

Maine

Section A: State Use of CSBG Funds

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

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

2. Total CSBG funds expended in FY 2010 for:

	Planned	Actual	ARRA Planned	ARRA Actual
a. Eligible Entities	\$3,350,393	\$3,230,393	\$4,270,007	\$4,270,007
b. State Administrative Costs *	\$186,133	\$125,714	\$45,820	\$45,121
* ARRA ONLY: Report Planned and Actual Funds spent on Benefits Enrollment Coordination Activities				
c. Discretionary Projects	\$257,274	\$257,274		
d. Total Funds	\$3,793,800	\$3,613,381	\$4,315,827	\$4,315,128

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

\$168,909

4. Carry-forward of FY 2010 funds to FY 2011 programs

\$278,187

\$0

5. State CSBG funds (see instructions)

\$0

6. TOTAL CSBG funds expended by State in FY 2010

\$3,613,381

\$4,315,128

Maine

Section B: General Information on Local CSBG Agencies

1. Eligible entities receiving FY 2010 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 | <input type="text" value="10"/> |
| b. Number of Limited Purpose Agencies (LPAs) among eligible entities | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| c. Number of organizations serving migrant or seasonal farmworkers | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| d. Number of these also counted in a or b | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| e. Number of tribal organizations | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| f. Number of these also counted in a, b, or c | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| g. Number of units of local government | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| h. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, or e | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| i. Others designated by statute | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| j. Number of these also counted in a, b, c, e, or g | <input type="text" value="0"/> |
| k. Total unduplicated number of eligible entities | <input type="text" value="10"/> |

2. Were previously funded eligible entities dropped in FY 2010?

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 2010 (if any)

c. Name of newly served county(ies) in FY 2010:

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	\$0
3. State subgrantee associations	\$60,000
4. Eligible Entities	\$125,000
5. Other (please specify below):	\$72,274

NASCSP, River Vally Tech Center

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

	Section A Discretionary
\$257,274	\$257,274

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	\$125,000
3. Competitive grants for exemplary or demonstration programs	\$0
4. Training or technical assistance for local agencies	\$10,000
5. Statewide programs	\$50,000
6. General Support	\$20,000
7. Other (please specify below):	\$52,274

NASCSP, River Valley Tech Center,

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

	Section A Discretionary
\$257,274	\$257,274

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 checked="" type="radio"/> Human Services Department	<input type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department
<input type="radio"/> Social Services Department	<input type="radio"/> Other (please specify)

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

DHHS, Office of Child and Family Services, Division of Public service Management

3. Other programs directed by the CSBG Administrator in FY 2010

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

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? (List titles of other programs below)

4. Was the State CSBG office subject to a reorganization in FY 2010, 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 2010? 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 2010 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 Equivalent (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds?

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: Western Maine Community Action, Inc.

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

WMCA identified this community need by working with the Board of 82 High Street, a low-income housing project in Farmington, ME.

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

CSBG funds supported the salaries of WMCA's Housing and Energy Program Manager, who was given key responsibilities to work with the Town of Farmington in coordinating its Community Development Block Grant application. The program manager also was charged with oversight and coordination of the mobile home replacements and/or renovations/retrofitting, as well as working with MaineHousing to obtain a donated Energy Star mobile home.

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

Town of Farmington: applied for a CDBG grant for 82 High Street project; 82 High Street Board of Directors: Volunteered sweat equity and worked with residents to identify project priorities; local ecumenical ministry: Volunteered sweat equity and other resources/supports for residents; local High School vocational tech donated construction of landings.

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

of dollars leveraged; Dollars saved in energy costs as result of energy-saving measures being installed; # of volunteer hours donated to project; # of low-income families who experience savings in energy costs.

- v. What outcomes have resulted in FY 2010? If no outcomes yet, when?

Full outcomes will result in FY2011. In FY2010, one donated Energy Star mobile home was donated as part of a demonstration pilot project for the project. This mobile home is being used as the standard benchmark, against which all energy measures installed will be measured.

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 2010. Show how responsible, informed leadership led to effective and efficient management of the CSBG program.

