King County

Task Force on Regional Human Services (TFRHS)
Regional Services to be Provided Through a Countywide Partnership

Basic Service Level Qualitative Analysis
8-6-04

#1 Food to Eat and Roof Overhead		
REGIONAL SERVICES Recommended for a Countywide Partnership	**OTHER REGIONAL SERVICES (primarily funded by state and federal governments)**	**LOCAL SERVICES (funded by local or municipal governments)**
• **Homeless Services** (case management, education, counseling, child care shelter meals, mobile outreach, day centers, hygiene/laundry services) • **Emergency Shelters/Transitional Housing** for individuals, families, couples, and children/youth • **Special Needs Housing** (seniors, mentally ill, disabled, persons with AIDS, people released from jail, etc.) • **Housing Stabilization/ Homelessness Prevention** (Tenant assistance, eviction prevention assistance, including vouchers, rental and utility assistance) • **Distribution, Transportation of Food**	• Permanent affordable housing • Child care nutrition programs • Meal and nutrition programs (home-delivered, congregate, summer sack, food vouchers) • Disaster relief	• Voice mail, check cashing, mail services, storage, etc. • Homebuyer assistance • Credit enhancement • Homesharing for seniors • Clothing and furniture • Community preparedness • Emergency food and food banks • Home repair/housing preservation • Protective payee services

The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Task 2 Report has been the structural basis for the work of the Task Force—the focus has been on the *Regional Services to be Provided through a Countywide Partnership* defined in the report. Throughout Task Force materials, reference to Regional or a Regional System is a reference to a countywide effort, not necessarily to King County government. Reference to a region (sometimes called sub-region) within King County (North, East, South, Seattle) is a reference to the geographic area and the people who live there, not necessarily to the jurisdiction(s) located there.

Overview of Data Related to Basic Needs

• The Federal Poverty Level as measured by the US Census uses nationally consistent thresholds that vary by family size. For example, in the 2000 Census, a family of four with an income of under $17,500 was considered below poverty level. HUD uses a different method. The HUD FY1999

definition for extremely low income was 30% of Area Median Income or $18,800 for a family of four; very low-income was 50% of Area Median Income or $31,300.[i]

- When comparing the 39 cities of King County, of the four cities with the largest percent of the population living below the Federal Poverty Level, three are located in the South Region: Auburn (12.8%), Tukwila (12.7%), and Kent (11.6%). Seattle is at 11.8%.[ii] The median poverty rate among all King County cities is 5.1%; Shoreline's rate is 6.9%, 14th highest among the 39 cities in King County.[iii] 15% of people of color had incomes below the Poverty Level (and 29% of South Region residents are persons of color).[iv]

- A living wage income is enough income to pay for the basic necessities of daily living. This is defined as less than 200% of the Federal Poverty Level, or $34,100 for a family of four in 1999. Almost 20% of the King County population was living in a household without a living wage income in 1999. Seattle had the greatest percentage (25%), followed by South Region (21.7%).[v]

- In a survey of job vacancies, King County had the greatest share of job openings in the state. However, many of these jobs were in retail and support positions, jobs characterized by low wages and high turnover. The median hourly wage for these jobs ranged from $9.06 to $11.53 in 2001.[vi]

- King County has over 58,000 people who are unemployed.[vii] As of June 2003, Washington State had the third highest unemployment rate in the country. The average unemployment rate for the first six months of 2003 was 6.5% in King County. In a 2002 statewide survey of unemployment insurance claimants, 37% reported that unemployment benefits represented their entire household income.[viii]

- In 2000, 70% of King County residents were employed. In Shoreline, 66.1% were employed.[ix]

- In March 2002, there were 12,000 Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) households in King County, comprised of roughly 10,000 adults and 22,000 children. Two-thirds of these families are in South Region.[x]

Homelessness Services, Shelter/Transitional Housing, Special Needs Housing, and Housing Stabilization

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- The principal causes of homelessness include a dramatic decline of public investment in the creation of affordable housing, escalating housing costs in the face of stagnant or declining incomes, a rise in female-headed families living in poverty, and drastic reductions in public and private safety-net services that protect against homelessness. Emergency resources such as shelters and food help people survive, but do not help stop the flow of people into a state of homelessness. Foundations and experts cite funding of advocacy and public education campaigns, community planning, prevention programs, supportive services tied to housing, and affordable housing initiatives as the most effective ways to end homelessness.[xi]

