

Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (STEP)

Year Two Final Evaluation Report

May 2008

Prepared for Futures Associates, Inc.

by Kristen Donovan, Ph.D. & Lisa Garbrecht, Ph.D.

EVALCORP
Research & Consulting

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank a number of individuals for contributing resources, time and input to support the development of this report. To begin, we thank The California Endowment for making the STEP initiative and its evaluation possible. We also thank STEP Project Manager, Deborah Parker, for making available to us everything we needed to inform the evaluation throughout the process. She has been a true partner of the evaluation and we very much appreciate all she has done to facilitate our work. Special thanks also are extended to Executive Director, Kim Herbstritt, for her ongoing commitment to the evaluation, and to Earl Bradbury, for his outstanding data related work and research into fair housing laws. We also wish to thank all of the key informants for their willingness to participate in interviews with us, as well as the many individuals who completed evaluative surveys following STEP trainings and presentations. The information collected through the key informant interviews and follow-up training surveys was instrumental to the overall evaluation process.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Evolution of the STEP Initiative	1
STEP's Revised Purpose	2
Goals and Objectives	2
Outcomes	3
EVALUATION DESIGN	4
Evaluation Research Questions	4
Year Two Data Collection Strategies	4
Document Reviews	4
Observational Methods	5
Survey Research	5
Structured Interviews	5
FINDINGS	6
Year Two Accomplishments	6
Research and Data Collected	6
Regional STEP Teams	8
Spokesperson and Tool Kit Trainings	9
Briefing Books and Tool Kit	10
Presentations and Technical Assistance	10
Trainings and Presentations Evaluated	12
Spokesperson Training Survey Methodology and Content	13
Results from Spokesperson Training Part II	13
Results from Spokesperson Training Part IIA	14
Tool Kit Training Survey Methodology and Content	15
Results from Tool Kit Training	16
Mental Health Presentation Survey Methodology and Content	17
Results from Mental Health Presentation Survey	18
Key Informant Interviews	19
Participants and Interview Content	19
Involvement with STEP	20
Importance of STEP	20
Lessons Learned	22
Looking Ahead	23
STEP Staff Interviews	26
Participants and Interview Content	26
Impact and Outcomes of STEP	26
Challenges	28
Lessons Learned	28
Looking Ahead	28
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29

CONCLUSION 32

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Revised Addendum to CUP Application 33
Appendix B: List of Media/Documents Produced 35
Appendix C: List of Presentations Produced..... 36
Appendix D: Spokesperson Training Part II Follow-up Survey 39
Appendix E: Spokesperson Training Part IIA Follow-up Survey 40
Appendix F: Tool Kit Follow-up Survey 41
Appendix G: Mental Health Presentation Follow-up Survey 42
Appendix H: Key Informant Interview Protocol..... 43
Appendix I: STEP Staff Interview Protocol 45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2006, Futures Associates, Inc. was awarded a grant through The California Endowment to continue the STEP policy advancement preparedness work begun several years ago. As part of the initiative, project staff and regionally based core planning groups were working to streamline the process for those intending to site a treatment facility within a community. Initially, STEP was advocating for modifications to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application process for residential alcohol and drug treatment programs throughout San Diego County; more specifically, via the strategic advancement of a STEP Addendum to the CUP Application for Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs by local STEP team members to their local governments.

During its first year of implementation, STEP staff became aware of the application of fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential alcohol and drug treatment programs. After undergoing extensive independent study and consulting with the Fair Housing Council of San Diego, STEP staff concluded that any local government that bases its denial of a use permit to a residential substance abuse program on NIMBY concerns puts itself at risk for being in violation of fair housing laws. With this knowledge, STEP evolved from a data-driven approach aimed at combating NIMBY by advancing discussions with local decision makers regarding the benefits to communities of residential alcohol and drug treatment programs, to an approach of changing norms regarding the application for and enforcement of fair housing laws. This required a redefinition of not only the project's goals, but also of its focus and strategies.

Early in its second year of implementation, STEP began integrating fair housing information into its purpose, objectives, project related materials, and media efforts. STEP continued with its initial approach of advancing its policy agenda of the proposed CUP Addendum, presenting fair housing laws along with other supporting data. The CUP Addendum helped keep the focus on land use issues and provided an entry point for discussing fair housing laws with planners and decision makers.

By the project's completion, the project had expanded beyond the CUP application process for residential alcohol and other drug treatment providers, to encompass land use issues for other residential service providers for persons with disabilities. The overall focus and goal of STEP had culminated into: a community change project that seeks to reduce discrimination in land use against housing and other residential services for persons with disabilities, and to change the norms governing how treatment providers and local governments approach the land use decision-making process.

Evaluation Design

A comprehensive formative evaluation design was used to assess the implementation and corresponding outcomes of the STEP initiative. The purpose of a formative evaluation is to help shape a project's development and strengthen the implementation of newer or pilot initiatives, such as STEP, through the use of evaluative data fed back to project stakeholders at regular intervals. The evaluation approach was participatory; thus, STEP staff was involved throughout the process and took an active role in shaping data collection instruments, identifying key informants, and interpreting evaluative findings.

The primary questions investigated through the evaluation included:

1. What changes or modifications were made to the project's initial goals, objectives, outcomes, and/or implementation plan?
2. Were any challenges/barriers/opposition encountered during the STEP's implementation? If so, how were they overcome?
3. To what extent did STEP achieve its goals, objectives, and intended outcomes?
4. What were the primary lessons learned, and what are recommendations for replication of similar initiatives in the future?

Various strategies were utilized throughout STEP's two-year term to collect evaluative data and answer the research questions posed for the study. Given the emerging nature of the project, along with STEP's objective to disseminate learnings and findings from the initiative with other counties and providers, it was determined that an evaluation plan relying primarily on qualitative inquiry and data collection techniques would be most appropriate. As such, the evaluation plan called for document reviews, observational methods, survey research, and structured interviews with identified key informants and STEP staff.

Findings

Numerous accomplishments were made and outcomes produced during the second year of STEP's implementation. A selected list of accomplishments is provided below.

