

Homes For All 2018 Policy Proposal

Name of Organization: NAMI Minnesota

1). Brief Description of your Proposal: NAMI is proposing that Homes For All request additional funding for the Bridges Rental Assistance Program and Supportive Housing for people living with a serious mental illness. People living with a mental illness disproportionately experience homelessness and housing instability, especially with co-occurring substance use disorder and other chronic health conditions.

In the previous session, Housing with supports saw a modest increase and the Bridges program funding remained the same. NAMI proposes that Homes for All renew the 2017 funding request for Bridges at 2 million dollars and request an additional 3 million dollars for housing with supports.

2). Is this a multi-year proposal, or targeted for only one year: This is targeted for FY 2019, with the hopes of adding this increase to the base in the next biennium.

3). What level of support are you requesting from Homes for All: We are asking to be on the Legislative Agenda.

4). If you are requesting that Homes for All put this item on our Legislative Agenda, will your organization move this proposal forward even without the leadership of Homes for All? Will your organization commit to working on the policy agenda of Homes for All even if your proposal does not make it on the agenda this year: Yes.

5). What kind of resources are you able to bring to support advancement of your proposal: NAMI has two dedicated lobbyists and a strong grassroots network.

Core Values Assessment

NAMI Minnesota

Proposal: Increase funding for Bridges and Supportive Housing.

- 1) Does the proposal support the continuum of housing and services? Both of NAMI's proposals provide targeted support to individuals and families impacted by mental illness, where there are some of the most substantial gaps in the housing continuum. Bridges responds to this problem by providing a housing subsidy until the individual with a serious mental illness can receive section 8. Supportive housing funding will strengthen the housing continuum at the tail end by ensuring that someone with a mental illness can acquire affordable housing that provides the services they need on-site. I've chosen to give a score of 7 because both of these programs only focus on one part of the housing continuum.
- 2) Does this proposal strengthen the connection between housing and services? Bridges funding is not used to directly connect the individual with a mental illness to services. Supportive housing, as the name implies, provides the support that many individuals need alongside their place of residence. Bridges gets a 2 and supportive housing gets a 5 for a total of 7 points.
- 3) Does this proposal reduce barriers/improve access to stable housing? For many people with a serious mental illness who are eligible for housing services, one of the biggest barriers is time. It can take months or even years for many individuals with a serious mental illness to receive the long-term housing supports necessary to stabilize their mental illness. Bridges steps in and provides these individuals with the housing subsidy they need to maintain a safe housing situation and to begin focusing on receiving mental health treatment or even employment. In addition to addressing the cost-barriers that many people with a mental illness face when attempting to secure stable housing, supportive housing provides them with the ongoing support that allows someone with a mental illness to successfully re-integrate into the community of their choice. Score of 8.
- 4) Does this proposal promote choice in Housing? This is a real strength of both Supportive Housing and Bridges. Both programs allow for the individual to choose where they live and, in the case of supportive housing, the level of care is customized to the individual. BRIDGES and supportive housing are also both very effective tools for someone transitioning to a more independent living situation. Score of 10.

Final Score: 32/40