- The strategies for preventing homelessness include: emergency assistance; crisis prevention for those at high-risk of becoming homeless because of rent increases, unemployment, or personal crises; discharge planning that prevents people leaving healthcare, correctional facilities, and foster care from becoming homeless; and capacity development that expands the supply of affordable housing. Affordable housing is the centerpiece of any plan to end homelessness.[xii]

- Many households simply do not earn a living wage in the current labor market. It is estimated that a person in King County must earn $17.75 per hour—about 2.5 times the minimum wage—to be able to afford to rent a modest two-bedroom apartment. There is a large disparity between income and housing cost.[xiii] Research on families assessed in shelters and then followed up five years later indicates that receipt of subsidized housing was the primary predictor of housing stability among formerly homeless families and concluded that housing subsidies are crucial to ending homelessness among families.[xiv]

- Permanent supportive housing with appropriate services such as health care, treatment for mental health or substance abuse, and employment supports has been shown to stabilize long-term homeless individuals and families. [xv] A study of New York City supportive housing found that providing "status quo" services to homeless individuals cost about $40,449 per person per year and that by providing supportive housing they reduced costs by 30%.[xvi]

- A recent study conducted for HUD identified five essential elements present in communities that had made the most progress toward reducing chronic street homelessness: a paradigm shift in the goals and approaches of the homeless assistance network; setting a clear goal of reducing chronic street homelessness; committing to a community-wide level of organization; having leadership and an effective organizational structure; and having significant resources from mainstream public agencies that go well beyond homeless-specific funding sources. (The old paradigm was that street homeless individuals should be cared for more by charitable, often religious, organizations rather than by mainstream public agencies. The old paradigm relied heavily on emergency shelters, transitional housing, and sobriety-based programs. The old paradigm did not plan, or expect, to end chronic street homelessness.)

  In addition to these five essential elements, other key elements included: a catalyst or trigger event; significant involvement of the private sector; commitment and support from mayors, city and county councils and other local elected officials; having a mechanism to track progress, provide feedback and support improvements; being willing to try new approaches to services; and having a strategy to handle and minimize negative reactions to locating projects in neighborhoods. This required significant investment of mainstream public agencies and local dollars. The goal cannot be met if the homeless assistance network providers are the only players and Federal funding streams the only resources.[xvii]

- Among the new strategies utilized to move individuals from chronic street homelessness are Housing First models that place people directly from the streets into permanent supportive housing units, breaking the linkage between housing and service use/acceptance, "harm reduction" conditions where sobriety is preferred but not required, restructured outreach activities, and focused discharge planning from jails and mental health facilities. If a community is intent on reducing chronic street homelessness, it is vital that it take steps to build the capacity to work with people who have co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders [xviii]

Prevalence or utilization data

- In the most recent One Night Count, it was estimated that 7,980 people are homeless in King County on any given night—a 23% increase from two years earlier. Of these, 1,265 were living unsheltered in King County outside of the Seattle Area. Approximately 905 individuals, or 449 households, were residing in shelters or transitional housing in East, North and South King County. Families with children made up 48% of the homeless outside of Seattle.[xix] 46% of those in shelters and transitional housing (located predominantly in Seattle) indicated that their last permanent address was outside of Seattle.[xx]

- In 2002, 38% of homeless people in shelters and transitional housing located outside of Seattle cited domestic violence (DV) as the major cause of their homelessness. Currently there are 72 transitional housing units for DV survivors, 25 of which are located outside of Seattle.[xxi]

- Crisis Clinic's Community Information Line reported 14,963 calls in 2003 from individuals identifying themselves as homeless. The bed bank keeps daily information on shelter availability. [xxii] They also received 2,127 calls for rental assistance in the first quarter of 2003.[xxiii]

- The 2002 transitional housing and emergency shelter survey reported 45% of all individuals served as having at least 1 disability; among single adults, that percent rose to 76%.[xxiv]

- Only 4% of emergency shelter beds in the county are located on the Eastside. The average turn away rate for emergency shelter is 9 families for every family served. There are no emergency shelters for single women who are not victims of DV, and limited shelter for special needs populations. Only 8% of transitional housing beds in the county are located on the Eastside. The average turn away rate is 6 families for every family served. There is presently a 1-2 year wait for subsidized housing on the Eastside.[xxv]

- People of color are significantly over-represented in the homeless population. They comprise about 20% of the general population in King County, but they comprise 61% of homeless people.[xxvi]

