

# ATTACHMENT F

**Nebraska**

**Section A: State Use of CSBG Funds**

1. State Reporting Period (month/day/year)

From: 10/01/10 To: 09/30/11

2. Total CSBG funds expended in FY 2011 for:

	Planned	Actual	ARRA Planned	ARRA Actual
a. Eligible Entities	\$4,244,315	\$4,244,315	\$0	\$0
b. State Administrative Costs *	\$235,796	\$161,464	\$0	\$0
* ARRA ONLY: Report Planned and Actual Funds spent on Benefits Enrollment Coordination Activities				
c. Discretionary Projects	\$235,795	\$298,576		
d. Total Funds	\$4,715,906	\$4,704,355	\$0	\$0

3. Of the total in 2d, how much represents carryover funding from the previous fiscal year?

\$242,513

4. Carry-forward of FY 2011 funds to FY 2012 programs

\$282,660

\$0

5. State CSBG funds (see instructions)

\$0

6. TOTAL CSBG funds expended by State in FY 2011

\$4,704,355

\$0

1. Eligible entities receiving FY 2011 funds:

(Please attach the provided Excel Spreadsheet for eligible entities, their addresses, and their award amounts.)

- a. Number of Community Action Agencies (CAAs) among eligible entities
- b. Number of Limited Purpose Agencies (LPAs) among eligible entities
- c. Number of organizations serving migrant or seasonal farmworkers
- d. Number of these also counted in a or b
- e. Number of tribal organizations
- f. Number of these also counted in a, b, or c
- g. Number of units of local government
- h. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, or e
- i. Others designated by statute
- j. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, e, or g
- k. Total unduplicated number of eligible entities

2. Were previously funded eligible entities dropped in FY 2011?

Yes  No

Number:

Reason:

3. State allocation method:

- Historic  Hold Harmless + Formula
- Formula with variables  Other (please specify)
- Base + Formula
- Formula Alone

4. Coverage of counties

a. Percent of State's counties receiving CSBG services at year end from local CSBG operators:

b. Number of counties newly receiving CSBG services in FY 2011 (if any)

Section B: State Use of CSBG Funds

c. Name of newly served county(ies) in FY 2011:

5. Uses of Discretionary Project Funds  
(if listed in Section A, Item 2.c)

a. What types of organizations received the awards?

1. Indian Tribes or tribal organizations	\$0
2. Migrant or farmworker organizations	\$42,000
3. State subgrantee associations	\$111,406
4. Eligible Entities	\$128,237
5. Other (please specify below):	\$16,933

Interchurch Ministries/CenterPointe Inc./Together, Inc.,

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

	Section A Discretionary
\$298,576	\$298,576

b. For what purposes were the awards given?

1. Awards to local agencies for expansion to new areas	\$0
2. Grants for exemplary or demonstration programs	\$42,000
3. Competitive grants for exemplary or demonstration programs	\$0
4. Training or technical assistance for local agencies	\$0
5. Statewide programs	\$111,406
6. General Support	\$16,933
7. Other (please specify below):	\$128,237

Paid out Discretionary funds to agencies to make up loss of FY2010 funds. Plus paid for ROMA training for 3 people.

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

	Section A Discretionary
\$298,576	\$298,576

*The totals of a. and b. should match both each other and Item 2.c in Section A.*

1. Please identify the cabinet or administrative department of your State CSBG office.

<input type="radio"/> Community Services Department	<input type="radio"/> Governor's Office
<input type="radio"/> Human Services Department	<input type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department
<input type="radio"/> Social Services Department	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Other (please specify)
Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services.	

2. What is the division, bureau, or office of the CSBG Administrator?

Child Welfare

3. Other programs directed by the CSBG Administrator in FY 2011

a. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct DOE Weatherization?  Yes  No

b. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct part or all of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) bill payment and/or crisis assistance programs?  Yes  No

1) If yes, does the CSBG Administrator also direct the LIHEAP energy conservation program?  Yes  No

c. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct USDA programs? If yes, please list titles below:  Yes  No

d. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct HUD programs? If yes, please list titles below:  Yes  No

Emergency Shelter Grant (Federal)  
HPRP (ARRA Funding)

e. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct any other federal programs for the homeless?  Yes  No

f. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct State Head Start programs?  Yes  No

g. How many federal or State programs not listed above are also directed by the CSBG Administrator? 6

(List titles of other programs below)

Childcare Subsidy Program, Childcare Grants, Refugee and Resettlement Program, Nebraska Homeless Assistance Program, Child Welfare Programs, Domestic Violence Programs.

4. Was the State CSBG office subject to a reorganization in FY 2011, such as an expansion or contraction of programs, or a transfer of the CSBG office to a different division or department?

Yes  No

If yes, please describe the change (attach an extra page if necessary):

5. State statute regarding CSBG:

a. Does your State have a statute authorizing Community Service programs? (If yes, please attach)

Yes  No

b. Did your State legislature enact authorizing legislation, or amendments to an existing authorizing statute during FY 2011?

Yes  No

*Please check those items which describe provisions of the current statute.*

1) What is the termination date of the current statute?

2) Does it "grandfather" CAAs?

Yes  No

3) Does it specify the terms, or formula, for allotting 90% pass-through funds among eligible entities?

Yes  No

4) Does it require local grantees to match CSBG funds?

Yes  No

5) Does it provide for the designation of new eligible entities?

Yes  No

6) Does it provide for the de-designation of eligible entities?

Yes  No

7) Does it specify a process the State CSBG agency must follow to re-designate an existing eligible entity?

Yes  No

8) Does it designate the bureau, division, or office in State government that is to be the State administering agency?

Yes  No

9) If it has other provisions, please list them:

6. a. Did it cost more in FY 2011 than the federally allowed limit in your State's CSBG allocation for your State to effectively administer the range of services and activities required by the CSBG Act?