Top State Management Accomplishment:

Supporting candidacy of 14 community action staff to become certified community action professionals. This experience will poise these staff to continue their community action leadership with a strong and confident background in the foundational elements of community action's mission. It strengthens our Maine network of community action leaders. A second accomplishment was the addition of one additional CSBG-dedicated staff person at the state level, increasing capacity. Also Securing additional ARRA funds to help Community Action Programs implement their Pathways to Excellence projects helped move

agencies toward greater standards of performance.

- b. Please describe what you consider to be the top three management accomplishments achieved by your agencies during FY 2010. 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: Kennebec Valley Community Action

Accomplishment:

Educare: In September 2010 Educare Central Maine opened its doors. This brand new, state of the art early care and education center is the culmination of several years of work by a consortium of community partners, led by KVCAP management, to bring this national early care and education model to central Maine. In addition to increasing the number of Early Headstart, Headstart and Childcare slots in the area (ie, increased by 80 slots), Educare will serve as an early care and education training center and will be a platform to inform policy in Maine.

Agency Name: Washington Hancock Community Agency

Accomplishment:

Washington Hancock Community Agency began implementing its Pathways to Excellence project this year by working with consultant Larry Koziarz on developing instruments to measure success, such as a self-sufficiency scale for clients and an agency wide scorecard. These are being put into use in FY2011 and will be expanded and revised as we begin to work with these new tools.

Agency Name: Penquis

Accomplishment:

Penquis contracted with a respected auditing and consulting firm to complete an extensive review of programs in each department at Penquis. Their review included interviews with all Department Directors as well and the Chair of the Board of Directors, the Chief Executive Officer, Administrative Officer, Financial Officer and Operating Officer. They reviewed programs not typically audited by our independent auditor. Their review included a measure of our programmatic compliance, our responsiveness to our clients and our clarity and transparency to our Board of Directors. Their final report was extremely positive and included recommendations which the Cooperate Officers and the Executive Committee are implementing. These include the development of an Audit Committee which is separate from the Finance Committee, is staffed by our Chief Administrator Officer, and its members represent each sector of our Board; the creation of "Dashboard" reports to our Board of Directors which are more specific than the reporting system used now and highlight the most important issues.

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: People's Regional Opportunity Program

ii. Program Name: Parkside Neighborhood Center

iii. CSBG Service Category: Linkages

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

With over 5,000 residents, Parkside is the most densely populated square mile in Maine. The Parkside neighborhood has been characterized as an area with high levels of poverty, drug use and social disorganization. According to the 2009 Portland Police Department Annual Analysis, in 2009 Parkside had the highest number of calls for domestic dispute or assaults (155 calls) out of any neighborhood in Portland, and generated 71% of the total Calls for Service in Portland. Additionally, reports of child abuse and neglect from DHHS are among the highest in the city (DHHS staff reports, 2009). Many families are living in poverty and struggling with high levels of food insecurity.

Parkside residents regularly turn to the Parkside Neighborhood Center for help with basic needs. In 2009, the Center served over 700 people through its programs. Families frequently request help with obtaining basic items, such as food, diapers, laundry detergent and soap. Many families are forced into homelessness: PROP Parkside Center staffers regularly assist clients with avoiding eviction or finding a place to live (including help with furnishings like mattresses and cribs). Over the past year, the number of requests for emergency food assistance has dramatically increased. The Center ran out of emergency Hannaford food vouchers twice, and, due to high numbers (50-plus) at Family Supper, clients have had to wait in lines or take meals "to-go".

Many Parkside families are 1st and 2nd generation immigrants and/or refugees who have come to Parkside with little to no income, lacking basic items such as furniture, clothing and food. Parents struggling with culture shock and post-traumatic stress disorder are frequently unable to adequately manage or relate to their children, whose adjustment to American culture occurs at a different rate, causing discord within the family. Forced to rely on their children to translate for them, parents often feel demeaned and overwhelmed, lacking the knowledge of how to change their lives.

In collaboration with outside service providers, the Parkside Neighborhood Center has offered Community Programming, which includes free events and classes for low-income Parkside community members, since the Center's opening in 2005. The goals of this program are (1) to create an informal system of supports for Parkside adults and families, (2) to enrich the lives of low-income Parkside residents through education and (3) to provide a safe venue for New Americans to gather and learn about issues specific to their communities, developing systems of support amongst one another, with a goal of self-sufficiency and better integration into the community.