- The Veterans Administration estimates there are approximately 2,000 homeless veterans in King County, with the majority in the downtown Seattle area.[xxvii]

- For individuals with disabilities who rely solely on their SSI check for income, market rate housing is not an option.   The average rent for a 1-bedroom apartment was 107.4% of the maximum amount of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) that a person with a disability could receive.[xxviii]

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

In regard to permanent, affordable housing:

- An affordability gap exists when renters pay 30% or more of their incomes on rent or home owners pay 25% or more on their mortgage. Renters are more likely to have an affordability gap than home owners (40% in 1999).[xxix]

- From 1989-1999 the percent of renters with an affordability gap remained virtually the same, for home owners the gap increased (from 18% of owners to 27% of owners).[xxx]

- The availability of low-cost rental housing varies among King County cities and regions. Cities in South Region have the highest proportion of affordable housing, East Region the lowest proportion.[xxxi]

- 37% of North Region renters spend more than 30% of household income on rent. Growing numbers of refugees/immigrants live in sub-standard housing.[xxxii] Forty percent of renters and 27% of owners in South Region are paying more than 30% of their incomes for housing.[xxxiii]

- Statewide an hourly wage of $15.15 for a full time worker would be required to rent a two bedroom apartment. There is no jurisdiction in the state in which a person earning minimum wage ($7.01 at the time of the study, now $7.16) can afford the fair market rent for a 1-bedroom unit.[xxxiv] In King County, a person must earn $17.75 per hour to afford a modest two bedroom apartment.[xxxv]

- During the two-week period in the spring of 2002, when the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) opened its waiting list, 7,000 applications were received, with a wait time of five years for those at the end of the list. Countywide, KCHA provides Section 8 rental assistance to more than 7,500 families.[xxxvi]

- KCHA provides 14,000 units of affordable housing to low income people throughout King County, outside of Seattle and Renton; 10,404 of these units are in South Region. Eighty percent of Section 8 housing vouchers are used in South Region.[xxxvii]

- For fiscal year 2003, Congress did not appropriate any money in the Federal budget for new Section 8 vouchers, nor did it fully fund vouchers already authorized.[xxxviii]

- The Legislature allocated $80 million to the Housing Trust Fund in the 2003-05 Capital Budget, to be used for acquiring, building and rehabilitating housing for low-income individuals.[xxxix]

In regard to other services needed by the homeless population:

- In 2002, 15% of all Public Health visits were with homeless people and those at high risk of homelessness. This segment of the population demonstrates significant health disparities (infectious diseases, tuberculosis, diabetes, hypertension, injuries, poor nutrition, mental health/substance abuse disorders). Health Care for the Homeless outreach teams provide health and mental health/substance abuse screening countywide, serving about 8000 people a year in over 60 sites. The program reaches about 1/3 of the annualized homeless population. The REACH case management program serves about 100 chronic public inebriates.[xl]

- The Corporation for Supportive Housing, which works with partners across the country to develop supportive housing, reports that 80% or more of mentally ill residents remain housed 12 months after entering supportive housing. A 2002 study showed that homeless people in supportive housing significantly reduce their use of shelters, hospitals and jails, resulting in savings of $16,281 per housing unit per year.[xli]

- In 2003, the King County mental health system reported approximately 350 clients in boarding homes who will need to move into independent supportive housing over the next five years. In the same year 2325 adults in the system had at least one episode of homelessness.[xlii]

- In California, 63% of the youth who age out of the foster care system annually become homeless. The First Place Fund for Youth has demonstrated success in helping emancipated foster youth become self-sufficient as they moved out of the foster care system.[xliii]

- Family problems are the main reason youth leave their homes. In 2002, outside of Seattle, 38% of homeless people in shelters and transitional housing cited domestic violence as a major cause of their homelessness.[xliv] Sixty-two percent of homeless youth have experienced sexual abuse before leaving home.[xlv]

Local planning initiatives

- South County plans to increase contributions to emergency services from industries and businesses with the greatest potential to impact vulnerable populations (via the Community Reinvestment Act).[xlvi]

- The Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC) is currently working on a 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness. Founded by the Church Council of Greater Seattle, the City of Seattle, King County Government, Eastside Human Services Alliance, North Urban Human Services Alliance, South King County Council of Human Services, Seattle-King County Coalition for the Homeless, and United Way, the primary goal is a roof over every man, woman and child's head.

