointed out that an actual physical location for the Housing Hub would serve as a

form of anxiety reduction for service users who are in crisis, *“In the short term simply having someone sit and listen and provide some attention while you are in a desperate situation will lower people’s stress response, and that would be a good thing”*.

Interestingly, many informants also agreed that the ‘Housing Hub’ might do well to provide service for *more than* just the unhoused or at risk of homelessness. There was wide agreement that it might also be a service for any and all seeking housing and housing solutions. If scaled up to include this function it would require more funding (from the City of Nanaimo). The establishment of a local ‘hotline’ number for housing was considered to be a useful mechanism as well. This model has been employed in a number of Canadian cities. (See Brandon Housing First) Also, there was considerable support for the creation of a Private Facebook page exclusive to service providers to share and manage client information. Interviewees also identified a need to create a Nanaimo wide ‘Process Manual’ to enable all agency staff to follow the overall process and paths of housing supports. This type of documentation has been identified as a key component of success in other Canadian cities.¹²

The goal of this study was to assess the feasibility of a Housing Hub in Nanaimo: There is no doubt that a Housing Hub is feasible, indeed it is, according to most informants, necessary.

¹² See *City of Kawartha Lakes and Haliburton County Homelessness Services Coordinated Entry System: Process Guide*, February 2018: <http://www.20khomes.ca/wp-content/uploads/CKLH-CES-Process-Guide.pdf>.

ACTION PLANS

The following action plan is based on the input of the service providers who were interviewed and a subset who participated in a facilitated focus group discussion on the feasibility of a housing hub in Nanaimo. These plans reflect the advice from leading practitioners in the field of housing support provision in Canada and the United States. Some of these recommendations can be enacted no matter what the final model might be:

1. Organize an all agency meeting to assess who is willing to be involved in the Nanaimo Housing Hub.
2. Develop a single Intake Form as a driver to link up coordination of Referrals and Intake. A draft template for an Intake form is attached; Appendix B (Goal: Develop tracking mechanism for real time data).
3. Formulate a clear concept and structure for the Hub: Start with structure outlined in this report (See Appendix D).
4. Identify potential physical locations: Within existing agency or stand alone? There are merits and associated costs in both arrangements.
5. Engage people with lived experience of homelessness in development and design of the Hub.
6. Establish funding and staffing model: Will it be funded by The City, BC Housing, in-kind or some other formula?
7. Develop a Nanaimo wide *Process Manual* for Housing Supports and Service Provision.
8. Examine and define the relationship between the Housing Hub and the forthcoming CAA.
9. Develop, Plan, and deliver Public Education Campaign to promote and establish visibility of the Hub and its services. (In collaboration with the Homelessness Coalition, the City, and Community Partners).
10. Arrange VAT training for staff in consultation with BC Housing as soon as possible.
11. Evaluate the utility of providing housing information and resources for the general public.

REFERENCES

- City of Nanaimo (2018). *Nanaimo Affordable Housing Discussion Paper*. City of Nanaimo. Retrieved from: https://www.nanaimo.ca/docs/default-document-library/rpt_c180423affordablehousingstrategydiscussionpaper_att.pdf.
- Deleon, G. (2000). *The Therapeutic Community : Theory, Model and Method*. New York: Springer Publishing Inc.
- Gaetz, S., Gulliver, T. & Richter, T. (2014). *The State of Homelessness in Canada: 2014*. Toronto: The Homeless Hub Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/SOHC2014.pdf>.
- Gaetz, S. (2013). *Introduction*, in Stephen Gaetz, S., Fiona Scott & Tanya Gulliver (Eds.), *Housing First in Canada: Supporting Communities to End Homelessness*, (pp. 1-16). Toronto: Canadian Homelessness Research Network Press.
- Gaetz, S. (2012). *The real cost of homelessness: Can we save money by doing the right thing?*, Toronto: Canadian Homelessness Research Network. Retrieved from: http://www.homelesshub.ca/ResourceFiles/costofhomelessness_paper21092012.pdf.
- Gibbs, A. (2015). *Assessment and the Role of By-Name Lists*. Retrieved from: <https://www.community.solutions/blog/assessment-and-role-name-lists>.
- Greenwood, D. J., Whyte, W. F., & Harkavy, I. (1993). Participatory Action Research as a Process and as a Goal. *Human Relations*, 46 (2), 175.
- Hall, B. (1975). Participatory Research: An Approach for Change, *Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education*, 8 (2): 24-31.
- Hall, B. (1981). Participatory Research, Popular Knowledge and Power: A Personal Reflection. *Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education*, 14 (3): 5-17.
- Macnaughton, E. , Nelson, G. , Worton, S. K., Tsemberis, S. , Stergiopoulos, V. , Aubry, T. , Hasford, J. , Distasio, J. and Goering, P. (2018). Navigating Complex Implementation Contexts: Overcoming Barriers and Achieving Outcomes in a National Initiative to Scale Out Housing First in Canada. *Am J Community Psychol*, 62: 135-149. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12268.
- OrgCode (2017). *Progressive Engagement and Coordinated Entry: Thoughts from OrgCode*. <http://www.20khomes.ca/wp-content/uploads/OrgCode-Progressive-Engagement-and-Coordinated-Entry.pdf>.
- Pathways PtH Housing First & The Centre for Research on Educational and Community Services, University of Ottawa (2017). *Final Report Of The Vulnerability Assessment Tool Evaluation*:

Narrative Summary Of Quantitative Results And Qualitative Findings. Retrieved from: http://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/Pathways_VAT.pdf.