The Center Director coordinates weekly classes and groups, based on community need and interest. In 2009-2010, offerings at the Center included: (1) Portland Adult Education's Even Start Family Literacy Program, which meets three mornings a week, for parents with children in the Parkside Center Head Start classroom, (2) a weekly support group for survivors of torture hosted by Community Counseling Center, (3) a weekly Rwandan youth dance group called "Umuco", (4) a Somali Qu'ran class for youth, (5) a wellness class for African women hosted by the Frannie Peabody Center and (6) Parkside Fun Mentoring, a program run by Community Policing matching elementary-aged children from Reiche with mentors from Waynflete (a local high school).

Classes currently offered include an East African Health Class taught by a Rwandan medical professional, and Eating Right, a weekly cooking and food budgeting class run by Good Shepherd Food Bank. The community room is regularly used by local groups for community functions, such as for Sudanese community meetings or Somali women groups'

dinner, on the evenings and weekends. Community Programming at the Center is offered year-round and has the capacity to serve 40 people in each class.

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

Since opening in 2005, the Center has offered a wide range of programs for the Parkside neighborhood and beyond, responding to community needs and interests. In offering community classes focusing on education, health, and cultural supports, the Center is providing Parkside residents with support toward eventual employment and familial stability. PROP Center staff regularly visit classes to connect participants to other PROP programs at the Center, and to offer participants emergency assistance and guidance around attaining long-term stability, such as in employment or job skills training. Staff will then meet individually with participants interested in receiving this support.

In response to requests from refugee and immigrant groups, the Center is offering many weekly classes adapted to specific concerns of New Americans. The goal of this targeted programming is to provide a safe venue for New Americans to gather and learn about issues specific to their communities, developing systems of support amongst one another, with a goal of self-sufficiency and better integration into the community. As American formalized supports are often ineffective in dealing with immigrant concerns such as these, the Center collaborates with and offers free meeting space to African elders, for instance, so that they may problem-solve within their own community. We believe that hosting both formal and informal opportunities for refugees and immigrants to engage in educational opportunities at the Parkside Neighborhood Center can help bridge some of the isolation and allow people from different cultures to come together to support each other, as well as to build a greater sense of community. With the Center as stabilizing venue for immigrants in Portland, groups focusing on topics such as African health, cultural education and community building allow participants to address issues specific to their community. Informal discussions with participants have indicated success in attaining these outcomes. We are currently administering surveys, to be completed by the end of January, to more accurately assess these outcomes and expect positive results

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

From 2009-2010, there were 15 participants in Portland Adult Education's Evenstart Family Literacy Program, an average of 15 participants attending the weekly Community Counseling survivors of torture support group, an average of 14 participants in the Umuco dance group, an average of 6 youth in the Somali Qu'ran class, 14 total participants in the Peabody Center African Wellness Class, and 20 youth participating in Parkside Fun Mentoring.

Outcomes for each community class offered at the Center include:

(1) Of all community class participants, 70 percent will report that participation has helped them to (a) increase their ability to care for their families and/or children, (b) build a local support system focused on neighborhood resource-sharing (in transportation, child care, etc.), and (c) take steps in reaching long-term stability and self-sufficiency.

(2) Of the people participating in classes and groups targeted at issues specific to New Americans, 80 percent will report that participation has helped them (a) build a community support system focused on culturally-appropriate interventions and resources, (b) gain education/awareness on issues of interest to them and (c) increase their ability to access jobs, health care and other services in Portland.

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

CSBG funds were used to fund 100% of the salary of the Parkside Neighborhood Center Director at 40 hours a week, 100% of the salary at Per-Diem Building Monitor (at an average of 4 hours a week), who monitors weekend and evening events at the Center. CSBG funds also support and the occupancy costs of the building, allowing groups to meet at the Center for free or at low cost. By linking residents to programs, resources and to each other, the Director is the "glue" binding all stakeholders together, helping to facilitate a system of both informal and formal supports for families and adults in need and recruiting the providers to offer services at the Center. The Director's CSBG-funded responsibilities include networking with area service providers, conducting outreach in the community, managing the Center's budget, overseeing staff and volunteers, and writing grant proposals. CSBG also funds the food and program materials for the Center's Family Supper night, Night Light After-School Program, and Emergency Assistance programs.