  Planning priorities include: prevention of homelessness; people who experience homelessness; and community awareness/public priority. Each of these priority areas has objectives and strategies. These can be viewed on their website, where a feedback mechanism is gathering public response to the elements of the plan.[xlvii] The CEHKC has been designated as the principal region-wide forum to oversee a homeless response.

- The King County Consortium, a regional housing partnership, includes set-aside funds for regional homeless planning. The Regional Affordable Housing Program is a consortium of all cities, that makes decisions on capital projects, emergency/transitional housing. The Housing Opportunity Fund works with community partners to direct funds to facilities for the homeless and special needs populations. All are administered by the King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS). A Consolidated Housing & Community Development Plan 2005-2010 is a federally required plan that will assess housing and community development needs and resources throughout the county, establish priorities, outcomes, objects and performance measures to guide investment of both federal and local dollars.[xlviii]

- The Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) is the inter-jurisdictional policy body for King County and the suburban cities on a wide range of housing and community development issues. The JRC was created through the interlocal cooperation agreements that formed the King County Community Development Block Grant Consortium and the King County HOME Investment Partnerships Consortium (HOME). The JRC allocates about $3 million in federal funds and about $1.8 million in state housing funds to low income housing developments throughout the county. The JRC also advises the county on the allocation of the county's housing dollars, priorities for McKinney homeless assistance funds ($10-$17 million annually between King County and Seattle), and reviews and recommends the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan.[xlix]

- The "Taking Health Care Home" initiative, funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJ) and the Corporation for Supportive Housing, is a two-year systems change grant administered by the City of Seattle. Focused on creating a pipeline for supportive housing in Seattle and Spokane, the project seeks to bring local and state funders together to find new approaches for stimulating and funding supportive housing for those with chronic homelessness.[l]

- The Safe Harbors Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) is being established to collect data on homeless people across programs in King County. It is a joint initiative of the City of Seattle, King County, and United Way. The desired benefits of the HMIS include improved coordination of care and services for clients, improved information about system needs for policy and funding decisions, automated reporting and improved data for service providers, improved partnerships among the components of the system, and better information for the general community regarding homelessness and housing issues.[li]

- Seattle was one of the sites for a 2002 HUD study of seven communities reputed to have made progress in reducing their chronic street homeless population. Seattle is cited for its programmatic accomplishments: the One Night Count, implementation of Housing First models, use of the Mental Health Information System to coordinate services, the Sobering Center, the Harborview Crisis Triage Unit, the REACH case management project and the High Users of Crisis Public Services interagency

team. However, in comparison to the other sites, our community was found to lack many of the elements associated with successful change. Specifically noted as missing were: a paradigm shift, clear goals set and a community-wide approach focusing on ending chronic street homelessness.[lii]

- Specific goals to end chronic homelessness were set in the 2003 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Application. The Application outlines goals, action steps, responsible parties and target dates, reflecting broad involvement of Seattle, King County, United Way, other cities and provider organizations. The goals reflect the best practices documented above, and include involvement of state agencies in the development of discharge planning policies. The plan provides an inventory of all current shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing capacity as well as a gap analysis.[liii] Future goals and plans will be integrated with the Committee to End Homelessness 10 Year Plan.

- A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) was created in 1992 through an interlocal agreement of several suburban governments in East King County. ARCH helps establish a teamwork approach to solving local housing issues. The Coalition's Executive Board consists of member executive level staff (City Manager or Elected Mayor), and supervises the Citizen Advisory Board and ARCH staff in the day-to-day administration of the work program and budget, and forwards housing trust fund recommendations to members for approval. The ARCH Housing Trust Fund is the primary means by which ARCH members assist in creating and preserving housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households. The Housing Trust Fund awards loans and grants to Eastside developments that include below-market rate housing. Between 1993 and 2002, ARCH member jurisdictions committed over $17 million to this fund, including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and General Funds. Also included in this amount is over $2 million in contributions of land, fee-waivers and other in-kind donations.[liv]

- Under the leadership of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Sound Families Initiative has created a true private-public partnership. The goal is to create a network of 1500 transitional housing units in the Puget Sound area. The program unites the vision and resources of the Foundation with the expertise of the seven public jurisdiction partners from the Puget Sound area. Sound Families also seeks to be a catalyst for partnership between housing and service providers. Supportive housing for homeless families can only succeed when social services are fully integrated into an affordable housing project. Sound Families uses its unique funding structure to provide both a capital grant and a service grant to cement these critical partnerships between nonprofit housing development groups and family service providers within each housing project.