Yes  No

b. If yes, what was the amount of these extra costs?

c. If yes, were State funds used to supplement federal administrative expenditures?

Yes  No

d. If yes, what was the amount of the supplemental State funds?

7. a. How many State positions were funded in whole or in part by CSBG funds?

b. How many Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds?

1

Please do NOT use acronyms.

See instructions for further details.

### 1. Strategic Thinking for Long-Term Solutions

- a. Please describe an agency strategy which addresses a long-term solution to a persistent problem affecting members of the low-income community.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Lancaster and Saunders Counties (formerly Lincoln Action Program)

- i. How did the agency identify the community need?

Community Action Partnership of Lancaster and Saunders Counties has operated our Coalition of Landlords and Tenants (COLT) program for number of years and have been one of only a few agencies statewide that operates such a program. During fall 2011, however, we identified that we answering some of the same questions for tenants again and again, and that our assistance to landlords often came at the expense of tenants who may or may not be at fault. The former contributed to an inefficient use of staff time, and the latter runs counter to our mission. So, we needed to "re-imagine" the program to overcome these two areas of weakness. Additionally, because so much time was spent in brief phone contact with households, we were unable to collect even limited information about these households.

- ii. How were CSBG funds used to plan, manage, and/or develop the approach?

"The COLT program depends solely on United Way/JBC funding for support, but these sources rarely cover the entire program. Therefore, CSBG funds are utilized to cover shortfalls in the program, as well as support the Director of Family Outreach, who oversees the program, and the Chief Operating Officer, who is ultimately responsible for the success or failure of this program and its service strategies. These two staff worked with a member of the agency's Resource Development team and the Supportive Housing Administrator to come up with new ways to serve individuals in danger of unjust eviction, and to utilize the agency's website more productively in order to minimize staff time answering similar questions again and again. Based on this planning, we determined that we would 1) Rename the program, "Tenant Support Services," and end services to landlords; and 2) Develop a new web page within Community Action's website in order to post FAQs, track the type of inquiries made, and collect limited information about in households seeking assistance (e.g. zip code, household size, etc.)."

- iii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

We sought input from the program's most valuable partner, Legal Aid of Nebraska, in order to determine what information we could post on our new web page while still avoiding the provision of legal guidance.

- iv. What outcome indicators did the agency use to measure success?

In past years we have averaged 700-800 inquiries responded to, but this outcome will shift in some ways based on the new web page. We expect this number will drop as the community transitions to utilizing more web contact as assistance. We also expect to determine, based on new data collected, the areas of the community most in need of improved rentals and tenant education, the most significant issue among tenants based on frequency of the type of inquiry made, and some limited information on inquiring households. Additionally, as more households are directed to reference web content first, we plan to devote more staff time to addressing directly (i.e. through phone and in-person contact) the more severe tenant situations we see.

- v. What outcomes have resulted in FY 2011? If no outcomes yet, when?

We just hired an attorney (a very valuable staff find) to lead this program part-time. He is charged with successfully implementing the strategies mentioned above, and we will have these outcomes by the end of FY12.

## 2. Delivering High-Quality, Accessible, and Well-Managed Services

- a. Please describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during FY 2011. Show how responsible, informed leadership led to effective and efficient management of the CSBG program.

### Top State Management Accomplishment:

The Nebraska CSBG office supported the reassessment of the Community Service Block Grant Peer Review process which Community Action Agencies participate in. Agencies and the State Association participated in a self assessment process which led to the adoption of a statewide scorecard. This system allows agencies to compare performance across five (5) management performance standards. The outcomes are shared among the agencies and are used to generate opportunities for agencies attaining high scores in a given area to offer support and assistance to agencies struggling in that area. As agencies become accustomed to the scorecard system, new standards will be added to expand the level of assessment and support. It is anticipated that the scorecard can be brought in line with proposed accreditation criteria for Community Action Agencies so that agencies will have consistent self monitoring to assure they are at least meeting the minimum standards for accreditation.

- b. Please describe what you consider to be the top three management accomplishments achieved by your agencies during FY 2011. Show how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services.

### Top Three Agency Management Accomplishments:

Agency Name:

Accomplishment:

1. National Peer-to-Peer Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) Trainers-To more effectively and efficiently utilize Results Oriented Management and Accountability within the agency and to assist agencies within the state of Nebraska with their understanding of ROMA, Nebraska currently has one Master trainer and three (3) staff members who have completed the Results Oriented Management and Accountability National Peer-to-Peer Train the Trainer program. This program supports National Indicator Goal 5: "Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results" by increasing the integration of ROMA into the agency's management and administration processes.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska

Accomplishment:

Based on the Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) cycle, Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska discovered that a zero tolerance policy in the Youth Department was having a negative impact. Rather than encouraging youth to change their behaviors, it reinforced failure and they were dropping out of the program. Management did research from other programs to find evidence-based best practices. Management also met with youth in the program - one meeting when only youth could speak; one meeting where only staff could speak; and finally a meeting to consolidate ideas - all based on Positive Youth Development concepts. The approach chosen was Harm Reduction. Both staff and youth received training and management is implementing.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Mid Nebraska

Accomplishment:

Community Action Partnership of Mid-Nebraska designed and implemented three (3) risk assessment tools for the agency. The first assessment is the Insurance Risk Assessment. This assessment describes the type of risk that the agency is exposed to and measures the severity of the risk, the likely hood of the risk occurring, what the amount of the insurance coverage is, and lists mitigation strategies to lessen the impact. The second assessment is the Funding Risk Assessment. This assessment lists the individual programs in the agency and risks the potential cutbacks in funding on a 1-5 scale and lists possible mitigation strategies. The third assessment is the Risk Assessment Checklist. This assessment is a checklist of 64 indicators that insure financial, legal, human resource and volunteer compliance for the agency.