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

PROP Parkside Center staff accomplishes its core work through regular, active collaborations. With 9 providers offering programs at the Center, we actively strategize with other organizations, including 3 local churches, to meet our collective goals. We assist agencies in recruiting for classes offered at the Center, and offer emergency assistance and referral services for clients attending those classes.

The Center has Memorandums of Agreement, detailing the strengths that PROP's Parkside Neighborhood Center and each organization bring to the partnership, with Portland Adult Education, Wayside Food Programs, Frannie Peabody Center, Community Counseling Center, and with Good Shepherd Food Bank.

Partners include Portland Adult Education, which administers the Evenstart Family Literacy class. In addition to teaching English literacy to New Americans, the Evenstart Family Literacy class also focuses on healthy parenting strategies. Community Counseling Center runs the survivors of torture support group, and plans soon to offer another group for Somali women at the Center. Rwandan and Congolese members of ALI (Abundant Leadership Institute) leads the Umuco dance group, which performs for block parties and other events offered by the Center. The Center provides space for ongoing 10-week African health classes offered by the Frannie Peabody Center. The Portland Police Department and Waynflete School jointly administer the Parkside Fun Mentoring program. Good Shepherd Food Bank and Wayside Food Programs jointly conducted the Eating Right cooking class for Parkside adults. By attending classes on food budgeting and cooking, parents learned to better provide healthy, low-cost meals for their children. Jovin Bayingana, a Rwandan medical professional, teaches the East African health class. We are currently meeting with a local group to develop a Somali language class for Somali children, and with the Maine Medical Center, Maine Nutrition Network and the University of Southern Maine's Muskie School about offering healthy living/nutrition classes for Somali women.

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:

i. Description of initiative

Community Concepts Head Start staff were able to work with local school districts to create public partnerships. These partnerships created options for Head Start classrooms to be established in the school buildings. In this process, teaching staff, kitchen staff, supplies and facilities were shared. Children were integrated into the Pre School Systems.

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

Community Concepts worked with RSU 17 (Oxford Hills area); New Sharon Schools; Jay Schools and the Dixfield School department. Each facility worked to integrate a classroom for Head Start children in the public school facilities.

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

These efforts resulted in approx forty children going into integrated programs in their local schools systems. These low income children were mainstreamed into a mixed populations of income and were quickly acclimating to the Kindergarten experience. These integrations occurred in very rural communities with limited services in their school districts.

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

CSBG funded the position of a Program Manager who met with the school boards and teachers to offer the opportunity to participate in this new program. Once a school was on board, the manager worked to coordinate the implementation through to the opening of the classroom. The manager also followed through after the opening to assure open communication.

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

Agency Name:

i. Description of initiative

The Waldo Community Action Partners provides transportation services for low-income seniors. WCTP provides door to door service. WCTP buses pick passengers up at their homes or at a designated pickup point on a route. Passengers may be dropped off and picked up at any medical facility or major shopping mall on routes traveled

Customers use transportation services for a variety of purposes. The following list is not conclusive but will provide a general idea of the purposes that people use transportation services for:

⊙ Grocery shopping, medical appointments, employment, errands, visitations, legal appointments, banking, day care, recreation, dining out, and to access services provided by other organizations.

Transportation services are available a minimum of once a week from each Waldo County Community to the Belfast area on a regularly scheduled basis.

Buses and or vans also travel to Bangor, Rockland, Waterville and Augusta almost daily seven days a week.

In most cases a customer can make a connection by using an existing route or by piggy backing with

another rider to connect with the buses and/or volunteer drivers traveling out of county. A fixed route shopper's run is operated three times a week in the downtown Belfast area. Riders are picked up at designated bus stops and on route circling the city continuously for several hours following the same route each time.