  The Steering Committee is comprised of executive level staff from the seven public jurisdiction partners in the project: the City of Seattle, the City of Everett, the City of Tacoma, Pierce County, Snohomish County, King County and the State of Washington. Also serving on the Steering Committee are representatives of other key partners, including the public housing authorities and representatives of private and public lending institutions. Not for profit organizations are also represented. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the City of Seattle. The City of Seattle Office of Housing serves as the administrative partner of the program. This office supervises the day-to-day operations of the program; coordinates the application review process and provides staff support for the governing process.[lv]

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Insufficient supply of affordable or subsidized rental housing, including supportive housing that includes appropriate health, counseling and life skills support

- Insufficient supply of affordable permanent ownership opportunities

- Lack of emergency housing/shelter capacity outside of Seattle

- Lack of transitional housing for domestic violence survivors, especially outside of Seattle

- Lack of transitional housing for youth, single men, and women without children in all parts of the county

- Lack of supportive services in shelters and day centers to help people transition to more stable housing

- Lack of mental health, substance abuse and medical care capacity to meet the demand for services

- The demand for emergency assistance (rent, utilities) exceeds supply

- Lack of transportation to basic services

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 67% of shelter and transitional housing participants moved to more stable housing. 81% of households in the Housing Stability Program reported they were in permanent rental or ownership housing 6 months after service initiation.[lvi]

- Over 12 months, 76% of Shelter Plus Care participants had a reduction in instances of reinstitutionalization.[lvii]

- Interfaith Hospitality Network (IHN) reports that 82% of families in its shelter/case management program move into transitional housing, permanent housing or a treatment program.[lviii]

- 48% of families in the Pathways Home program moved into permanent, affordable housing.[lix]

- A 3 month follow up survey of eviction prevention recipients served at Hopelink showed that 92% of respondents were still at the same address.[lx]

- 74% of youth sheltered by Friends of Youth returned to safe, stable living conditions.[lxi]

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Number of people who are homeless

- Number of homeless people served by shelters or transitional housing

- Number of people provided with support services for the homeless

- Number of people provided with housing stabilization and prevention services

- Number of permanent supportive housing units

Outcome indicators

- Percent of people making an hourly wage that allows them to afford fair market housing

- Percent of rental housing /ownership stock that is affordable to low-income households with less than 30% of the median income

- Change in number of households per year that retain stable housing

- Percent of people being discharged from hospitals, correctional facilities, or foster care with a stable housing plan

- Percent of people moving out of homelessness into secure permanent housing

- Percent of people in permanent supportive housing who remain housed 12 months after entering supportive housing

- Change in the amount of time spent in shelter/the number of episodes that a person experiences homelessness

- Cost savings associated with providing permanent supportive housing to chronically homeless individuals

Food to Eat

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- Research into the factors relevant to the variation in state rates of hunger studied: the share of households that report they changed dwellings; share of renter-households that spend more than 50% of income on rent; peak monthly unemployment rates; state poverty rate; share of population under age 18; and, share of population non-Hispanic white. The first three factors were significant in their relationship to hunger rates in Oregon and Washington. Research conclusions state that mobile populations put upward pressure on the hunger rates in their states (with mobility serving as a proxy for a variety of disruptions—divorce, separation, eviction, and graduation). Lowering hunger rates will require a focus on serving vulnerable, mobile populations—for example, via a highly developed food bank network, a state of the art information and referral system, focus of Food Stamp efforts on newcomers, and more effective support programs for displaced renters.[lxii]

- Child nutrition programs, WIC, and the Food Stamp Program are intended to address hunger, as well as to invest in the health and development of children. Recent research has documented the impact of nutrition in early childhood on brain development and the achievement of intellectual potential.[lxiii]

- Food sources for distribution to food banks is changing, and the expansion of bulk buying food rescue programs requires storage capacity including refrigerated or freezer storage.[lxiv]

Prevalence or utilization data

- Washington's Federal Poverty rate is below the national average, but it ranks tenth nationally in level of food insecurity and second in level of hunger.[lxv] In share of renter-households that spend more than 50% of their income on rent, Washington ranked ninth nationally (17.8% of households).[lxvi]