- Extensive research was conducted on federal fair housing laws as they applied to the use permitting process for residential treatment programs.
- Findings from STEP's proximity scan of all licensed residential treatment centers in San Diego County were used to shape and inform decision-making among local governments, providers, advocates, and community groups.
- Two North County Regional STEP Team Spokesperson Trainings were held focusing on the integration of fair housing information, and supportive research and data designed to facilitate STEP spokespersons' ability to speak about the initiative with the public and local decision makers.
- STEP Briefing Books, a Tool Kit, and numerous documents/media pieces were produced to support treatment providers and other community partners in advocating for a streamlined CUP process and compliance with fair housing laws in land use decisions.
- A Tool Kit Training was conducted to inform service providers, advocates, and local officials regarding the specifics of how fair housing laws apply to residential facilities for persons with disabilities in order to promote compliance with those laws.
- Numerous presentations and many hours of technical assistance were provided to alcohol and drug program administrators, treatment providers, mental health service providers, fair housing professionals, and government decision makers throughout California. STEP staff responded to requests for technical assistance from other states as well.
- As a result of presentations made by STEP staff, a work group from the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC) and a committee from the state Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP) licensing staff and committees were formed.

Results of Evaluative Surveys

A series of evaluative surveys revealed overwhelmingly positive findings for all presentations/trainings assessed during Year Two. Findings from the North County Spokesperson Training Part II (April 2007) revealed that all of the respondents agreed that the training had been a valuable experience and that nothing about the training was least useful. The majority of respondents found the discussion of the application of the Fair Housing Amendment Act to be particularly useful and it was suggested that future trainings include role-playing scenarios. The North County Spokesperson Training Part IIA (May 2007) also was rated positively. All of the survey respondents strongly agreed that the training was a valuable experience, that it helped them to better understand the applicability of fair housing information, and they thought that the training would be useful to them in their role as STEP spokespersons.

Findings from a survey administered following the STEP Project Manager's presentation to the Mental Health Services Council (November 2007) also were highly favorable. All of the respondents agreed that the presenter was knowledgeable about the applicability of fair housing to residential mental health facilities and that the presentation materials were useful. The majority of respondents also agreed that the presentation helped them better understand fair housing laws, that the training was a valuable experience, and that they would be able to apply the information from the presentation. Interestingly, all of the respondents indicated that they could benefit from additional information and resources to advocate for enforcement of fair housing laws in their communities.

Lastly, very positive responses were evidenced through the evaluation survey for the Tool Kit Training conducted in April 2008. All of the respondents agreed that the Tool Kit training had been a valuable experience, with the majority of respondents indicating that the training helped them better understand land use issues and fair housing laws. Moreover, respondents also believed that they would be able to apply the information from the training, and that the training workbook/materials were useful.

Findings from Structured Interviews

To gain an in-depth perspective of the impact of the STEP initiative and to obtain perceptions, experiences, lessons learned, and recommendations for similar future initiatives, structured interviews were conducted with 24 individuals representing treatment providers and advocates, county and statewide alcohol and drug administrators, directors of statewide alcohol and drug organizations, key informants to government officials, and consultants to providers and/or local governments.

Findings from the interviews revealed that the majority of informants thought that the promotion of fair housing laws was very important to the STEP initiative and that the majority of persons who "should know" about the implications of fair housing laws for residential providers were not aware of such implications. When asked to comment on the most important "take-away" of the project, almost half of the participants found the fair housing information to be the most useful, and others valued STEP's crime related research, technical assistance, emphasis on understanding laws and local mandates, and collaboration with other entities to bring about change. Additionally, the majority of interviewees reported having used the information and materials provided by STEP. Looking ahead, the majority of informants discussed the need to educate the public and policy makers regarding fair housing laws, the stigma associated with treatment centers, and the legislative process surrounding CUPs. The majority of informants

had positive views about the probability of providers being able to obtain CUPs given the groundwork being laid through the STEP initiative. All of the interviewees expressed a desire to continue working with STEP to increase awareness and enforcement of fair housing laws among providers and within their local governments.

As the initiative neared completion in April 2008, structured interviews were conducted with STEP staff to obtain their perceptions and experiences regarding the project's outcomes, challenges, lessons learned, and suggestions to inform future initiatives. STEP staff indicated that the most significant impact of STEP was the increased level of knowledge about the application of fair housing laws to the initiative. Other significant outcomes included: positive changes to public perceptions and increased dialogue; enhanced understanding regarding the application of fair housing laws and Housing Element; increased incidences of providers pursuing CUPs; changes made to the Room Housing Ordinance in San Diego; work groups being formed from CADPAAC and state DADP licensing staff and committees; and connections made among providers, advocates, local governments, and county and statewide organizations. Looking ahead, interviewees acknowledged that NIMBY still influences decision makers but that progress is being made as more providers are applying fair housing laws as they proceed in their efforts to increase beds and acquire CUPs. STEP staff indicated that pressure needs to be put back on decision makers in effective ways so that they will follow the laws. Staff emphasized that education, media advocacy, extensive training, and a larger-scale working task force was needed to ensure that residential providers for persons with disabilities get a level playing field in the use permitting process and other land use decisions.

Conclusion

The STEP initiative has achieved its purpose, goals, and objectives through its comprehensive approach in engaging in extensive research, collaboration, production of materials and presentations, media advocacy, and community action throughout the two years of the project's implementation. The discovery and greater understanding of the application of fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential treatment programs necessitated modifications to the project's goals and strategies as the initiative progressed. Due to the experience, ability, flexibility, and tenacity of the STEP project staff, along with their comprehensive connections in the community, the initiative evolved into a large-scale community change project promoting the enforcement of fair housing laws to reduce discrimination in land use decisions for service providers of persons with disabilities.