### 3. Mobilizing Resources to Support Innovative Solutions

a. Please describe how your agency addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Showcase how your agency relied on mobilization and coordination of resources to help reach interim and final outcomes. Demonstrate how CSBG "works" as it funds staff activities, investments, or services to meet a community need.

i. Agency Name:

ii. Program Name:

iii. CSBG Service Category:

iv. Description of program (capacity, duration, targeted population, etc)

For some time the agency has needed an assessment that would A) Measure participant progress across all programs toward self-sufficiency; B) Provide valide pre- and post-service data for analysis; and C) Prove how effective the agency is in meeting its mission to empower people to reach their potential and achieve self-reliance. Therefore, our target population includes all participants of Community Action programs, as well as the staff utilizing this assessment.

v. How was the agency's approach innovative or creative? Please be specific.

"In response to this need, Community Action's Chief Operating Officer and Data Administrator partnered with the Center for Applied Management Practices, Inc. and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Center on Children, Families, and the Law to build this assessment based on tested best practices in the human services field. What resulted is the agency's new Self-Sufficiency Assessment ("Assessment"), the purpose of which is to measure each household's current life situation in key categories (e.g. Employment, Housing, Primary Health Care, etc.) on a scale of Thriving to In-Crisis (in order to align with the ROMA framework). Each rating level, such as "Thriving," is called a benchmark, and the agency's case managers must rank each household at a certain benchmark each time they complete the Assessment. The numbers that correspond to each benchmark (e.g. 10, 4, 0) is then used to quantify participant progress toward greater self-sufficiency. We will use the results of every completed Assessment to determine if and how much the people we serve are moving toward greater economic self-sufficiency and personal self-reliance. This data will help the agency to make strong cases for increased and new funding, to determine more effective ways to serve vulnerable and underserved populations. Instructions accompany each category in order to help case managers determine as objectively as possible where a household should be rated in each category at a particular time; we believe this will limit the need for more subjective determinations, which limit the validity of data collected. In many cases, where a participant/household is ranked in each category directly corresponds to information the family provides to the case manager on the Family Form, Community Action's universal intake form. This is an innovative strategy because few of our peer agencies statewide or nationwide have devoted this much care to deliberately seek out a research-based approach to proving the effectiveness of its programming. Once our first round of post-service data is collected, we will utilize the services of UNL's CCFL to evaluate our results and to report information regarding outcomes, strengths/weaknesses of the approach, and guidance for

improved implementation of the Assessment. "

vi. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

All case management staff have received training on how to implement the Assessment, and all data collected is being entered into Service Point. At this point we have collected pre-service data on the majority of households served, minus those served through our Emergency Services and Tenant Support Services Programs based on the brevity of client contact within each of these programs. We will collect post-service data by the end of August 2012.

vii. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

CSBG funds support 100% of the salary of the Data Administrator, the staffperson leading the effort to implement the Assessment. CSBG funding also supports the Chief Operating Officer, and we will likely utilize CSBG funding to support our analysis of data in Fall 2012 in partnership with UNL's CCFL.

viii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

See above - UNL's CCFL was the most instrumental partner in this effort.

Please do NOT use acronyms.

See instructions for further details.

#### 4. Providing Positive Results for Vulnerable Populations

- a. Please describe one youth-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Eastern Nebraska

i. Description of initiative

"The Eastern Nebraska Community Action Partnership (ENCAP) and the youth department partnered with ConAgra Foods to provide a college and corporate experience for 25 low-income high school seniors. The requirements included: a minimum GPA of 2.70 and youth who showed the attitude and aptitude to become the first class of the Corporate Experience Camp. Youth were selected from ENCAP's the existing First Employment Experience Team, Summer Jobs Program. The purpose was to create a pipeline for local low-income students to start relationship building with a local corporation which leads to mentorship, internship, and possible employment. The program also was designed to increase minority low-income students' participation in careers that emphasize Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) to addressing the current low numbers. Partnership included Creighton University, where the students resided for the two-week intensive camp. ConAgra Foods, Inc. provided a welcome ceremony for students and parents at Creighton University's Harper Building thus, gaining parental and family support. A dinner was served that evening with Keynote speaker, Ms. Patricia Rodriguez, with ConAgra Foods who works with the college interns at ConAgra. A Panel of College interns addressed the youth and answered questions. Youth selected a career path within ConAgra Foods and divided into groups for their team projects for the week. They were presented with their Laptop computers and had an overview of what to expect for the week. The youth were introduced to the CEC Virtual World; a technology program required their daily decisions and input to pay bills and also to create a virtual life style where they can meet people and interact with each other. Youth were treated to a shopping excursion at Kohl's to purchase business attire for social networking and classes at ConAgra. Youth were familiarized and gained practical experience working on the Zodiac Simulation, which is a board game simulating a billion dollar company that they had to run by making everyday decisions and then to re-evaluate how well they did or didn't do with their company. Youth also toured of one of ConAgra Foods plants in Council Bluffs IA. They also went to the University of Nebraska for a college tour and to discuss what types of classes they should be taking during their senior year and the steps needed to enter into college. The youth were exposed to a leadership series with Vice President's and upper management staff of ConAgra Foods. The program required team final projects that were presented to ConAgra's staff, parents, and entire the ENCAP FEET staff. A celebration dinner ended the CEC program with certificates awarded, gift cards distributed based on their performance and presentation, and a dance to end the evening. "

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Local Partners include ConAgra Foods, Inc for funding and the ConAgra staff and ConAgra's Black Employee Network providing instruction and mentorship; Building Bright Futures and Avenue Scholars for financial support and student recruiting; Creighton University for facility and dorm use.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

1. Number of Youth Selected 23 and 19 successfully completed the camp. 2. Innovative Partnership Developed to Offer Opportunities for Low-income Youth: ConAgra stated that they would like to do the CEC again this year and that they would love to dialogue more on how their mentors could work with the current youth staff to act as a liaison between OPS and ConAgra Foods with the youth. 3. Develop Opportunities for Financial Opportunities for Low-income Students: Interested youth from the previous CEC would be eligible for a paid internship next year as a camp counselor for the summer. 5. Financial Support and Sustainability: ENCAP's received \$88,000 from ConAgra Foods to operate he program.