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

Up until May of 2010 the Maine Department of Health and Human Services funded the rides for low-income seniors. Maine's Governor issued a curtailment order rescinding the funding that was used to provide the service indefinitely. In order to continue transportation services for seniors public transportation funding provided from the Maine Department of Transportation combined with municipal funding from 25 of the 26 municipalities in Waldo County is used to subsidize the senior rides. The seniors now are required to pay a small bus fare as well.

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

18,287 One way rides reported under ROMA Goal 6.5.D. for 165 seniors for Fiscal year 2010

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

CSBG pays for 30% of the salary of the Waldo Community Action Partners Transportation/CSBG Director position. Part of the Transportation/CSBG Directors responsibilities are to mobilize financial resources form all Waldo County Municipalities for matching state and federal grants in addition to funding gaps in services in all program areas.

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: Aroostook County Action Program, Inc.

i. Number of jobs created and/or saved: 5

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

CSBG ARRA funded four (4) case managers and maintaining one (1) supervisor position.

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

CSBG ARRA funded salary, fringe benefits, travel, supplies and occupancy costs associated with providing Case Management services (including Homeless Prevention) to those in need at three locations in Aroostook County.

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) 75 2. 126% to 200% of FPL 25

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

1. The role of partners or collaborations

Homeless Services of Aroostook (the only homeless shelter in the northern third of Maine), local town offices, and other social service agencies collaborated significantly in coordinating resources to meet the needs of ACAP Case Management customers.

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

Collaborators provided in-kind space, services and resources.

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

ACAP has the only Case Management program in the Aroostook County that does not work only with specific populations, nor is it driven by insurance or MaineCare. ACAP Case Management filled a significant gap identified in previous community assessments.

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: York County Community Action Corp

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

Expansion of a previously offered program/service: the increased funding enabled YCCAC to expand its Default/Foreclosure Housing Counseling services by adding a half-time Housing Counselor Intake staff person. This in turn resulted in YCCAC's ability to leverage an additional \$ 130,000 funding to create two additional full time default housing counselors. The total number of households assisted in FY10 was 911, a 349% increase in households served in the previous year.

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

Increased Funding

Expanded income eligibility

Please explain other:

Operational changes

Other (please explain)

iii. Regarding regularly appropriated CSBG funds:

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

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

iv. Regarding ARRA CSBG funds:

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

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

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

1. Infants and children (0-11 years)

2. Youth (12-18 years)

3. Adults (18-54 years)

4. Seniors (55+ years)

5. Entire Community

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?

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

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

Table 1: Total amount of CSBG funds expended in FY 2010 by Service Category

Service Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
Employment	\$136,902	\$270,100
Education	\$275,788	\$436,095
IncomeManagement	\$187,313	\$182,196
Housing	\$353,948	\$541,176
EmergencyServices	\$82,610	\$149,009
Nutrition	\$46,575	\$6,160
Linkages	\$1,000,130	\$1,513,662
SelfSufficiency	\$617,697	\$826,391
Health	\$256,540	\$477,808
Other	\$362,594	\$403,757
Totals	\$3,320,097	\$4,806,354

Of the CSBG funds reported above	\$263,917	\$338,507	were for administration.
	7.95%	7.04%	

Please consult the instructions regarding what constitutes "administration."

Table 2: Of the funding listed in Table 1: Funds for Services by Demographic Category, FY 2010

Demographic Category	CSBG Funds	CSBG ARRA Funds
Youth (Aged 12-18)	\$151,120	\$39,777
Seniors (Aged 55+)	\$190,000	\$105,279