The outcomes and resulting impact of the STEP initiative are far reaching, extending well beyond the original scope of the project. Through multiple channels of education, training, outreach, and advocacy employed by STEP staff and their community partners, change has begun within the public dialogue, perceptions, knowledge levels, and norms governing how service providers and local governments approach the land use decision making process. With the knowledge gained and the momentum built through the current STEP initiative, future projects can extend the initial success of STEP to continue the reduction of discrimination and increase compliance with fair housing laws in land use decisions for residential services for persons with disabilities.

INTRODUCTION

In May 2006, EVALCORP Research & Consulting was contracted by Futures Associates, Inc. to design and conduct an evaluation of the Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (STEP), funded in part by The California Endowment and administered by Futures Associates, Inc. The following report serves as the Year Two Final Evaluation Report, summarizing project accomplishments and evaluation findings from the second year of the initiative (i.e., January 2007 through April 2008).¹

Evolution of the STEP Initiative

In early 2006, Futures Associates, Inc. was awarded a grant through The California Endowment to continue the STEP policy advancement preparedness work begun several years ago. Previously, STEP had identified data supporting this policy advancement which showed that residential alcohol and drug treatment programs were not a threat to the health and safety of surrounding communities. As part of the initiative, project staff and regionally based core planning groups were working to streamline the process for individuals and groups intending to site a treatment facility within a community. STEP was advocating for modifications to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application process for residential alcohol and drug treatment programs throughout San Diego County; more specifically, via the strategic advancement of a policy by local STEP team members to their local governments to adopt the STEP Addendum to the CUP Application for Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs.

During its first year of implementation, STEP staff became aware of the application of fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential alcohol and drug treatment programs. After undergoing extensive independent study and consulting with the Fair Housing Council of San Diego, STEP staff concluded that any local government that bases its denial of a use permit to a residential substance abuse program on NIMBY concerns puts itself at risk for being in violation of fair housing laws. With this knowledge, STEP evolved from a data-driven approach of combating NIMBY by advancing discussions with local decision makers regarding the benefits to communities of residential alcohol and drug treatment programs, to that of changing norms regarding the application for and enforcement of fair housing laws. This required a redefinition of not only the project's goals, but also of its focus and strategies.

Early in its second year of implementation, STEP began integrating fair housing information into its project purpose, objectives, project related materials, and media efforts. STEP continued with its initial approach of advancing its policy agenda of the proposed CUP Addendum, presenting fair housing laws along with other supporting data. The CUP Addendum helped keep the focus of consideration on land use issues and provided an entry point for discussing fair housing laws with planners and decision makers. With the inclusion of the fair housing information, STEP staff made revisions to the CUP Addendum, Spokesperson Trainings, and corresponding media plan.

Whereas the project activities originally focused on local governments within two regional areas (North and East County), with the application of fair housing laws, the scope was expanded to include countywide groups of providers, advocates, and all local governments, even rippling out into organizations statewide. STEP rapidly evolved into a public education project for providers, organizations, funding agencies, and local governments about the application of fair housing laws to land use decisions that was available to providers who worked with persons with

¹ The STEP initiative was granted a four month no-cost extension to continue the project through April 2008.

disabilities and who sought a CUP. Additionally, STEP began providing necessary technical assistance to providers seeking CUPs; many of which were providers who without knowledge of fair housing laws would never seek one knowing the almost certain outcome of having it denied. STEP staff began presenting to these groups and advocates to promote the understanding of fair housing laws and the specific ways in which local governments should be adhering to them.

STEP's Revised Purpose

STEP originated as a data-driven policy initiative intended to counter negative perceptions regarding licensed residential alcohol and drug treatment programs. The overall purposes of the initiative were to:

- ✓ increase public awareness through media and public education efforts regarding the contributions of licensed residential alcohol and drug treatment programs relative to safe communities;
 - ✓ empower community members to influence a shift in perception among local decision makers to one that includes a role for licensed residential treatment programs in their communities; and
 - ✓ prepare community members to advance the STEP policy agenda of the proposed Addendum to the CUP Application to local governments in San Diego County in two pilot regions: North County and East County.
- During its second year of implementation, however, STEP modified its purpose to concentrate more on the application of fair housing laws than on advancing the policy agenda of the proposed CUP Addendum, with the purpose of promoting local governments' compliance with fair housing laws. STEP evolved into a community change project aimed at increasing the ability of residential alcohol and drug treatment providers to obtain CUPs for the siting of new and expanded residential treatment programs via local governments' adherence to fair housing laws.

Goals and Objectives

Initially, two primary goals were established for the STEP initiative: (1) to prepare two Regional STEP Teams in San Diego County, with 3-5 primary spokespersons/representatives from each regional area, and (2) to train spokespersons to speak to local governments to advance a policy of adopting STEP's Addendum to the CUP Application for Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs. The overall operational objectives of the project were to:

1. Establish **Regional STEP Teams** (i.e., East County and combined North County Inland and North County Coastal) to create and define a policy agenda tailored to their region, and to become active advocates to advance the policy agenda by being spokespersons at city council and/or county planning meetings. Develop a training needs inventory and STEP briefing book, and provide training as needed to all planning group members.
2. Develop a **strategic plan** for policy promotion in each region. Incorporate new and updated data, changes in local governments, new health and safety policy initiatives, and identification of those local governments and officials who can provide the best leverage in influencing peers in neighboring jurisdictions.
3. Design a **media plan** for each region, targeting both decision-makers and community members with key messages relating to the need for CUP revision and the benefits of treatment facilities. Generate at least five media pieces each year to increase community awareness and promote the STEP policy agenda.

4. Convene **quarterly project briefings** in each region to monitor progress, revise and provide additional training, and amend strategic and media plans based on newly identified policy influences and reaction to previous media coverage.
5. **Convene the Regional STEP Teams** at least three times during the funding period to share data and lessons learned, refine and coordinate media strategies, and identify opportunities to leverage one another's work.
6. Develop a **tool kit** for the replication of the STEP advocacy efforts for dissemination to other advocates in California. The tool kit will include tips for crafting effective media messages, training components, and challenges/successes of working in community planning groups. This tool kit is to be disseminated to at least 50 providers/counties in California.

