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Homelessness is a growing issue throughout British Columbia and is becoming increasingly visible in urban, suburban, and rural communities. Factors contributing to homelessness are complex, including both structural and individual causes. Longstanding structural issues like the ongoing impacts of colonization, poverty, and a national under-investment in affordable housing, health, and social services are currently being compounded by a provincial economic boom and rising real estate costs. These structural factors intersect with individual experiences of childhood instability, violence & abuse, addiction, mental illness and discrimination to produce a shocking reality of growing poverty and marginalization.

Extensive academic research, predominantly out of the US, has explored vulnerabilities to homelessness. Consistently, experiences of childhood poverty, family disruption, and trauma are seen as the major pathways into homelessness with trigger events, such as violence, loss of employment, sickness or injury immediately precipitating an individual losing their home. Information on homelessness in rural communities (population under 15,000) is notably absent from this research. What research there is, predominantly out of the UK, illustrates that homelessness and extreme poverty exist in many small communities but has a markedly different ‘face,’ characterized most often by invisibility.

Homelessness, as we know, occurs on a continuum with the absolutely and chronically homeless—those without any shelter & entrenched in street life—on one end and the relatively homeless—those with unsafe, unsustainable, or overcrowded housing—at the other. Necessary services and supports to maintain stable housing differ from individual to individual. ‘High support’ services, such as 24/7-staffed supported housing and access to a variety of health professionals, are the only solution for some homeless individuals, the ideal solution for others, and unnecessary for others.

The need for a range of appropriate housing and services is pressing. Recent Ministry of Health research estimates that between 8,000–15,000 people with severe addiction or mental illness are homeless and in need of housing and support services throughout the province. Unfortunately, while the overall cost savings of providing housing for homeless individuals (an individual stabilized in supported housing uses less expensive emergency services such as ambulances, police, hospitals, courts, and jails) are increasingly recognized, the up-front costs of implementation are quite high. It is unlikely that there will ever be a large enough investment of public money to create a supply of housing and appropriate services that meets the demand.

Given the gap between supply and demand for housing and support services, community organizations have developed innovative strategies to sustain formerly homeless individuals in market housing. For example, non-clinical outreach-based housing support workers who help tenants access housing, conduct home visits to help with budgeting and basic life-skills, and provide mediation and liaison supports for landlords and property managers are—on an ad-hoc and organization-by-organization basis—providing crucial services that maintain formerly homeless individuals in housing.

As governments, community agencies, and community members continue working to address homelessness, the perspectives of homeless and formerly homeless individuals, as well as the landlords and property managers who house them, must help to guide and shape appropriate responses.
BACKGROUND

In June 2006, Canadian Mental Health Association’s (CMHA) BC Division received funding from the Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance (MEIA) for a one-year pilot project to deliver outreach services to homeless individuals in eight communities throughout BC. This investment was one of several new provincial housing and homelessness focused projects, including BC Housing’s Homeless Outreach Project in 17 communities throughout the province among others. In addition to service provision, research and evaluation to determine best practices in the delivery of outreach services in ‘less urban’ contexts was central to the outreach project. Initial evaluation findings reveal that approximately two thirds of all outreach clients are being housed in private market housing, and that a variety of relationship-building efforts are being piloted by outreach workers to try and secure landlords and property managers who are willing to rent low-income units to outreach clients.

In the spring of 2007, the outreach project coordinator conducted a series of interviews with both outreach clients and landlords/property managers to learn more about pathways into and out of homelessness in small BC communities, as well as to get outreach client perspectives on best practice in outreach service delivery. These interviews complemented an evaluation process that included external evaluation, an extensive client database, a community impact survey, quarterly interviews with outreach workers and a review of the central coordination role. The following report outlines key themes that emerged from the outreach client and landlord/property manager interviews.

---

8 See BC Housing website for more details. www.bchousing.org/programs
9 See CMHA BC Division website for more details. www.cmha.bc.ca/advocacy/homelessness
In December 2006, CMHA BC Division convened a research reference group with representatives from the Ministry of Health, BC Housing, Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance, SFU Faculty of Health Sciences, and CitySpaces Consulting to provide direction on researching pathways into and out of homelessness in small BC communities. Staff at the City of Vancouver’s Tenant Assistance Program were also engaged. With direction from this group, interview sites, draft interview guides, selection criteria for interviewees, and appropriate interview processes were developed.