Maine

Section F: Other Resources Administered and Generated

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

Subsection I. Federal Resources

2. Amount of FY 2010 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.	\$3,942,971	\$4,797,875
a.	\$3,647,767	\$16,278,196
b.	\$3,169,006	\$0
c.	\$8,725,882	\$0
d.	\$16,803,554	\$1,341,712
e.	\$4,747,369	\$1,139,532
f.	\$0	\$0
g.	\$2,488,817	\$0
h.	\$32,664,959	\$0
i.	\$0	\$0
j.	\$2,119,861	\$55,089
i.	\$1,275,076	\$259,656
ii.	\$1,297,912	\$0
iii.	\$148,400	\$8,500
iv.	\$47,277	\$4,279
k.	\$2,768,665	\$272,435
l.	\$14,115,137	\$43,451
m.	\$601,285	\$0
n.	\$3,357,990	\$496
o.	\$834,129	\$0
i.	\$6,545,114	\$0
ii.	\$420,411	\$0
iii.	\$0	\$0
iv.	\$5,331	\$0
v.	\$28,203	\$4,279
vi.	\$18,138	\$0
q.	\$3,238,359	\$1,115,754
r.	\$2,893,860	\$426,369
s.	\$22,000	\$0
t.	\$1,063,288	\$0
u.	\$72,828	\$4,046
v.	\$2,067,140	\$0
w.	\$299,240	\$0
x.	\$305,768	\$48,848
y.	\$64,719	\$0
i.	\$671,722	\$0
ii.	\$13,200	\$0
iii.	\$0	\$0
iv.	\$0	\$0
z.	\$684,922	\$0

TOTAL: NON-CSBG FEDERAL RESOURCES

\$113,773,742

\$20,730,207

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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.	\$1,089,006
c. State Nutrition programs	c.	\$0
d. State Day Care and Early Childhood programs	d.	\$1,711,828
e. State Energy programs	e.	\$2,425,498
f. State Health programs	f.	\$2,657,051
g. State Youth Development programs	g.	\$876,406
h. State Employment and Training programs	h.	\$44,183
i. State Head Start programs	i.	\$2,728,386
j. State Senior programs	j.	\$1,357,060
k. State Transportation programs	k.	\$2,089,273
l. State Education programs	l.	\$535,445
m. State Community, Rural and Economic Development programs	m.	\$577,313
n. State Family Development programs	n.	\$486,849
o. Other State Resources		
	i.	\$365,266
	ii.	\$421,228
	iii.	\$45,542
	iv.	\$0
Total Other State Resources	o.	\$832,036

TOTAL: STATE RESOURCES	\$17,410,334
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I (Federal Resources), please estimate the amount	\$0

Maine

Section F: Other Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

Subsection III. Local Resources

a. Amount of unrestricted funds appropriated by local government	\$744,055
b. Amount of restricted funds appropriated by local government	\$616,599
c. Value of Contract Services	\$407,326
d. Value of in-kind goods/services received from local government	\$0

TOTAL: LOCAL PUBLIC RESOURCES	\$1,767,980
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I or II, please estimate the amount	\$138,940

Subsection IV. Private Sector Resources

a. Funds from foundations, corps., United Way, other nonprofits	\$4,264,652
b. Other donated funds	\$3,562,337
c. Value of other donated items, food, clothing, furniture, etc.	\$4,501,471
d. Value of in-kind services received from businesses	\$5,836,459
e. Payments by clients for services	\$4,609,987
f. Payments by private entities for goods or services for low-income clients or communities	\$1,813,197

TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES	\$24,588,103
If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I, II, or III, please estimate the amount	\$0

TOTAL: ALL OTHER RESOURCES (FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, PRIVATE) less amount of double count in Subsection II, III, IV	\$157,401,219	ARRA ONLY
		\$20,730,207

Maine

Section G: Program Participant Characteristics

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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

\$157,401,219

ARRA ONLY

\$20,730,207

2b. Total amount of CSBG Funds allocated

\$3,942,971

\$4,797,875

Total Resources for FY 2010 (2a + 2b)

\$161,344,190

\$25,528,082

- 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.	200,124
4.	5,654
5.	91,438
6.	5,654

7. Gender

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

- a. Male
- b. Female
- TOTAL*

82,517
109,101
191,618

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*

29,573
18,427
18,371
18,788
48,230
22,650
23,042
20,358
199,439

9. Ethnicity/Race

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

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

814
27,954
28,768

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*

29,737
1,366
320
1,459
328
106
704
34,020

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**

6,348
10,305
36,199
8,594
11,157
72,603

11. Other Characteristics

NUMBER OF PERSONS*

	Yes	No	Total
a. Health Insurance	132,746	31,447	164,193
b. Disabled	18,897	125,681	144,578

12. Family Type

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

- a. Single Parent/Female
- b. Single Parent/Male
- c. Two Parent Household
- d. Single Person
- e. Two Adults/No children
- f. Other

1,371
329
1,939
662
267
110

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***

32,494
21,420
13,314
10,077
4,442
1,907
739
710
85,103

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.)