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

Community Service Block Grant Funds were used for salary support for Youth Services Manager, Human Resources Officer, Development Director, Finance Director and marketing for the program.

b. Please describe one senior-focused initiative that illustrates how CSBG funding was used and coordinated with other programs and resources.

Agency Name: Community Action Partnership of Mid Nebraska

i. Description of initiative

Community Action Partnership of Mid-Nebraska administers two senior centers in Minden and North Platte, Nebraska. The mission of our senior centers is to provide freedom, dignity and independence for senior citizens and offer nutrition, education, health, and social activity opportunities. A congregate meal is served Monday-Friday from 12-1:00 p.m. at both centers. North Platte also offers a Home Delivered Meal Program which serves the homebound or handicapped, age 60 or over, and those who give permission for a doctor's order to be obtained by the Senior Center staff. There is not a set fee to eat at the senior centers, only a suggested donation. Client donations are confidential and no one is ever turned away for inability to pay.

ii. What local partners were involved, and how did each contribute to the program?

Partners for the senior centers include South Central and West Central Area on Aging, United States Department of Agriculture, Department of Health and Human Services, the City of North Platte, United Way of the Kearney Area, Mid-Plains United Way, Kearney County Board of Supervisors, Minden Senior Center Trust, North Platte Policy Advisory Committee, and the North Platte Bingo Trust. These partners contribute financially to help support program operations of the centers as well as provide oversight and expertise on program operations. Other partners include: local health care organizations, banks, and churches that help bring in educational opportunities, health screenings, and support the centers through fundraising events.

iii. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

"• 31,000 congregate meals and 34,000 home-delivered meals served• 956 unduplicated individuals received services in Grant, Hooker, Keith, Kearney, and Lincoln counties• 256 unduplicated volunteers that provided 22,031 service hours to help with senior center activities• 103 of 107 seniors (96%) surveyed for the North Platte Home Delivered Meal Program agreed the program improved their nutrition• 66 of 71 (93%) surveyed for the North Platte Congregate Meal Program said participating helped them feel physically healthy and socially active• 39 of 42 (93%) surveyed for the Minden Senior Center Congregate Program agreed the program provided them with a more varied diet and increased their consumption of fruits and vegetables• 42 of 42 (100%) surveyed for the Minden Senior Center Congregate Program agreed eating at the center helped them or someone they know remain in their home"

iv. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

Community Service Block Grant funding is an essential resource for the senior centers. Grant funding, client donations, and fundraisers do not cover the rising operational costs of running the senior centers. CSBG funds are used to cover personnel costs for both centers when there are shortfalls in the budget. If CSBG funds were not available, we would have to look at reduced staff positions and program operations for both centers.

Please do NOT use acronyms.  
See instructions for further details.

5. Impact of ARRA CSBG Funds

a. Please describe how one agency program, funded at least in part by ARRA CSBG funds, created or saved jobs in your community.

Agency Name:

i. Number of jobs created and/or saved:

ii. How were ARRA CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

iii. If applicable, how were regularly appropriated CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

iv. What percent of participants had incomes in the following ranges when they enrolled in the program?

1. 0% to 125% of Federal Poverty Line (FPL)  2. 126% to 200% of FPL

v. Describe the community improvement created or supported using ARRA CSBG funds.

1. The role of partners or collaborations

2. Type of resource contributed by each partner (monetary, in-kind, services, etc)

vi. Had the need addressed by this initiative been identified in previous community assessments or was it an emergent problem?

b. Please describe one major agency initiative supported at least in part by ARRA CSBG funds (other than the initiative listed in "5.a", above).

Agency Name:

i. Was this a new initiative or the expansion of a previously offered program/service?

ii. Which factor(s) allowed for the creation or expansion of these services? (Check all that apply)

- Increased Funding
- Expanded income eligibility
- Operational changes
- Other (please explain)

Please explain other:

iii. Regarding regularly appropriated CSBG funds:

1. How much CSBG was used to support this initiative?

\$10,883

2. How were CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

Staff time allocation - E.D, Dev. Dir., Finance Dir., Exec. Admin Assist., ODS Coordinator, and various support staff.

iv. Regarding ARRA CSBG funds:

1. How much ARRA CSBG was used to support this initiative?

\$43,699

2. How were ARRA CSBG funds used? Please be specific.

Funds were used to execute of our 45th Anniversary community event and various "Lunch and Learn" events to broaden ENCAP's scope within the community.

v. Did this initiative primarily impact (Check all that apply)

1. Infants and children (0-11 years)

4. Seniors (55+ years)

2. Youth (12-18 years)

5. Entire Community

3. Adults (18-54 years)

Please explain if this affected the entire community:

vi. What percent of participants had incomes in the following ranges when they enrolled in the program?

1. 0% to 125% of Federal Poverty Line (FPL)

2. 126% to 200% of FPL

vii. Describe the community improvement created or supported using ARRA CSBG funds.

1. The role of partners or collaborations

2. Type of resource contributed by each partner (monetary, in-kind, services, etc.)

viii. Had the need addressed by this initiative been identified in previous community assessments or was it an emergent problem?