Port Alberni, Merrit, Squamish and Williams Lake, as the smallest communities operating a CMHA outreach project, were selected as interview sites. Selection criteria for landlord/property manager interviews was broad and included any market housing provider who had housed CMHA outreach clients and was willing to be interviewed. Selection criteria for outreach clients was more precise, and focused on individuals who:

- had a history of homelessness
- were housed with the assistance of CMHA outreach workers
- were in their current housing for at least three months
- were stable enough (i.e., sober and no recent trauma) on the day of the interview to complete more than 50% of interview questions

Interview guides for both landlord/property managers and outreach clients were developed with input from the research reference group. Landlord interview questions focused on common problems that arise in relation to tenants, reasons for eviction, and supports and services that would prevent evictions; the interview guide is attached as Appendix A. Outreach client interview questions focused on events that caused individuals to lose their housing, the impacts of stable housing, and factors that help sustain housing. The interview guide is attached as Appendix B.

Acknowledging the sensitivities of interviewing marginalized individuals, several strategies were employed to reduce the invasiveness of outreach client interviews. First and foremost, CMHA outreach workers, with their pre-existing trust based relationships with clients, were identified as the most appropriate interviewers. Outreach workers received a one-day training on qualitative interview skills that included both workshop sessions and role-playing the interview process. Secondly, the outreach client interview guide was piloted, with the support of Judy Graves, City of Vancouver Tenant Assistance Program, with five City of Vancouver outreach clients in downtown Vancouver, using the fore-mentioned selection criteria. Based on learnings from these interviews, and the invaluable input from Judy Graves, the interview guide was refined with substantial language changes. Finally, CMHA outreach workers provided additional input to shape the final interview guide.

In May 2007, the outreach project coordinator conducted a total of nine interviews with landlords or property managers and twelve interviews with outreach clients in the fore-mentioned communities. Interviewees consented to publicly sharing information gleaned from the research and were assured anonymity.

Landlord and property manager interviews took place in property manager offices, homes, at coffee shops, and over lunch. The outreach project coordinator conducted the interviews, took notes, and transcribed the interviews which were later independently reviewed to identify emerging themes. Interviewees were given a small gift in appreciation for their time.

Four interviews were conducted with landlords and five with property managers. Buildings owned or managed by the interviewees ranged in size from a ten-unit apartment building consisting mostly of bachelor and one bedroom suites to a 75-unit building consisting mostly of three-bedroom units. Three of the buildings were hotels or rooming houses and six were low-income apartment buildings. Two hotel landlords reported that tenants were mostly homeless or displaced people; the remainder reported a mix of tenants in their buildings, including working families, seniors, people on Income Assistance and single parent families.

Outreach client interviews took place over coffee, in people’s homes, and in public parks. The outreach worker conducted the interview while the project coordinator took notes and transcribed the interviews which were later independently reviewed to identify emerging themes. Outreach clients received a $25 food voucher in appreciation for their time and willingness to share their stories.

Eleven of the twelve interviews were conducted in person, with one conducted via telephone. Eight of the interviewees were men and four were women, including one couple. Two interviewees identified that they were under 19, three were assumed to be under 29, and the remaining seven were assumed to be over 30. Five interviewees were assumed to be First Nations, the remaining seven were assumed to be Caucasian.
EMERGING THEMES

▶ Housing has positive individual health impacts

Increasingly, the positive impacts of housing—improved individual health and decreased overall system costs (by avoiding excessive use of costly emergency services)—are being recognized by policy-makers and illustrated by longitudinal research. Outreach clients identified that housing provides a stable platform on which to address some of the issues, particularly addiction related, in their lives. Marked decrease in personal substance use, cutting ties to drug-involved communities, and slowly getting reconnected to work, school, and support services were consistently highlighted as positive impacts of stable housing.

In response to the question, “Since you’ve been in your own place, what’s been better?” decreased substance use was identified as the most consistent benefit of housing:

“I quit using.”

“I don’t smoke as much weed as I used to.”

“I don’t drink as much.”

Exiting drug-involved communities and increased connections to support services—particularly addiction-related programs, work, or school, were the next most commonly identified benefits of housing:

“I haven’t talked much to any of my old friends—they’re into heavy drugs.”

“I don’t hang out with the ‘bad’ people anymore.”

“I’m working a program; I go to meetings three or four times a week.”

“We’ve totally turned around; we both started working.”

Outreach clients were clear that the impact of moving into their own place was positive and enabled them to decrease their substance use and search for more meaning in their lives.

Unlike commonly held perceptions that individuals with histories of homelessness cannot maintain housing, outreach clients identified that their last stable tenancy lasted for an average of three-and-a-half years.

In addition, individuals with histories of homelessness strive to be financially self-sufficient and functionally independent. Increased independence was consistently highlighted by outreach clients as a major benefit of stable housing:

“I’ve always liked being on my own; getting my own place, supporting myself. My place is small, but it’s nice.”