69,502
1,849
71,351
5,930
11,609
32,890
8,625
2,843
5,680
13,727
10,199
4,248
95,751

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***

9,854
8,085
19,989
14,471
11,249
7,665
5,585
4,602
81,500

16. Housing

NUMBER OF FAMILIES***

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

43,377
23,010
1,154
4,392
71,933

TOTAL*** 4,678

Maine

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2010 - NPI 1.1

Number of Agencies Reporting: 8

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:

	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 (%)
A. Unemployed and obtained a job	8	1,817	734	107.31%
B. Employed and maintained a job for at least 90 days	5	746	503	87.48%
C. Employed and obtained an increase in employment income and/or benefits	6	922	301	84.08%
D. Achieve "living wage" employment and/or benefits	6	1,440	932	105.79%

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:

	Number of Participants Enrolled in Programs (#)	Number of Participants Achieving Outcome in Reporting Period (#)
A. Obtained skills/competencies required for employment	7 2,438	975
B. Completed ABE/GED and received certificate or diplom	5 1,196	170
C. Completed post-secondary education program and obtained certificate or diploma	6 1,438	226
D. Enrolled children in before or after school programs	4 1,507	313
E. Obtained care for child or other dependant	7 1,888	1,520
F. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	7 360	213
G. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family membe	6 8,205	7,848
H. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	8 2,543	2,654
I. Obtained food assistance	5 3,316	3,177
J. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	4 7,792	7,741
K. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	3 682	412
L. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	3 745	475

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:

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

Enhancement 2. Number and percent of participants who obtained court-ordered child support payments and the expected annual aggregated dollar amount of payments

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

	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) (\$)
4	873	876	100.34%	\$1,300,956
3	77	48	62.34%	\$129,382
8	36,882	32,029	86.84%	\$1,835,559

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	4	163	104	132	126.92%
Utilization 2. Number and percent of participants opening an Individual Development Account (IDA) or other savings account	6	55	45	31	68.89%
Utilization 3. Number and percent of participants who increased their savings through IDA or other savings accounts and the aggregated amount of savings	6	62	47	40	85.11%
Utilization 4. Of participants in a Community Action assets development program (IDA and others):					
Utilization 4a. Number and percent of participants capitalizing small business with accumulated savings	3	41	10	5	50.00%
Utilization 4b. Number and percent of participants pursuing post secondary education with accumulated savings	4	44	10	5	50.00%
Utilization 4c. Number and percent of participants purchasing a home with accumulated savings	6	47	23	21	91.30%
Utilization 4d. Number and percent of participants purchasing other assets with accumulated savings	3	38	3	0	0.00%

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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	74	248
B. Accessible "living wage" jobs created, or saved, from reduction or elimination in the community	5	52	155
C. Safe and affordable housing units created in the community	7	150	338
D. Safe and affordable housing units in the community preserved or improved through construction, weatherization or rehabilitation achieved by Community Action activity or advocacy	10	608	4,747
E. Accessible safe and affordable health care services/facilities for low-income people created, or saved from reduction or elimination	6	615	13,189
F. Accessible safe and affordable child care or child development placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	4	12	884
G. Accessible before-school and after-school program placement opportunities for low-income families created, or saved from reduction or elimination	6	34	478
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	6	16	41,979
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	28	955

Number of Agencies Reporting: 7

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	4 9	206
B. Increase in the availability or preservation of community facilities	5 9	16
C. Increase in the availability or preservation of community services to improve public health and safety	5 12	1,079
D. Increase in the availability or preservation of commercial services within low-income neighborhoods	1 4	49
E. Increase in or preservation of neighborhood quality-of-life resources	4 19	50

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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

7	1,147
---	-------

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

10	1,600,754
----	-----------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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

10	313
----	-----

B. Jobs saved at least in part by ARRA funds

10	211
----	-----

Maine

Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2010 - NPI 3.1

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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)	10 1,057,888

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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

10	263
----	-----

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

5	24
---	----

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

9	483
---	-----

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

7	201
---	-----

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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 (#)	
Non-Profit	10	1,031
Faith Based	10	236
Local Government	10	210
State Government	10	105
Federal Government	10	72
For-Profit Business or Corporation	10	326
Consortiums/Collaboration	10	179
Housing Consortiums/Collaboration	9	38
School Districts	9	145
Institutions of post secondary education/training	10	78
Financial/Banking Institutions	10	138
Health Service Institutions	10	172
State wide associations or collaborations	10	125

In the rows below, please include any additional indicators that were not captured above.