The need had been addressed by previous initiatives.

ix. Outcomes achieved (include the number of people enrolled and areas affected)

Community leaders were invited to various ENCAP's events to increase their awareness regarding the programs and services.

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Table 1: Total amount of CSBG funds expended in FY 2011 by Service Category

Service Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
A. Employment	\$283,736	\$2,503
B. Education	\$363,114	\$7,510
C. Income Management	\$369,473	\$5,007
D. Housing	\$182,140	\$3,129
E. Emergency Services	\$614,447	\$6,259
F. Nutrition	\$439,514	\$8,136
G. Linkages	\$655,789	\$6,259
H. Self Sufficiency	\$1,034,178	\$8,762
I. Health	\$249,934	\$7,510
J. Other	\$156,916	\$7,510
<b>K. Totals</b>	<b>\$4,349,240</b>	<b>\$62,587</b>

L. Of the CSBG funds reported above	\$763,022	\$0	were for administration.
	17.54%	0.00%	

Please consult the instructions regarding what constitutes "administration."

Table 2: Of the funding listed in Table 1: Funds for Services by Demographic Category, FY 2011

Demographic Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
M. Youth (Aged 12-18)	\$360,924	\$1,527
N. Seniors (Aged 55+)	\$238,481	\$0

# Nebraska

## Section F: Other Resources Administered and Generated

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

### Subsection I. Federal Resources

2. Amount of FY 2011 CSBG allocated to reporting agency:

3. Federal Resources (other than CSBG)

- a. Weatherization (DOE) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- b. LIHEAP- Fuel Assistance (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- c. LIHEAP- Weatherization (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)
- d. Head Start (HHS)
- e. Early Head Start (HHS)
- f. Older Americans Act (HHS)
- g. SSBG (HHS)
- h. Medicare/Medicaid (HHS)
- i. Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- j. Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)
- k. Other HHS resources (list largest to smallest):

**TOTAL HHS Other:**

- l. WIC (USDA)
- m. All USDA Non-Food Programs (e.g. rural development)
- n. All Other USDA Food Programs
- o. CDBG - Federal, State, and Local
- p. Housing Programs (HUD):
  - i. Section 8
  - ii. Section 202
  - iii. Home Tenant Based Assistance
  - iv. HOPE for Homeowners Program (H4H)
  - v. Emergency Shelter Grant Program (ESGP)
  - vi. Continuum of Care (CofC)
- q. All other HUD including homeless programs
- r. Employment and training programs (US DOL)
- s. Other US DOL programs
- t. Corp. for National and Community Services (CNCS)
- u. FEMA
- v. Transportation (US DOT)
- w. Department of Education
- x. Department of Justice
- y. Department of Treasury
- z. Other Federal Sources (list largest to smallest):

**TOTAL Federal Other:**

### ARRA ONLY

2.	\$4,399,437	\$0
a.	\$1,064,486	\$10,691,248
b.	\$0	\$0
c.	\$2,380,576	\$0
d.	\$18,357,890	\$242,879
e.	\$4,871,004	\$2,679,027
f.	\$160,866	\$0
g.	\$162,471	\$0
h.	\$690,254	\$0
i.	\$0	\$0
j.	\$46,353	\$0
i.	\$2,519,445	\$461,354
ii.	\$439,909	\$3,825
iii.	\$342,437	\$2,468
iv.	\$1,022,308	\$0
k.	\$4,324,099	\$467,647
l.	\$6,794,485	\$0
m.	\$83,345	\$0
n.	\$4,979,577	\$0
o.	\$0	\$0
i.	\$229,106	\$282,076
ii.	\$0	\$0
iii.	\$33,706	\$0
iv.	\$0	\$0
v.	\$261,322	\$0
vi.	\$627,946	\$0
q.	\$1,120,648	\$593,779
r.	\$10,239	\$0
s.	\$0	\$0
t.	\$938,698	\$0
u.	\$45,980	\$0
v.	\$599,477	\$55,064
w.	\$0	\$0
x.	\$9,706	\$0
y.	\$63,077	\$0
i.	\$699,300	\$0
ii.	\$0	\$0
iii.	\$87,372	\$0
iv.	\$0	\$0
z.	\$786,672	\$0

**TOTAL: NON-CSBG FEDERAL RESOURCES**

**\$48,641,984**

**\$15,011,720**

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Subsection II. State Resources

a. State appropriated funds used for the same purpose as Federal CSBG funds	a.	\$0
b. State Housing and Homeless programs (include housing tax credits)	b.	\$1,534,383
c. State Nutrition programs	c.	\$45,981
d. State Day Care and Early Childhood programs	d.	\$129,900
e. State Energy programs	e.	\$2,013
f. State Health programs	f.	\$1,716,964
g. State Youth Development programs	g.	\$0
h. State Employment and Training programs	h.	\$2,400
i. State Head Start programs	i.	\$0
j. State Senior programs	j.	\$47,667
k. State Transportation programs	k.	\$332,876
l. State Education programs	l.	\$657,680
m. State Community, Rural and Economic Development programs	m.	\$0
n. State Family Development programs	n.	\$0
o. Other State Resources		
	i.	\$458,466
	ii.	\$0
	iii.	\$2,943
	iv.	\$0
<b>Total Other State Resources</b>	<b>o.</b>	<b>\$461,409</b>

<b>TOTAL: STATE RESOURCES</b>	<b>\$4,931,274</b>
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I (Federal Resources), please estimate the amount	\$0

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

**Subsection III. Local Resources**

a. Amount of unrestricted funds appropriated by local government	\$356,631
b. Amount of restricted funds appropriated by local government	\$417,615
c. Value of Contract Services	\$387,830
d. Value of in-kind goods/services received from local government	\$50,005

<b>TOTAL: LOCAL PUBLIC RESOURCES</b>	<b>\$1,212,081</b>
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I or II, please estimate the amount	\$0