 “[I like] being able to go out and say I’m gonna pay a bill.”

▶ Formerly homeless individuals can maintain tenancy and want to be independent

Individuals with histories of homelessness may need supports to maintain housing, but it can be done; outreach clients identified that their last stable tenancy lasted for an average of three-and-a-half years.

In addition, individuals with histories of homelessness strive to be financially self-sufficient and functionally independent. Increased independence was consistently highlighted by outreach clients as a major benefit of stable housing:

“I haven’t talked much to any of my old friends—they’re into heavy drugs.”

“I don’t hang out with the ‘bad’ people anymore.”

“I’m working a program; I go to meetings three or four times a week.”

“We’ve totally turned around; we both started working.”

Outreach clients were clear that the impacts of moving into their own place were positive and enabled them to decrease their substance use and search for more meaning in their lives, either through employment, school, or greater connections to support services.

▶ Community-minded landlords need supports to house formerly homeless individuals

As mentioned, stable tenancy for individuals with histories of homelessness is an achievable goal. However, to achieve this goal, supports must be provided to both individuals with histories of homelessness and the landlords who house them. Landlord and property managers revealed a community-minded perspective of their roles as
housing providers and spoke compassionately about their tenants and their desire to avoid the eviction process:

“We provide homes to the ones who cannot afford houses.”

“It’s hard on me to evict them. That’s a human being, you can’t just kick him in the rear end and say, ‘You’re gone.’”

They spoke of tenants that were thousands of dollars in arrears but still living in the building, of being flexible with rent payments in order to keep families housed, and—in some cases—of going well out of their way to support elderly tenants or tenants with mental illness. As one property manager put it:

“[The landlord] is very understanding of the housing situation in [this community] and is trying to do his best.”

Like other community members motivated to support others by a sense of responsibility and compassion, landlords and property managers often felt unsupported and unacknowledged in their efforts.

“My job is a thankless one; no one ever appreciates me. I have to deal with people at 3 a.m. partying and fighting.”

Landlords and property managers consistently and clearly identified the supports they need that would help prevent evictions, namely:

1) Housing support workers

Landlords and property managers highlighted the need for an accessible staff person who could talk to tenants, provide basic life-skills support, and mediate conflicts that arise; this role is commonly known as a housing support worker.

“If we have a problem we could get someone else to go talk to the person—like a translator who I could explain my needs to.”

“Somebody accessible with authority, who could come in and talk to tenants—teach them to be good tenants; call someone who would come and have a talk about living in community with other people; somebody neutral.”

As part of this role, landlords and property managers envisioned basic life-skills supports for tenants would include budgeting, groceries, and home up-keep, and that the housing support worker could increase communication between the landlord/property manager and a tenant’s other support workers. The desire for increased communication, and the notion that landlords and property managers wanted to be ‘in the loop’ regarding a tenants’ health and well-being came up repeatedly during the interviews, but was tempered with considerations of confidentiality:

“Let us know briefly what the issues are and who to contact; check in with clients regarding confidentiality: ‘are you comfortable with me sharing this info.’ As long as we have a heads up, everything will be fine. Knowing is half the battle.”

2) Ensure landlords don’t suffer undue financial losses: emergency rent program and Income Assistance rent payment direct to landlords

While housing support workers were the most consistent suggestion, simple measures to ensure that landlords receive rent and don’t suffer undue financial losses from housing individuals with histories of homelessness were also frequently identified. Both emergency rent programs and ensuring that Income Assistance rent cheques come direct to landlords came up often:

“We need a program that would help tenants when they get into rent problems. For example, there’s a couple here—she works at a restaurant and he just lost his job. Now they’re supposed to be able to afford their apartment with her $9-an-hour wage.”

“[Income Assistance] clients can change rent direct deposit to landlord. This needs to be changed.”

Current Ministry of Employment and Income Assistance regulations allow for rent payment direct to landlord but this designation is subject to client choice and can be switched according to client requests.

Interestingly, supports and services suggested by landlords and property managers to help prevent evictions are all evidence-based and have been proven successful in other jurisdictions. Recent Canadian research on eviction prevention highlights similar programs to the ones suggested as best practice. Acacia Consulting & Research (2006) found that conflict resolution and mediation services between tenants and landlords, emergency financial assistance for people who owe rent money, and third party financial management of a tenants rent money (to ensure that rent gets paid) are initiatives that successfully prevent evictions.
Maintaining a stable income, staying occupied, and having connections to community help sustain housing

Outreach clients identified a variety of factors that help sustain housing and highlighted the importance of basic social determinants of health. Clients consistently said that employment—providing both stable income and a means to stay occupied—and connections to community or social supports were the most important factors that helped sustain housing.