Along with the purpose of the initiative, STEP's goals shifted during the second year of implementation to reflect the application and enforcement of fair housing laws. The overarching goal of STEP evolved into changing the norm for both providers and local government decision makers as to how they approach the use permit process for residential alcohol and drug treatment providers and promote the compliance of fair housing laws. The revised goals of the initiative were stated as follows:

- Local decision makers follow the spirit and letter of fair housing laws during the permitting process.
- Land use decisions made by municipal and county governments regarding residential alcohol and drug treatment programs are free from discriminatory practices.
- Local residential alcohol and drug providers and their community advocates know how to employ fair housing laws in the permit process and in other land-use considerations.

By its completion, the project had expanded beyond the CUP Application process for residential alcohol and other drug treatment programs to encompass land use issues for other residential services for persons with disabilities. The overall goal of STEP had culminated into:

- A community change project that seeks to reduce discrimination in land use against housing and other residential services for persons with disabilities, and to change the norms governing how treatment providers and local governments approach the land use decision-making process.

Outcomes

In addition to the project goals and objectives, a shift also occurred in the three outcomes that were expected to be accomplished over the two-year term of the STEP initiative. The project outcomes are listed below:

1. Inclusion of objective data to inform decision-making among local governments and media for Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) to expand licensed residential treatment in the targeted communities.
2. To inform providers, advocates, funders, regulatory agencies, and local government representatives of the specifics of how fair housing laws apply to residential facilities for persons with disabilities in order to promote compliance with those laws.
3. Increased competency of providers, advocates, and collaborators in the target regions to be advocates for reducing discrimination in land use decisions.

EVALUATION DESIGN

A comprehensive formative evaluation design was used to assess the implementation and corresponding outcomes of the STEP initiative. The purpose of a formative evaluation is to help shape a project's development and strengthen the implementation of newer or pilot initiatives, such as STEP, through the use of evaluative data fed back to project stakeholders at regular intervals. The evaluation approach was participatory; thus, STEP staff was involved throughout the process and took an active role in shaping data collection instruments, identifying key informants, and interpreting evaluative findings.

Evaluation Research Questions

The primary questions investigated through the evaluation included:

- What changes or modifications were made to the project's initial goals, objectives, outcomes, and/or implementation plan?
- Were any challenges/barriers/opposition encountered during the STEP's implementation? If so, how were they overcome?
- To what extent did STEP achieve its goals, objectives, and intended outcomes?
- What were the primary lessons learned, and what are recommendations for replication of similar initiatives in the future?

Year Two Data Collection Strategies

Various strategies were utilized throughout STEP's two-year term to collect evaluative data and answer the research questions posed for the study. Given the emerging nature of the project, along with STEP's objective to disseminate learnings and findings from the initiative with other counties and providers, it was determined that an evaluation plan relying primarily on qualitative inquiry and data collection techniques would be most appropriate. The evaluation plan called for document reviews, observational methods, survey research, and structured interviews with key informants and STEP staff.

Document Reviews

From the onset of the evaluation, comprehensive reviews of all project related documents have taken place, as well as an examination of publications/information developed during STEP's initial funding period several years ago. Examples of the types of documents/materials that have been used to inform the evaluation during the second year of implementation included: STEP Revised Addendum to CUP Application (see Appendix A); STEP Fact Sheets; STEP FAQ Sheets; STEP Message Triangles; STEP Facility Type Matrix; STEP Interim Grant Report Forms to The California Endowment; all Regional STEP Team meeting agendas and minutes; North County Spokesperson Training Part II and IIA materials; STEP presentation to the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC); STEP Tool Kit Training materials; Federal Fair Housing Act Amendment; Housing Element Law Requirements; Op-Ed media pieces; and other pertinent research/literature and data collected by STEP staff. Including and in addition to the above mentioned materials, reviews were done of all documents produced by STEP (see Appendix B) and a sampling of all presentations produced by STEP (see Appendix C).

Observational Methods

As part of the evaluation strategy, evaluators participated in Regional STEP Team meetings, North County Spokesperson Trainings, and the Tool Kit Training that was held during the project's second year of implementation. During each meeting and training session, the evaluators participated unobtrusively and made evaluative observations. Following each meeting and/or training, a set of "Evaluator Process Notes" were developed and shared with STEP staff. This information served as a running log chronicling the activities, accomplishments, and any challenges experienced.

Survey Research

Questionnaires were developed to obtain feedback from attendees of the North County Spokesperson Training Part II held in Vista, CA in April 2007 (see Appendix D), the North County Spokesperson Training Part IIA held in Escondido, CA in May 2007 (see Appendix E), and the Tool Kit Training in April 2008 (see Appendix F). The training surveys each contained nine open- and closed-ended items that assessed the extent to which the training was perceived as relevant and informative to participants. The surveys were also used to measure the types of things that participants had learned, which components of the training were deemed most and least useful, whether attendees had applied what they had learned, whether they would recommend the training to others, and to obtain any suggestions to improve future trainings. The Spokesperson Training surveys were administered online immediately following the trainings. Survey findings from the initial Spokesperson Training were used by the STEP Project Manager in the development of subsequent Spokesperson Trainings. The Tool Kit Training survey was administered on paper at the end of the training. Similarly, feedback from the Tool Kit Training survey was provided to the STEP Project Manager.

An additional survey was developed to assess the impact of a presentation made by the STEP Project Manager to the Mental Health Services Housing Council in November 2007 regarding the application of fair housing laws to residential mental health facilities (see Appendix G). The survey consisted of 10 open- and closed-ended items asking respondents to indicate their levels of agreement about things such as the presenters' knowledge of fair housing laws as they applied to residential mental health facilities, the perceived usefulness of the training and the training materials/handouts, and whether or not the participants desired further information or resources. Although the survey was intended for paper copy distribution immediately following the presentation, time constraints did not allow for the administration of the survey. The following week an online version of the survey was developed and a link to the survey was sent via email to attendees of the presentation.