Norman, T. and Pauly, B. (2016). Where's the CASH (Centralized Access to Supported Housing)?: Evaluation of a Single Point of Access to Supported Housing, in Nichols, N., & Doberstein, C. (Eds.). *Exploring Effective Systems Responses to Homelessness*. Toronto: The Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press.

Norman, T and Pauly B. (2015). *CASH EVALUATION Centralized Access to Supported Housing (CASH), Victoria, BC: Evaluation of a Single Point of Access to Supported Housing* . http://victoriahomelessness.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/CASH_Evaluation_2015.pdf.

Tandon, R. (1981). Participatory Research in the Empowerment of People, *Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education*, 8 (2): pp. 44-53.

Turner, A. and Rogers, J. (2016). The “First City to End Homelessness”: A Case Study of Medicine Hat’s Approach to System Planning in a Housing First Context, in Nichols, N., & Doberstein, C. (Eds.). *Exploring Effective Systems Responses to Homelessness*, (pp. 497- 515), Toronto: The Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press.

Turner, A. (2014). Beyond Housing First: Essential Elements of a System-Planning Approach to Ending Homelessness. *School of Public Policy Research Papers*, 7(30), 1-24. Retrieved from <http://www.policyschool.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/research/beyond-housing-turner.pdf>.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: List of Study Participants

Individuals from the following Agencies and Organizations were interviewed and or attended the Facilitated Focus Group on September 12, 2018:

Canadian Mental Health Association	People with lived experience of homelessness
Salish Lelum	Island Crisis Care Society
Tillicum Lelum Friendship Centre	The City of Nanaimo
Nanaimo Women’s Resource Centre	Haven Society
Nanaimo Aboriginal Centre	Nanaimo Youth Services Association – Housing Staff
Salvation Army – New Hope Centre	Nanaimo Unitarian Society Cold Weather Shelter
Nanaimo Region John Howard Society	VIHA – Community Outreach team
AVI Health Centre	Uplands Walk (Pacifica Housing)
Private Market Landlord	Pacifica Seniors Lodge
Property Management Firm	

APPENDIX B: Intake and Referral Form (Draft)

NB: This form was co-designed by the attendees at the Nanaimo Housing Hub Feasibility Study: Facilitated Focus Group, September 12, 2018

Process and Purpose: The intent of using this form is to provide a single point of entry for Clients into the Housing Support systems in Nanaimo.

No Wrong Door: All Service Providers may fill in this form with or on behalf of a client; Or Individuals may fill in the form with aide of a Support Worker at the Hub, or wherever a client may normally engage with service providers.

All forms must be sent to the Housing Hub, in hard copy, by mail or scanned and emailed to: HHub@nanaimo.ca

All data will be entered into a central data base accessible to all service agency staff and monitored by the Housing Hub for current housing status, changes in client's situation, location on priority lists for different programs, date of recent contact with Hub, completion of VAT.

Clients may be contacted for more in depth information gathering (e.g. Completion of VAT interview) or be re-directed to agencies with specialist resources or programs (e.g. Haven Society for Women fleeing violence). Hub staff will contact agencies to decide on best immediate options.

Housing Hub staff will make an initial assessment of each client's general eligibility for different housing supports, taking into account any information provided by referring agencies. If it is deemed appropriate based on the information on the Referral/Intake form staff may invite clients to complete a VAT interview.

In all cases the goal is to eventually have the names and a thumbnail sketch of all homeless and at risk individuals in Nanaimo. Being placed in the Hub's data base does not require completion of a VAT.

FORM FOLLOWS:

Nanaimo Housing Hub: Intake and Referral Form

THIS IS NOT AN APPLICATION FOR HOUSING

- ***This form can serve both a Referral form AND an Intake Form.***

Referring Agency

Self-referral / Walk-in: Y/N

Name:

Age range:

Do you identify as Aboriginal/Indigenous? Y/N

Gender: include range of options

Income: (self-reported)

Length of time in Nanaimo:

Currently working with any service agencies (identify which ones/type of support)

Have you previously completed a Vulnerability Assessment Tool (VAT) interview? Y/N

If so with which agency? When?

BC Housing Registry: Registered? Y / N

History of Violence? Y/N

Pets? Y / N

Specific Mental Health Supports Required?

Addiction: Active Y/N; In Recovery Y/N

Disabilities / Special Needs

Legal orders?

Mental Health Diagnosis? Y/N (Note details if offered).

Consent to release of information: Advise client that multiple agencies will have access to information:

Tick those you DO NOT WANT TO SHARE WITH: _____(LIST TO BE ADDED)

**APPENDIX C:
Illustrative Budget**

ITEM	Budget	ASSUMPTIONS
	Annual	
Expenses		
Staff salary and wages	27,300	7 hrs per day x 3 days per week x 52 weeks x \$25 per hour = \$27,300
In Kind Staff salary	(9100)	1 DAY per week (minimum) in-Kind Specialist Support from Agencies on rotating basis = 1/3 Regular Staff = \$9,100
Fringe benefits & payroll taxes	5,460	20% MERC
Rent and Supplies	12,000	\$1000/mo. ESTIMATE STAND ALONE OFFICE **
Total cash expenses	44760	
Total in-kind expenses	9,100	
Total Expenses (Annually)	\$ 53860	

****OFFICE SPACE:**
If housed in City of Nanaimo Office
space could reduce Rent to almost ZERO.

APPENDIX D: Organizational Diagram