“Family support and my job are helping me keep my place.”

Where individuals weren’t employed, they consistently identified that staying occupied—either through ‘binning’ (collecting empty bottles and cans) or simply walking around—was important in order to stave off the boredom and other negative mental health impacts that un-employment brings.

“I always seem to excel at things when my hands are busy. When I’m not busy, I tend to beat myself up when I’m not working.”

Similarly, fixed income supports were repeatedly identified as a factor enabling people to stay housed.

“[Social assistance] helps me keep my place for now; and right now it’s one day at a time.”

Social support, either through connections to support services or through connections to community, also featured prominently in people’s responses, and was highlighted as a key factor that helps sustain housing.

“There are three or four guys in the hotel that I know. If I need something I can borrow it from them; if they need something they can borrow it from me.”

“It was home. All the neighbours were like ‘Hey, can I borrow a cup of sugar?’ People would leave the doors open in the summer. It was a community.”

Active addictions and housing instability are closely tied

Landlords and property managers consistently identified that drug use and association with drug-involved communities were the most common reasons for both evictions and rejection of potential tenants. Landlords and property managers were all clear about the supports and services needed in order to sustain housing. They were also clear about the number one cause of housing instability—namely, active addictions.

Landlords and property managers consistently identified that drug use and association with drug-involved communities were the most common reasons for both evictions and rejection of potential tenants. Landlords spoke of excessive noise, non-payment of rent, guest traffic in and out of suites, and property damage as common causes of eviction but noted that drugs were most often the root of the issue:

“Drugs—out of drugs, everything comes out.”

Clients consistently said that employment—providing both stable income and a means to stay occupied—and connections to community or social supports were the most important factors enabling them to sustain housing.

What is also notable about the importance of community connection, is the degree to which experiences of isolation came up repeatedly throughout the interviews. Clients remarked over and over again that they either had no friends or family left, or that they were simply loners and never had enjoyed the company of others.

“I’ve got no family left.”

“No one comes to see me.”

“I hang out by myself.”

Finally, good quality housing—particularly housing that is within walking distance to shops and services and has access to a kitchen—was identified as a key factor that enabled housing stability. Housing that is centrally located is a particular issue in small BC communities, as poverty limits access to a vehicle and little or no public transportation is available.

“I’ve got no wheels and at this place I can walk to either side of town. I’m close to my meetings, the grocery store, the bank—everything I need.”

“I used to have to walk for two hours to get to anything. Here, I can walk to everything.”
Noting that it often isn’t the tenant but rather the tenants wider community that causes disruption and eventual eviction, interviewees highlighted the challenges that many formerly homeless individuals face in trying to maintain housing stability.

“These aren’t bad people it’s just that they get caught up in the wrong crowd—the drug culture; next thing you know, all these drug dealers are in the building.”

“Sometimes it’s not [the tenant], it’s whatever they attract.”

Similarly, as outreach clients relayed their personal stories, substance use-related conflicts with neighbours (mostly around noise and partying), increased personal substance use, or increased substance use by a roommate or friend, were all frequently identified as the trigger event that led to a loss of housing.

“We were basically feuding with our neighbours and it was starting to get out of hand…Words were exchanged and gestures were made.”

“I left ‘cause of drinking. I started hanging out with ‘the boys’…Hanging out and getting back into [alcohol]…Didn’t get rent paid.”

“I was living with a roommate who was using. I started getting into the drugs myself and it wasn’t working out so I left.”

**Reputation matters: Individuals with histories of homelessness in small BC communities have few housing options**

Individuals in small BC communities quickly run out of housing options as they develop negative reputations and ‘burn their bridges’ with local landlords and property managers. Landlord and property managers consistently identified that there were a number of ‘known’ individuals in town that they would never accept as tenants.

“[This community] is a town of about 15,000 people; of that there are about 50 problem people in town. It’s a small place—it doesn’t take a long time to get to know them.”

“There are about three or four families in town that I won’t touch.”

These ‘known’ individuals were generally perceived to be either drug dealers, violent, or embedded in drug culture. While it’s not surprising that property managers and landlords in small BC communities are unlikely to accept individuals who are perceived to cause problems as tenants, it does raise an interesting question from a community perspective, that is: where are these people supposed to live?
SUMMARY + CONCLUDING REMARKS

Individuals with histories of homelessness in small BC communities can maintain housing and stabilize their lives, but increased supports and services for both landlords/property managers and individuals—in addition to a healthy dose of personal commitment—are needed.