Structured Interviews

A Key Informant Interview Protocol was developed for the Year Two series of structured interviews with key informants. The 24 key informants who participated in the interviews included representatives from the Regional STEP Teams, treatment advocates and providers, directors of statewide alcohol and drug programs, county and statewide alcohol and drug program administrators, key informants to government officials, and consultants to providers or local governments. Key informants were asked a total of 10 questions, all of which were open-ended. Questions asked during the interview were categorized into one of four sections, which included: (1) Involvement with the STEP Initiative, (2) Importance of STEP, (3) Lessons Learned, and (4) Looking Ahead. All of the interviews completed with key informants were conducted by phone. A copy of the Key Informant Interview Protocol is included in Appendix H.

In addition to the key informants mentioned above, STEP staff members were also interviewed to evaluate the significant impacts, outcomes, challenges, and lessons learned throughout the implementation of the STEP initiative. The STEP staff interviews, which consisted of 10 open-ended questions, were conducted by phone with the STEP Project Manager and in person with the Executive Director. A copy of the STEP Staff Interview Protocol is given in Appendix I.

FINDINGS

The following sections address the research questions and highlight findings from the evaluation data collection strategies employed during year two of the STEP initiative.² First, significant accomplishments made during the second year of STEP's implementation are outlined and discussed. Then the results of the follow-up surveys from the Spokesperson Training Part II, Spokesperson Training Part IIA, Tool Kit Training, and the Mental Health Services Housing Council Presentation are reviewed. Finally, the findings from interviews with key informants and STEP staff are reported.

Year Two Accomplishments

During the second year of STEP's implementation, the initiative's objectives expanded beyond a regional approach to combating NIMBY against residential alcohol and drug treatment programs when it integrated the application and enforcement of federal fair housing laws into its policy advancement of the CUP Addendum. As the scope of the STEP initiative expanded, modifications were necessary to the project's goals and activities. The focus moved beyond the two local project areas and beyond advancing the CUP Addendum, with even greater emphasis on the research, documents/materials, presentations, technical assistance, and outreach efforts required in order to educate local, county, and statewide government officials, decision makers, regulatory agencies, and treatment providers of the applicability of fair housing laws to land use decisions for residential treatment programs. Additionally, STEP expanded from a focus on residential alcohol and drug programs to include residential facilities for other persons with disabilities.

The overall accomplishments achieved during year two included: extensive and comprehensive research activities pertaining to federal fair housing laws, state Housing Element law, crime related research and proximity scan; the Regional STEP Teams (RST) advocacy activities (regarding the Revised CUP Addendum and The Fellowship Center's CUP Application to the City of Oceanside); the North County Regional STEP Team Spokesperson Trainings and Tool Kit Training conducted; numerous documents produced and media tool kit developed; multiple presentations delivered around the state of California; and the local, county and statewide outreach efforts and technical assistance provided by STEP staff. Each of these areas of accomplishment is discussed in further detail below.

Research and Data Collected

Fair Housing Amendment. In the latter part of the first year of implementation, STEP staff became educated about federal fair housing laws. The Fair Housing Amendments Act (FHAA) of 1988 added protections against discrimination in housing for persons with disabilities, which included housing for residential programs. Research into the subject led to a realization that more expert help was needed. STEP entered a small Consulting Agreement with the Fair Housing Council of San Diego to assist in sorting through both the fair housing law and the case

² See the STEP Year One Interim Evaluation Report (May 2007) for a summary of Year One accomplishments.

law relevant to the use permitting process for residential treatment programs. STEP concluded that any local government that bases its denial of a use permit to a residential substance abuse program on NIMBY concerns puts itself at risk for being in violation of fair housing laws as the FHAA prohibits discrimination against substance abusers and those with mental health conditions living in group homes or residential treatment programs. This realization was a significant accomplishment as most residential treatment providers, local government decision makers, regulatory agencies, and even some fair housing consultants were unaware of the applicability of fair housing laws to residential treatment programs.

In early 2007, STEP staff re-engineered the project's purpose and goals to apply the fair housing information. After talking with fair housing lawyers and advocates from around the country, STEP gained efficacy in using fair housing information, revising the project's approaches, media tool kit, and outreach efforts to highlight information on fair housing laws as they applied to the CUP process and other land use decisions. As the fair housing information was integrated into the project goals and talking points, an enforcement element was introduced that had been previously missing from the project. When talking with local government officials and decision makers, STEP staff discovered that most government representatives were unaware of the applicability of fair housing laws to the CUP process. Although project staff found two planners who were aware of how fair housing laws applied to land use and zoning issues for persons with disabilities, they were unable to find any city managers or elected officials with knowledge about the application of fair housing laws to the siting process for residential alcohol and drug treatment facilities.

STEP began addressing the invisibility of fair housing advocacy regarding how fair housing laws apply to residential facilities in the nearly 20 years since they were enacted. This led to another shift in the project's objectives that occurred in early 2008, when the project evolved from the goal of policy preparedness for the advancement of the CUP Addendum to that of the promotion of the understanding and compliance of fair housing laws among local government decision makers. STEP staff collaborated with the Fair Housing Council of San Diego to establish, for the first time, a land use tract for persons with disabilities presented at the 2008 Annual Fair Housing Conference.

California Housing Element law. Near the end of 2007 just as STEP was getting a handle on the application of fair housing laws, the project discovered another component, the state Housing Element, that was necessary to learn about to understand its applicability. The mandated Housing Element update requires that all local governments in the state (1) must identify and eliminate all discriminatory land use policies, and (2) must implement reasonable accommodation procedures. Implementation for this law is to be completed by between 2008 and 2010 depending upon the state mandated schedule for completion. As with fair housing laws, STEP was educating providers, advocates, organizations, and government decision makers about how to work with Housing Element law on a local, county and statewide basis. In particular, the Tool Kit Training provided background information and supportive materials on the Housing Element.