**Subsection IV. Private Sector Resources**

a. Funds from foundations, corps., United Way, other nonprofits	\$1,547,521
b. Other donated funds	\$1,373,829
c. Value of other donated items, food, clothing, furniture, etc.	\$5,160,426
d. Value of in-kind services received from businesses	\$2,160,905
e. Payments by clients for services	\$2,700,817
f. Payments by private entities for goods or services for low-income clients or communities	\$1,279,394

<b>TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES</b>	<b>\$14,222,892</b>
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I, II, or III, please estimate the amount	\$0

<b>TOTAL:</b>	ALL OTHER RESOURCES (FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, PRIVATE) less amount of double count in Subsection II, III, IV	\$69,008,231	<b>ARRA ONLY</b>
			\$15,011,720

# Nebraska

## Section G: Program Participant Characteristics

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

2a. Total Non CSBG resources Reported in Section F TOTAL

2b. Total amount of CSBG Funds allocated

Total Resources for FY 2011 (2a + 2b)

\$69,008,231
\$4,399,437
\$73,407,668

ARRA ONLY	
\$15,011,720	
\$0	
\$15,011,720	

- 3. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom one or more characteristics were obtained
- 4. Total unduplicated number of persons about whom no characteristics were obtained
- 5. Total unduplicated number of families about whom one or more characteristics were obtained
- 6. Total unduplicated number of families about whom no characteristics were obtained

3.	102,663
4.	11,842
5.	41,307
6.	3,428

7. Gender

NUMBER OF PERSONS\*

- a. Male
- b. Female
- TOTAL\*

43,704
55,726
99,430

8. Age

NUMBER OF PERSONS\*

- a. 0-5
- b. 6-11
- c. 12-17
- d. 18-23
- e. 24-44
- f. 45-54
- g. 55-69
- h. 70+
- TOTAL\*

22,518
10,772
8,916
8,524
24,695
7,505
9,287
6,837
99,054

9. Ethnicity/Race

NUMBER OF PERSONS\*

I. Ethnicity

- a. Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
- b. Not Hispanic, Latino or Spanish Origin
- I. TOTAL\*

21,451
78,010
99,461

II. Race

- a. White
- b. Black or African American
- c. American Indian and Alaska Native
- d. Asian
- e. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
- f. Other
- g. Multi-race (any 2 or more of the above)
- II. TOTAL\*

78,117
4,329
2,929
482
213
4,432
9,475
99,977

10. Education Levels of Adults #

(# For Adults 24 Years Or Older Only)

NUMBER OF PERSONS\*

- a. 0-8
- b. 9-12/Non-Graduates
- c. High School Graduate/GED
- d. 12+ Some Post Secondary
- e. 2 or 4 yr College Graduates
- TOTAL\*\*

2,489
6,869
17,240
5,781
4,660
37,039

11. Other Characteristics

NUMBER OF PERSONS\*

	Yes	No	Total
a. Health Insurance	64,087	28,547	92,634
b. Disabled	18,465	62,855	81,320

12. Family Type

NUMBER OF FAMILIES\*\*\*

- a. Single Parent/Female
- b. Single Parent/Male
- c. Two Parent Household

8,040
822
10,872

- d. Single Person
- e. Two Adults/No children
- f. Other

10,806
3,145
2,863

TOTAL\*\*\*

36,548
--------

13. Family Size

NUMBER OF FAMILIES\*\*\*

- a. One
- b. Two
- c. Three
- d. Four
- e. Five
- f. Six
- g. Seven
- h. Eight or more
- TOTAL\*\*\*

14,233
7,074
5,173
4,837
3,323
1,806
759
652
37,857

14. Source of Family Income

NUMBER OF FAMILIES

- a. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting One or More Sources of Income\*\*\*
- b. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting Zero Income\*\*\*
- TOTAL (a. and b.)\*\*\*
- c. TANF
- d. SSI
- e. Social Security
- f. Pension
- g. General Assistance
- h. Unemployment Insurance
- i. Employment + Other Sources
- j. Employment Only
- k. Other
- TOTAL (c. through k.)

29,729
6,345
36,074
1,878
4,813
7,334
1,016
463
1,873
8,370
10,676
4,353
40,776

15. Level of Family Income (% of HHS Guideline)

NUMBER OF FAMILIES\*\*\*

- a. Up to 50%
- b. 51% to 75%
- c. 76% to 100%
- d. 101% to 125%
- e. 126% to 150%
- f. 151% to 175%
- g. 176% to 200%
- h. 201% and over
- TOTAL\*\*\*

8,173
5,276
7,753
6,298
4,052
1,698
750
70
34,070

16. Housing

NUMBER OF FAMILIES\*\*\*

- a. Own
- b. Rent
- c. Homeless
- d. Other
- TOTAL\*\*\*

11,342
18,216
2,698
2,814
35,070

**Nebraska**

**Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2011 - NPI 1.1**

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

**Employment**

The number and percentage of low-income participants in Community Action employment initiatives who get a job or become self-employed, as measured by one or more of the following:

		<b>Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)</b>	<b>Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)</b>	<b>Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)</b>	<b>Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)</b>
<b>A. Unemployed and obtained a job</b>	9	2,278	1,054	1,113	105.60%
<b>B. Employed and maintained a job for at least 90 days</b>	9	1,256	679	659	97.05%
<b>C. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income and/or benefits</b>	9	775	412	344	83.50%
<b>D. Achieve "living wage" employment and/or benefits</b>	9	570	207	199	96.14%

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

**Employment Supports**

The number of low-income participants for whom barriers to initial or continuous employment are reduced or eliminated through assistance from Community Action, as measured by one or more of the following:

	<b>Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)</b>	<b>Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)</b>
<b>A. Obtained skills/competencies required for employment</b>	8   1,663	770
<b>B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diploma</b>	9   321	59
<b>C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma</b>	9   262	128
<b>D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs</b>	5   146	52
<b>E. Obtained care for child or other dependant</b>	7   458	332
<b>F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license</b>	9   614	471
<b>G. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family member</b>	8   3,110	2,985
<b>H. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing</b>	8   1,462	1,334
<b>I. Obtained food assistance</b>	8   10,488	10,381
<b>J. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance</b>	3   53	42
<b>K. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance</b>	6   1,278	1,056
<b>L. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)</b>	3   295	291

**Nebraska**

**Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2011 - NPI 1.3**

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

**Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization**

The number and percentage of low-income households that achieve an increase in financial assets and/or financial skills as a result of Community Action assistance, and the aggregated amount of those assets and resources for all participants achieving the outcome, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)	
Enhancement 1. Number and percent of participants in tax preparation programs who qualified for any type of Federal or State tax credit and the expected aggregated dollar amount of credits	9	7,537	6,635	7,309	110.16%	\$404,164
Enhancement 2. Number and percent of participants who obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments	6	82	80	76	95.00%	\$88,473
Enhancement 3. Number and percent of participants who were enrolled in telephone lifeline and/or energy discounts with the assistance of the agency and the expected aggregated dollar amount of savings	3	24	28	23	82.14%	

# Nebraska

## Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2011 - NPI 1.3

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 1: Low-income people become more self sufficient.

### Economic Asset Enhancement and Utilization

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)	Aggregated Dollar Amounts (Payments, Credits, or Savings) (\$)
Utilization 1. Number and percent of participants demonstrating ability to complete and maintain a budget for over 90 days	9	975	606	90.10%	
Utilization 2. Number and percent of participants opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account	5	56	49	65.31%	
Utilization 3. Number and percent of participants who increased their savings through IDA or other savings accounts and the aggregated amount of savings	5	285	272	90.07%	\$35,963
Utilization 4. Of participants in a Community Action assets development program (IDA and others):					
Utilization 4a. Number and percent of participants capitalizing a small business with accumulated savings	1	1	1	100.00%	
Utilization 4b. Number and percent of participants pursuing post secondary education with accumulated savings	1	2	3	66.67%	
Utilization 4c. Number and percent of participants purchasing a home with accumulated savings	0				
Utilization 4d. Number and percent of participants purchasing other assets with accumulated savings	0				

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

**Community Improvement and Revitalization**

Increase in, or safeguarding of, threatened opportunities and community resources or services for low-income people in the community as a result of Community Action projects/initiatives or advocacy with other public and private agencies, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Projects or Initiatives (#)		Number of Opportunities and/or Community Resources Preserved or Increased (#)
A. Jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	6	24	312
B. Accessible "living wage" jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	3	14	266
C. Safe and affordable housing units created in the community	0		
D. Safe and affordable housing units in the community preserved or improved through construction, weatherization or rehabilitation achieved by Community Action activity or advocacy	9	15	1,645
E. Accessible safe and affordable health care services/facilities for low-income people created, or saved from reduction or elimination	4	11	32,040
F. Accessible safe and affordable child care or child development placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	5	30	1,821
G. Accessible before-school and after-school program placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	2	5	448
H. Accessible new or expanded transportation resources, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available to low-income people, including public or private transportation	4	17	558
I. Accessible or increased educational and training placement opportunities, or those that are saved from reduction or elimination, that are available for low-income people in the community, including vocational, literacy, and life skill training, ABE/GED, and post secondary education	5	18	3,161

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

Community Quality of Life and Assets	Number of Program Initiatives or Advocacy Efforts (#)	Number of Community Assets, Services, or Facilities Preserved or Increased (#)
The quality of life and assets in low-income neighborhoods are improved by Community Action initiative or advocacy, as measured by one or more of the following:		
A. Increases in community assets as a result of a change in law, regulation or policy, which results in improvements in quality of life and assets	7   10	41
B. Increase in the availability or preservation of community facilities	6   10	1,418
C. Increase in the availability or preservation of community services to improve public health and safety	3   15	199
D. Increase in the availability or preservation of commercial services within low-income neighborhoods	2   5	40
E. Increase in or preservation of neighborhood quality-of-life resources	3   6	706

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

**Community Engagement**

The number of community members working with Community Action to improve conditions in the community.

**Total  
Contribution by  
Community (#)**

**A. Number of community members mobilized by Community Action that participate in community revitalization and anti-poverty initiatives**

9	14,034
---	--------

**B. Number of volunteer hours donated to the agency  
(This will be ALL volunteer hours)**

9	606,886
---	---------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 8

Goal 2: The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

**Employment Growth from ARRA Funds**

The total number of jobs created or saved, at least in part by ARRA funds, in the community.

**Number of Jobs (#)**

A. Jobs created at least in part by ARRA funds

6	59
---	----

B. Jobs saved at least in part by ARRA funds

7	88
---	----

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

**Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation**

**Total Number  
of Volunteer  
Hours (#)**

Total number of volunteer hours donated by low-income individuals to  
Community Action (This is ONLY the number of volunteer hours from  
individuals who are low-income)

9	408,109
---	---------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 3: Low-income people own a stake in their community.

### Community Enhancement through Maximum Feasible Participation

The number of low-income people mobilized as a direct result of Community Action initiatives to engage in activities that support and promote their own well-being and that of their community, as measured by one or more of the following:

#### Number of Low-Income People (#)

A. Number of low-income people participating in formal community organizations, government, boards or councils that provide input to decision-making and policy-setting through Community Action efforts

9	350
---	-----

B. Number of low-income people acquiring businesses in their community as a result of Community Action assistance

3	3
---	---

C. Number of low-income people purchasing their own home in their community as a result of Community Action assistance

3	41
---	----

D. Number of low-income people engaged in non-governance community activities or groups created or supported by Community Action

8	1,930
---	-------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 4: Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved

### Expanding Opportunities through Community-Wide Partnerships

The number of organizations, both public and private, that Community Action actively works with to expand resources and opportunities in order to achieve family and community outcomes.