- From 1995-1999, the five year average of King County adults age 18+ who are concerned about having enough food for themselves or their families was 4.7% . Within Seattle, it was 5.5%.[lxvii]

- An estimation of unmet food need in King County, using 2002 data, shows the combination of all programs was able to meet 89% of the needs of people who are at less than 150% of the Federal Poverty Level (257,818,845 meals), leaving a gap of 29,268,239 meals.[lxviii]

- 75% of those served by Food Lifeline's member agencies are working, retired, or disabled. Only 5.4% of people receiving emergency food supplies list welfare as their primary source of income. Higher percentages of people in Western Washington have to choose between food and either rent or heat than the national averages. 40% of those receiving food from food banks, meal programs, and shelters are children.[lxix]

- In 2001, 57% of Second Harvest food bank clients named "low wages" as their reason for needing assistance, a 32% increase over what was reported in 1998. Nearly half of client families had at least one working adult, and 18% of these were working two or more jobs.[lxx]

- Food prices in the Puget Sound area are higher than in other metropolitan areas nationally.[lxxi]

- Hopelink documented a 16% household increase in food bank use between September 2001 and September 2002.   Among the 28 faith-based organizations surveyed on the Eastside in 2003, slightly more than one-third reported offering direct food assistance to people in need. Most refer people to existing food banks and social service programs to address needs rather than provide the assistance themselves. Almost all support two or more human services agencies in the community through financial or in-kind contributions.[lxxii]

- 40% of eligible residents are not participating in food stamp and other federal and state funded programs.[lxxiii]

- The number of food stamp recipients with a Bellevue zip code has risen 40% in the last two years. Approximately one out of three of these food stamp beneficiaries is a child.[lxxiv]

- The number of seniors at Bellevue food banks increased by 10% between 1998 and 2000.[lxxv]

- North King County food bank use has increased 30% in the past two years, despite the fact that food bank services are available only two days a month. There is an increased demand for emergency food bags between food bank days.[lxxvi]

- King County has almost 400,000 children under the age of 18. Forty-three percent of them live in the South Region. Fifty-six percent of the school based free lunch applications and 55% of the food stamps for children were distributed in the South Region.[lxxvii]

- The South King County Food Bank Coalition indicates a 32% increase in the number of households served during 2002. Half of the food bank clients are children.[lxxviii]

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- Housing costs divert family resources, reducing the amount remaining for food. Oregon ranks as one of the worst states for food insecurity. The Oregon Hunger Summit, convened by the governor, identified more affordable housing as one of the major strategies to address hunger.[lxxix]

- There is a growing need for culturally sensitive nutrition programs in Senior Congregate Meals and Meals on Wheels programs.[lxxx]

Local planning initiatives

- The Washington State Nutrition & Physical Activity Plan has three priority objectives: 1) to increase access to health promoting foods, 2) to reduce hunger and food insecurity in Washington State, and 3) to increase the proportion of mothers who breastfeed their infants and toddlers.[lxxxi] This plan provides the basis for local Public Health initiatives, and also aligns with programming offered by the WSU King County Extension program.

- Planning is currently underway for creation of a King County Food Policy Council. Food Policy Councils include stakeholders in the food system that come together to work on issues relating to food security, school nutrition programs and connections with locally grown foods. Leadership for creating a Food Policy Council is being provided by the WSU King County Extension program.[lxxxii]

- South Region intends to improve and increase food storage coordination among South Region food banks. The Multi-Service Center, as lead agency in South Region, was funded to purchase a truck and hire a part time driver to pick up and deliver food to food banks in Auburn, Highline, White Center, Kent and Federal Way. They hope to create a food distribution center that can appropriately refrigerate and store food and distribute to food banks.[lxxxiii]

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Increase in number of refugee/immigrant clients at food banks, creating need for culturally appropriate food and bilingual staff

- Food storage/distribution center and transportation needed in South Region

- Change in the types of foods available, need for refrigerated facilities and transportation

- Limited sources for food donations

- Underutilization of food stamps/access to eligibility process

- Shoreline has no food bank facility; food is trucked in every two weeks. There are no congregant meal programs or summer breakfast/lunch programs.

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 600,000 pounds of food were stored and distributed in 2003.[lxxxiv]

- 18 food banks received food transportation assistance.[lxxxv]

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Pounds of food stored and distributed

- Number and distribution of food banks

- Percent of food banks receiving transportation assistance

Outcome indicators

- Percent of adults age 18+ who are concerned about having enough food for themselves or their families

[i] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[ii] *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005*. South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

[iii] Presentation to TFRHS, North King County.