Landlords and property managers need supports provided by housing support workers and simple solutions that ensure no undue financial losses are incurred by housing individuals with histories of homelessness. The benefits of providing such services are, at minimum, threefold:

1) Successfully preventing evictions through hands-on support for tenants and landlords
2) Reducing the burden of responsibility on landlords and property managers to singularly maintain tenant stability
3) Increasing experiences of support, acknowledgement, and appreciation for landlords and property managers so that they continue renting units to individuals with histories of homelessness. As one interviewee responded,

   “With more supports available, I might be less ’zero tolerance.’”

Increasingly, as governments continue to work with community agencies to address BC’s housing crisis, the development of supportive housing units will need to be supplemented by housing support services for tenants and landlords/property managers of market housing units.

Landlords and property managers need supports provided by housing support workers and simple solutions that ensure no undue financial losses are incurred by housing individuals with histories of homelessness.

Individuals benefit greatly from stable housing and need stable income (fixed or otherwise), something to do, and connections to community in order to maintain their housing. Active addictions and unresolved root causes of addiction sabotage housing stability and may leave individuals homeless. Once people in small BC communities are active in addictions, or connected to drug-involved communities, personal reputations are quickly tarnished, leaving individuals with few, if any, remaining housing options.

Addressing issues of homelessness has clear benefits for the health and well-being of individuals, as well as for reducing system costs. As governments, community agencies, and community members continue working to address homelessness, the perspectives of homeless and formerly homeless individuals, as well as the landlords and property managers who house them, must help to guide and shape appropriate responses.
Appendix A: Pathways interview Questions – Landlords and Property Managers

1) How many buildings do you own or manage? How long have you been a landlord for?

2) Number of units?

3) Can you describe your tenants generally?

4) Can you describe the people you generally don’t accept as tenants? Does this change according to how the market/vacancy rates are doing?

5) What are the biggest issues you have with your tenants?

6) What are the most common reasons for eviction?

7) What’s different about tenants who stay in their units for a long time vs. those who get evicted or leave quickly?

8) What are the warning signs that ‘something is going wrong’ with one of your tenants and they might get evicted or leave quickly?

9) What, if anything, do you do when these warnings signs come up?

10) If we wanted to prevent the eviction of tenants, what kind of support services would be helpful to you in these situations?
    - Direct deposit or third party administration of cheques
    - Mediation/conflict resolution
    - Accessible support person

11) What kind of support services would be helpful for those tenants who either leave quickly or are evicted, so that they could stay in their housing?

12) Any other thoughts on what could be done to prevent evictions?
Appendix B: Pathways Interview Questions – Clients

Part I: Pathways Into and Out of Homelessness

1) How long have you been inside/been living in your own independent place?

2) Where were you before this? How long?

3) Before that, what was the last place where you were inside/living in your own independent place that you felt settled?

4) What caused you to lose that place? What were the events that happened in the short time before you lost that place?

5) Since you’ve been inside/in your own independent place, can you tell me what's changed?
   a) What's been better?
      - Mental Health
      - Physical Health
      - Income (on Income Assistance or increased benefits to Persons with Persistent Multiple Barriers (PPMB), Persons with Disabilities (PWD))
      - Employment
      - Family contact
      - People you hang out with
      - How you spend your time
      - Substance use
   b) What's been worse?
      - Mental Health
      - Physical Health
      - Income (on Income Assistance or increased benefits to Persons with Persistent Multiple Barriers (PPMB), Persons with Disabilities (PWD))
      - Employment
      - Family contact
      - People you hang out with
      - How you spend your time
      - Substance use

6) How did you react to moving inside/getting your own independent place?

7) What is helping you keep your place?
   - Quality of housing
   - Mental health, physician supports
   - Friends/community
   - Financial situation

8) What else would help you keep your place?

9) The last time you were in your own place and felt settled, what was helping you keep your place?

10) You’ve talked about the events that happened in the short time before you lost that place, are there any other things that caused you to lose your home?

11) What do you like about living inside/in your own independent place now?
Part II: Best Practice Outreach

1) What did you and [X] (your outreach worker) do together?
   - [ ] Income Assistance administration pieces (identification, getting and filling out forms)
   - [ ] Housing
   - [ ] Health services
   - [ ] Mental health services
   - [ ] Addiction services
   - [ ] Community connections
   - [ ] Other

2) Did [X] do anything that wasn’t helpful? If so, why wasn’t it helpful?

3) Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the work [X] is doing?

4) [X] is your outreach worker. What are the kinds of things that make a good outreach worker? What kinds of things made it easy to work with/get along with [X]? What did [X] do that was particularly helpful?