	Number of Organizational Partnerships (#)	
A. Non-Profit	9	1,027
B. Faith Based	9	557
C. Local Government	9	403
D. State Government	9	283
E. Federal Government	9	112
F. For-Profit Business or Corporation	9	1,619
G. Consortiums/Collaboration	8	530
H. Housing Consortiums/Collaboration	8	259
I. School Districts	9	505
J. Institutions of post secondary education/training	8	104
K. Financial/Banking Institutions	9	112
L. Health Service Institutions	9	630
M. State wide associations or collaborations	9	136
In the rows below, please include any additional indicators that were not captured above.	9	136
	8	1,115
	3	24
N. Total number of organizations CAAs work with to promote family and community outcomes (This total is not calculated automatically)	9	4,678

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 5: Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results

**Agency Development**

The number of human capital resources available to Community Action that increase agency capacity to achieve family and community outcomes, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Resources in Agency (#)	
A. Number of Certified-Community Action Professionals	3	8
B. Number of Nationally Certified ROMA Trainers	4	4
C. Number of Family Development Trainers	5	12
D. Number of Child Development Trainers	5	17
E. Number of Staff Attending Trainings	9	1,413
F. Number of Board Members Attending Trainings	9	139
G. Hours of Staff in Trainings	9	48,518
H. Hours of Board Members in Trainings	9	577

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

**Independent Living**

The number of vulnerable individuals receiving services from Community Action who maintain an independent living situation as a result of those services:

**Number of  
Vulnerable  
Individuals Living  
Independently (#)**

A. Senior Citizens (seniors can be reported twice, once under Senior Citizens and again if they are disabled under Individuals with Disabilities, ages 55-over)

9	13,060
---	--------

B. Individuals with Disabilities

0-17

8	1,044
---	-------

18-54

8	3,016
---	-------

55-over

9	3,297
---	-------

Age Data Not Collected

0	
---	--

Total

	7,357
--	-------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

### Emergency Assistance

The number of low-income individuals served by Community Action who sought emergency assistance and the number of those individuals for whom assistance was provided, including such services as:

		Number of Individuals Seeking Assistance (#)	Number of Individuals Receiving Assistance (#)
A. Emergency Food	9	27,952	28,082
B. Emergency fuel or utility payments funded by LIHEAP or other public and private funding sources	9	14,351	9,097
C. Emergency Rent or Mortgage Assistance	9	11,247	6,130
D. Emergency Car or Home Repair (i.e. structural, appliance, heating system, etc.)	7	100	95
E. Emergency Temporary Shelter	8	716	607
F. Emergency Medical Care	8	570	537
G. Emergency Protection from Violence	6	105	92
H. Emergency Legal Assistance	4	143	141
I. Emergency Transportation	8	969	891
J. Emergency Disaster Relief	4	19	8
K. Emergency Clothing	7	1,379	1,379

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

**Child and Family Development**

The number and percentage of all infants, children, youth, parents, and other adults participating in developmental or enrichment programs who achieve program goals, as measured by one or more of the following:

		Number of Participants Enrolled in Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Expected to Achieve Outcome in Reporting Period (Target) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (Actual) (#)	Percentage Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (%)
Infant and Child 1. Infants and children obtain age appropriate immunizations, medical, and dental care.	8	14,994	13,117	15,171	115.66%
Infant and Child 2. Infant and child health and physical development are improved as a result of adequate nutrition	9	18,436	17,415	16,353	93.90%
Infant and Child 3. Children participate in pre-school activities to develop school readiness skills	7	3,491	3,194	3,335	104.41%
Infant and Child 4. Children who participate in pre-school activities are developmentally ready to enter Kindergarten or 1st Grade	8	2,395	1,584	1,713	108.14%
Youth 1. Youth improve health and physical development	6	6,284	3,501	5,898	168.47%
Youth 2. Youth improve social/emotional development	7	3,255	1,908	3,096	162.26%
Youth 3. Youth avoid risk-taking behavior for a defined period of time	5	2,162	1,214	2,108	173.64%
Youth 4. Youth have reduced involvement with criminal justice system	3	708	42	417	992.86%
Youth 5. Youth increase academic, athletic, or social skills for school success	4	670	296	584	197.30%
Adult 1. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved parenting skills	6	3,279	3,263	3,197	97.98%
Adult 2. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved family functioning skills	8	2,740	2,106	2,667	126.64%



Number of Agencies Reporting: 8

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

**Family Supports (Seniors, Disabled, and Caregivers)**

Low-income people who are unable to work, especially seniors, adults with disabilities, and caregivers, for whom barriers to family stability are reduced or eliminated, as measured by one or more of the following:

	Number of Participants Enrolled In Program(s) (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome In Reporting Period (#)
A. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	3   38	28
B. Obtained care for child or other dependant	3   193	173
C. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	5   113	79
D. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family member	4   3,651	3,651
E. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	6   532	409
F. Obtained food assistance	6   12,060	12,060
G. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	3   64	62
H. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	5   656	534
I. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	4   333	258

Number of Agencies Reporting: 9

Goal 6: Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

**Service Counts**

The number of services provided to low-income individuals and/or families, as measured by one or more of the following:

	<b>Number of Services (#)</b>
A. Food Boxes	8   154,023
B. Pounds of Food	3   287,355
C. Units of Clothing	8   3,241
D. Rides Provided	8   275,896
E. Information and Referral Calls	8   144,932