[iv] Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.

[v] *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.

[vi] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[vii] Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.

[viii] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[ix] Presentation to TFRHS, North King County.

[x] *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005*. South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

[xi] *Ending Bay Area Homelessness: the Philanthropic Role*. The Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness.

[xii] *Ending Bay Area Homelessness: the Philanthropic Role*. The Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness.

[xiii] *Scope of the Problem. Committee to End Homelessness in King County*. www.cehkc.org.

[xiv] Shinn, M., et al. *Predictors of Homelessness Among Families in New York City: From Shelter Request to Housing Stability*. American Journal of Public Health. November 1998. Vol 88, No 11.

[xv] *Ending Bay Area Homelessness: the Philanthropic Role*. The Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness.

[xvi] *Taking Health Care Home Newsletter*, Vol. 1 Issue 1, March 2004.

[xvii] *Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness*. US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prepared by Walter R. McDonald & Associates and The Urban Institute. January 2004.

[xviii] *Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness*. US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prepared by Walter R. McDonald & Associates and The Urban Institute. January 2004.

[xix] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xx *Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prepared by Walter R. McDonald & Associates and The Urban Institute. January 2004.

xxi Presentation to TFRHS, South King County Human Services Forum.

xxii *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xxiii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xxiv *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xxv Presentation to TFRHS, Eastside Human Services Forum.

xxvi *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xxvii *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xxviii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xxix *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County.* Public Health—Seattle & King County.

xxx *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County.* Public Health—Seattle & King County.

xxxi *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005.* South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

xxxii Presentation to TFRHS, North King County.

xxxiii Presentation to TFRHS, South King County Human Services Forum.

xxxiv *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xxxv Presentation to TFRHS, South King County Human Services Forum.

xxxvi *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xxxvii *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005.* South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

xxxviii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xxxix *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

xl Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health—Seattle & King County.

xli *Ending Bay Area Homelessness: the Philanthropic Role.* The Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness.

xlii *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xliii *Ending Bay Area Homelessness: the Philanthropic Role.* The Bay Area Foundation Advisory Group to End Homelessness.

xliv *Scope of the Problem.* Committee to End Homelessness in King County. www.cehkc.org.

xlv Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.

xlvi *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005.* South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

xlvii *Overview of the Planning Framework. Committee to End Homelessness in King County.* www.cehkc.org.

xlviii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.

xlix JRC in a Nutshell.

l *Taking Health Care Home Newsletter*, Vol. 1 Issue 1, March 2004.

li *Safe Harbors.* www.safeharbors.org.

lii *Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prepared by Walter R. McDonald & Associates and The Urban Institute. January 2004.

liii *Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness.* US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Prepared by Walter R. McDonald & Associates and The Urban Institute. January 2004.

liv *A Regional Coalition for Housing.* www.archhousing.org

lv *Sound Families.* www.soundfamilies.org

lvi Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.

lvii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.

lviii Presentation to TFRHS. North King County.

lix Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health—Seattle & King County.

lx *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004.* City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department..

lxi Presentation to TFRHS, Eastside Human Services Forum.

lxii Tapogna J. and Suter, A. *Explaining Variations in State Hunger Rates.* ECONorthwest.

lxiii *Nurture Trumping Nature in New Studies.* Seattle Times, December 6, 2003.

lxiv Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.

lxv *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County.* Public Health—Seattle & King County.

lxvi Tapogna J. and Suter, A. *Explaining Variations in State Hunger Rates.* ECONorthwest.

lxvii *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County* Public Health—Seattle & King County.

lxviii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.

lxix Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.

lxx *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005.* South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

lxxi *Grocery Bills are Higher Here.* Seattle Post Intelligencer, September 26, 2003.

[lxxii] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[lxxiii] Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.

[lxxiv] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[lxxv] Presentation to TFRHS, Eastside Human Services Forum.

[lxxvi] Presentation to TFRH, North King County.

[lxxvii] Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.

[lxxviii] Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.

[lxxix] *Oregon Summit Targets Hunger*. Seattle Times, April 17, 2004.

[lxxx] *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

[lxxxi] http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/NutritionPA/wa_nutrition_pa_plan.htm

[lxxxii] Invitation to Planning Meeting, April 17, 2004.

[lxxxiii] *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005*. South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.

[lxxxiv] *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.

[lxxxv] *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.