Crime Related Research and Proximity Scan. When opposing the development of residential treatment centers, a primary NIMBY concern expressed by community members is that the centers would have a detrimental impact on community health and property values, and would lead to increased levels of crime. Although anecdotal evidence did not support the NIMBY concerns, STEP recognized the need for research and data to address these inaccurate stigmas associated with residential alcohol and drug treatment programs. To combat community and government decision makers' concerns that a residential alcohol and drug treatment center

should not be located near any school or park where children would congregate, STEP designed and conducted a proximity scan of all 76 licensed residential treatment centers in San Diego County to determine the number of services where children gather that were located within a two-block radius of residential treatment centers. The scan was designed to demonstrate that many local treatment centers were near services for children with no known detrimental outcomes. The findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of Children’s Services within a Two Block Radius of the 76 Licensed Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Centers in San Diego County

Type of Community Service	Number	Percentage
Schools	50	66%
Places of Worship	70	92%
Community & Recreation Centers	33	43%
Parks	23	30%
Child/Day Care Centers & Pre-schools	37	49%
Youth Centers	28	37%

Findings from the proximity scan indicated that residential treatment centers, any of which had been in the present locations from 20 to 50 years, did not contribute to neighborhood problems. This supported the comprehensive review of state and national research done by STEP staff in which no studies were found that linked residential alcohol and drug treatment programs to an increase in crime or a decrease in property values as the NIMBY stigmas indicated. However, several existing studies revealed a direct relationship between alcohol outlets and crime in which an increased concentration of alcohol outlets is related to increased crime. Findings from the proximity scan and crime related research were added to STEP’s talking points for discussion with local government representatives, community members, and the media.

Regional STEP Teams

With the evolution of the project’s goals, the North County Regional STEP Team continued to meet as needed, meeting monthly through the summer of 2007 but not as often since that time. Much of the team’s emphasis was on two issues: (1) better understanding of fair housing laws and how to apply that knowledge to the project goal of making it easier for residential alcohol and drug treatment providers to site programs, and (2) the provision of technical assistance to all parties involved in The Fellowship Center’s (TFC) CUP application to the City of Oceanside.

Because most of the North County RST members had previous experience advancing policies to their respective local governments, their knowledge of local decision makers helped shape STEP’s and TFC’s approaches, and helped obtain meetings with city council representatives to discuss the CUP process, application of fair housing laws, and community dynamics. RST members assisted in the strategizing, message development, writing and soliciting Letters to the Editor, and identification of key contacts. For example, one member arranged meetings with the Director of Community Development and the Director of Planning in the City of Escondido. Due to the member’s long standing relationship with city staff and elected officials, STEP was able to have an in-depth, informal discussion about fair housing laws and that city’s planning practices. One outcome of that meeting was advice taken on necessary revisions to the CUP Addendum. In another instance, the Planning Director for the City of Vista agreed to adopt the STEP

Addendum to the CUP Application for administrative use by the planning department. The forms were distributed at the planning counter to anyone seeking a CUP for a residential alcohol and drug program in that city. The North County RST members also helped promulgate STEP/TFC talking points among Oceanside residents who were open to receiving data regarding a more accurate impact of a residential alcohol and drug treatment program on a community.

Due to the reluctance of two East County collaboratives to participate in STEP, the East County RST never really formed. However, two East County collaboratives in El Caidon and Lemon Grove did agree to participate. Furthermore, Lemon Grove adopted STEP's CUP Addendum. STEP staff concluded during year two that an RST was no longer a critical component for effective organization or promotion of the project work since it expanded beyond a regional approach. It was far more effective for STEP to identify key Local Government Planning Groups (LPGP) or those who have access or ways to get access to decision makers in project-targeted local governments.

Spokesperson and Tool Kit Trainings

North County RST Spokesperson Trainings. Following up on the first North County RST Spokesperson Training that took place in year one, STEP staff developed and facilitated two additional three-hour Spokesperson Trainings with the North County RST in the second year of implementation. Delivered in April 2007, the Spokesperson Training Part II concentrated on the integration of information on fair housing laws, outlining STEP's modified strategy of using fair housing laws to support a residential alcohol and drug treatment provider's CUP application. Participants were given STEP's new purpose statement, applied data and research findings, and key talking points. Results from surveys evaluating the Spokesperson Training Part II were used in the development of the subsequent training. In May 2007, the Spokesperson Training Part IIA focused on ensuring that the North County RST spokespersons had a firm grasp on project talking points and the supporting data by having the participants apply them in role-playing scenarios. Participants were also given literature on the Fair Housing Amendments Act, an updated Message Triangle, and key talking points. Both trainings were interactive and allowed time for questions and answers, observations, and participant feedback on the training. Results of surveys evaluating both Spokesperson Trainings are discussed in further detail in the subsequent sections.

Tool Kit Training. As a culmination of the STEP initiative, a Tool Kit Training was developed and presented by the STEP Project Manager in April 2008. With a comprehensive Tool Kit workbook given to participants, the training provided an overview of the STEP Project, research and data on property values and crime, land use issues for residential care or treatment programs and supportive housing, fair housing laws, discriminatory intent and impact, reasonable accommodation, California Housing Element law, and community action. Participants included residential service providers for alcohol and drug treatment programs, mental health programs, and other supportive living programs for persons with disabilities, as well as advocates, county health services staff, developers, and city planners. The training was interactive and allowed time for questions and answers, participant discussion, and an exchange of resources and information among participants and the facilitator. Subsequent sections will discuss the results from the survey evaluating the Tool Kit Training.

Briefing Books and Tool Kit

STEP Briefing Books and a Tool Kit were developed as part of the materials for use during (and after) both of the North County RST Spokesperson Trainings and the Tool Kit Training. These publications were comprehensive workbooks containing information covered during the trainings, along with all of the data and ‘helpful hints’ about how best to inform decision makers about the application of the fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential alcohol and drug treatment programs, mental health programs, and other supportive living programs for persons with disabilities and their advocates. According to surveys evaluating the trainings, participants said that the content covered in the Spokesperson Training Briefing Books and Tool Kit Training was meaningful and would serve as a useful reference guide.