0

0

0

Total number of organizations CAAs work with to promote family and community outcomes (This total is not calculated automatically)

10 2,825

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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 (#)	
Number of Certified-Community Action Professionals	5	3
Number of Nationally Certified ROMA Trainers	7	9
Number of Family Development Trainers	8	27
Number of Child Development Trainers	8	97
Number of Staff Attending Trainings	10	2,150
Number of Board Members Attending Trainings	10	172
Hours of Staff in Trainings	10	39,065
Hours of Board Members in Trainings	10	543

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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)

10	34,128
----	--------

B. Individuals with Disabilities

0-17	5	2,536
------	---	-------

18-54	6	8,166
-------	---	-------

55-over	7	4,783
---------	---	-------

Total (NOT automatically calculated)	1	12,254
--------------------------------------	---	--------

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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 84,910	87,031
B. Emergency fuel or utility payments funded by LIHEAP or other public and private funding sources	10 9,883	8,211
C. Emergency Rent or Mortgage Assistance	8 1,000	1,905
D. Emergency Car or Home Repair (i.e. structural, appliance, heating system, etc.)	4 310	185
E. Emergency Temporary Shelter	6 878	340
F. Emergency Medical Care	5 1,551	1,365
G. Emergency Protection from Violence	3 146	45
H. Emergency Legal Assistance	2 605	260
I. Emergency Transportation	3 173	79
J. Emergency Disaster Relief	8 518	73
K. Emergency Clothing	6 1,073	1,428

Number of Agencies Reporting: 10

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.	9	10,909	8,309	9,941	119.64%
Infant and Child 2. Infant and child health and physical development are improved as a result of adequate nutrition	10	44,582	41,021	42,001	102.39%
Infant and Child 3. Children participate in pre-school activities to develop school readiness skills	8	2,989	2,515	3,569	141.91%
Infant and Child 4. Children who participate in pre-school activities are developmentally ready to enter Kindergarten or 1st Grade	7	2,199	1,610	1,653	102.67%
Youth 1. Youth improve health and physical development	4	1,293	1,152	2,016	175.00%
Youth 2. Youth improve social/emotional development	6	2,180	1,971	2,306	117.00%
Youth 3. Youth avoid risk-taking behavior for a defined period of time	4	3,517	2,923	5,740	196.37%
Youth 4. Youth have reduced involvement with criminal justice system	4	1,382	1,251	1,119	89.45%
Youth 5. Youth increase academic, athletic, or social skills for school success	3	272	193	552	286.01%
Adult 1. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved parenting skills	7	3,877	2,960	2,982	100.74%
Adult 2. Parents and other adults learn and exhibit improved family functioning skills	7	4,429	3,298	4,780	144.94%

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	3 468	412
B. Obtained care for child or other dependant	4 807	836
C. Obtained access to reliable transportation and/or driver's license	5 9,511	11,174
D. Obtained health care services for themselves and/or family membe	5 7,849	7,743
E. Obtained and/or maintained safe and affordable housing	5 1,822	1,091
F. Obtained food assistance	6 90,402	103,068
G. Obtained non-emergency LIHEAP energy assistance	6 27,122	27,308
H. Obtained non-emergency WX energy assistance	5 5,622	1,461
I. Obtained other non-emergency energy assistance (State/local/private energy programs. Do not include LIHEAP or WX)	4 565	335

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:

	Number of Services (#)	
A. Food Boxes	4	41,290
B. Pounds of Food	3	649,385
C. Units of Clothing	4	1,596
D. Rides Provided	6	1,337,788
E. Information and Referral Calls	8	202,012