In addition to the STEP Briefing Books and Tool Kit, numerous documents were created by STEP staff to help educate local government representatives, residential service providers and advocates, county and state alcohol and drug program administrators, and the general public on the applicability of fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential service providers. Some of the documents produced during year two include: a revised *Addendum to CUP Application*, three *Message Triangles*, an *updated STEP FAQ Sheet*, an *updated STEP Fact Sheet*, *Residential/Facility Matrix*, Proximity Scan Results, A Call to Action for Advocates of Sober Living and Supportive Housing for the Mentally Ill and Other Persons with Disabilities in the City of San Diego, and the STEP Tool Kit.

Along with the STEP Briefing Books and other documentation produced to support the STEP initiative, the following media outputs were generated during the second year of implementation:

- A February 2007 program on fair housing on “These Days” that featured Jeanne McAlister of MITE, Mary Scott Knoll of the Fair Housing Council of San Diego, and the STEP Project Manager, Deborah Parker.
- A June 2007 Op-Ed piece on fair housing in the *Union Tribune* written by STEP and authored by John Richardson, Vice President of Mental Health Systems, and Mary Scott Knoll of the Fair Housing Council of San Diego.
- A series of STEP generated Letters to the Editor were published in support of the above Op-Ed.
- An editorial board meeting with the *North County Times* supporting The Fellowship Center’s CUP application.
- A Fall 2007 Op-Ed piece in the *North County Times* written by STEP Project Manager, Deborah Parker.
- A series of STEP generated Letters to the Editor supporting The Fellowship Center from opposition by local mobile home park residents.
- The Futures Associates, Inc. website distributing STEP information and materials.

Presentations and Technical Assistance

With the application of fair housing laws to the initiative, STEP evolved into a public education project for providers, advocates, and local governments about enforcement available to providers who worked with persons with disabilities and seek a CUP. As news of the project spread, STEP received requests to speak with various organizations at the local, county, and state level. The Fair Housing Council of San Diego asked STEP to present at the Annual Fair

Housing Conference in February 2007 on how the project had changed course to employ fair housing laws. STEP found that some of the fair housing advocates and government representatives in attendance were not aware of the application of fair housing to land use issues for residential programs.

Similarly, participants were also unfamiliar with fair housing information when STEP presented at the San Diego Alcohol and Drug Services Providers Association (ADSPA) in March 2007 and at the San Diego Re-Entry Roundtable the next month. As the word spread, the California Association of Addiction Recovery Resources (CAARR) requested a STEP presentation on fair housing laws at their statewide meeting held in Orange County in April 2007. Providers in attendance were incredulous that fair housing laws applied so specifically to siting additional recovery programs. Among the participants was the Director of the Licensing Division for the State Department of Alcohol and Drugs (DADP) who was unaware of most of the information presented. As a result, the Director asked the STEP Project Manager to present to the DADP Licensing staff and statewide licensing committee in May 2007.

One outcome at that meeting was the removal of a recently added DADP licensing requirement for a CUP due to it being redundant to local requirements and burdensome to providers who had been in business long before many local governments required CUPs. Another outcome was to discover that the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC) did not know of the potential power of fair housing laws. After CADPAAC arranged to have STEP present at their September 2007 quarterly meeting, members were encouraged about the application of fair housing laws and wanted to know more about how they could use this information in their counties. Similar to outcomes from previous presentations, when STEP presented to another statewide organization at the California Conference on Alcohol Problems (CCAP) in October 2007, it led to numerous requests for technical assistance around the state from providers, county administrators, and even elected officials.

Expanding beyond residential alcohol and drug treatment providers and organizations, STEP staff cultivated contacts with and provided technical assistance to residential mental health service providers and other providers of congregant or supportive living programs for persons with disabilities. When presenting at the Mental Health Services Housing Council in November 2007, STEP found that the participants were also unaware of the potential of fair housing laws to combat NIMBY and apply reasonable accommodation. As a result of this presentation, the San Diego County Mental Health Administrator assisted STEP in making key contacts in the mental health field and paved the way for STEP to present to the statewide Mental Health Administrators Association in 2008. Other presentations were made by STEP to organizations across the state in 2008, including presentations to the Fair Housing Council and the San Diego Re-Entry Roundtable in February, and to the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency and the Sacramento County Expansion in April 2008.

In addition to the above mentioned presentations, STEP has performed considerable outreach and provided technical assistance to various organizations and residential providers to promulgate the use of STEP knowledge and materials, and to encourage their use in community action. Throughout the implementation of the project, STEP staff has worked in conjunction with the Institute for Public Strategies (IPS) East County Communities Change Project to develop and co-facilitate a community meeting and supportive materials to bring about more effective ways for community groups to deal with poorly managed sober living residences and/or other supportive living residences that do not violate fair housing and other relevant land use laws. STEP has also provided ongoing technical assistance to a committee that was formed

specifically to promote treatment expansion in their own counties as a result of the May 2007 presentation to the statewide DADP licensing staff and committees.

Much of the practical application of the project's research and materials has occurred through STEP's technical assistance to residential alcohol and drug treatment providers who seek CUPs, as well as to other service providers who would previously be unlikely to seek CUPs knowing the almost certain outcome of having it denied. The following are a few examples of how STEP strategies and technical assistance has had an impact on outcomes in three cities in San Diego county:

- After being involved in the STEP initiative, The Fellowship Center changed its CUP advancement strategy in the City of Oceanside from combating NIMBYism to promoting adherence to fair housing laws. Upon meeting resistance and being denied approval for the CUP, TFC has retained a fair housing attorney to represent them in the advancement of their CUP.
- An eldercare provider in Vista who sought to expand his facility from 6 to 10 beds was previously denied the CUP for NIMBY reasons. Upon hearing STEP's message, he realized his rights had been violated and contacted the San Diego Fair Housing Council who put him in touch with a fair housing attorney. The provider's attorney successfully advanced his proposed bed increase through reasonable accommodation in lieu of the CUP process.
- The City of San Diego proposed a Rooming Housing Ordinance to control the proliferation of "mini-dorms" in the area surrounding San Diego State University (SDSU). Because the ordinance as written could potentially having a detrimental effect on sober living and other supportive living residences, STEP began discussions with the Deputy City Attorney and her staff regarding the fair housing laws and state Housing Element. The Deputy City Attorney agreed to change the ordinance to state that housing for persons with disabilities as defined by federal and state Fair Housing Acts, would be exempt from the ordinance, including sober living residences and supportive housing for the mentally ill.

Furthermore, the San Diego Regional Task Force on the Homeless is determining how fair housing laws may apply to their clientele and other local treatment providers, including the Volunteers of America, and they are much closer to applying for CUPs than they were before. STEP staff has also received numerous requests for technical assistance from other counties in California as well as from other states regarding the initiative.

Trainings and Presentations Evaluated

As mentioned in prior sections, STEP staff designed and facilitated two Spokesperson Trainings with the North County Regional STEP team and a Tool Kit Training during the second year of implementation. The Spokesperson Training Part II was held in April 2007 in Vista, CA, the Spokesperson Training Part IIA was held in May 2007 in Escondido, CA, and the Tool Kit Training took place in April 2008 in San Diego, CA. Surveys were developed and administered after each of these trainings to inform STEP staff about the trainings' ability to help participants understand the application of fair housing laws and about participant needs that could be addressed in future trainings. For similar reasons, a survey was also administered following a presentation made in November 2007 by the STEP Project Manager to the Mental Health Services Housing Council. Although surveys were typically not administered for STEP's presentations, an evaluation of this particular presentation was desired as the topic was

expanded to include the application of fair housing laws to residential mental health facilities. The findings from each of the above mentioned surveys are discussed in detail below.

Spokesperson Training Survey Methodology and Content

In order to determine the impact of the trainings on participants, as well as to learn how best to improve future trainings, online surveys were designed and administered to participants of the second and third Spokesperson Trainings. Following each Spokesperson Training, a list of participants was generated by the STEP Project Manager and provided to the evaluators so that the survey link could be sent via email to potential respondents. The content of the surveys included five likert-scale items asking respondents to indicate their levels of agreement about things such as the presenters' ability to communicate information, the usefulness of the training content and materials/handouts, and the training's ability to help participants understand the applicability of the fair housing laws to the STEP initiative. A five-point scale was used to obtain agreement levels (i.e., ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). In addition to the closed-ended survey items, a total of four open-ended items were included. The open-ended survey questions assessed what was most and least useful about the training and asked respondents to share their suggestions for improving future trainings and any additional comments.

Results from Spokesperson Training Part II

The North County STEP Spokesperson Training Part II "Talking with Decision Makers and the Media" that was conducted in April 2007 in Vista, CA was attended by five participants. A total of four surveys were returned, resulting in an 80 percent response rate.

Ratings on Training Content. Participants' ratings on all items assessed were highly positive. As seen in Table 2, all (100%) of the survey respondents either *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the presenter was easily understood and that the training materials/handouts were useful. All respondents also agreed that the content of the training contributed to their ability to understand the applicability of fair housing laws to the STEP initiative and was useful in their roles as STEP spokespersons. Furthermore, all (100%) of the survey respondents rated the training highly as a valuable experience overall.

Table 2. Levels of Agreement Regarding Training Content

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenter communicated in a way that was easy to understand.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%
The training materials/handouts were useful.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
The content of the training will be useful to my role as a STEP spokesperson.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%
The training helped me to better understand the applicability of FHAA laws to the STEP initiative.	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%

Most Useful Aspects of Training. In order to ensure that future trainings met the needs of STEP spokespersons, participants were asked to share what they felt was most useful to them about the training. The majority of the respondents found the most value in the discussion on

the application of the Fair Housing Amendment Act to the STEP initiative. The comments included:

- “Discussions on FHAA and how it applies to STEP, key talking points, and ideas for how to get our message across.”
- “The information about the FHA and how it pertains to land that needs to be re-zoned for multiple housing.”
- “Discussing application of fair housing laws and how that changes the context of the STEP project.”
- “Content of information. Planning of a coordinated strategy to present to a multitude of recipients (municipalities, agencies, boards, etc.).”

Least Useful Aspects of Training. When asked what was least useful to them about the training, all (100%) of the respondents indicated that nothing was least useful.

Suggestions for Improvement. In an effort to develop future trainings that are maximally useful to participants, the survey asked respondents to provide any suggestions that they had for the follow up Spokesperson Training in May 2007. Twenty five percent of the respondents offered no suggestions. Of those who did offer suggestions, the majority stated that it would be beneficial if the future training provided an opportunity for spokespersons to role-play scenarios to practice what they had learned. One respondent also indicated that training participants should take the initiative to review fair housing information and materials prior to the training.

Additional Comments. The final item on the survey welcomed any additional comments or input about the training. One of the survey respondents listed no additional comments. The comments from the other respondents are listed below:

- “Write the response to re-zoning Fellowship Center land.”
- “This is such a small group and a complicated issue, so I have concerns about my ability to be an effective spokesperson.”
- “We need to play out a mock presentation.”

Results from Spokesperson Training Part IIA

A total of five participants attended the North County STEP Spokesperson Training Part IIA “Talking with Decision Makers and the Media” that was held in Escondido, CA in May 2007. With three surveys completed, the response rate was 75 percent.

Ratings on Training Content. All of the survey respondents gave the training the highest possible rating on all items assessed. As Table 3 demonstrates, all (100%) of the survey respondents *strongly agreed* that the presenter communicated in an understandable manner and that the training provided useful materials/handouts. All respondents also *strongly agreed* that the content of the training was useful in their roles as STEP spokespersons and contributed to their ability to understand how the Fair Housing Amendment Act applied to the STEP initiative. Similarly, all (100%) of the survey respondents *strongly agreed* that the training was a valuable experience overall.

Table 3. Levels of Agreement Regarding Training Content

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenter communicated in a way that was easy to understand.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The training materials/handouts were useful.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The content of the training will be useful to my role as a STEP spokesperson.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The training helped me to better understand the applicability of FHAA laws to the STEP initiative.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Most Useful Aspects of Training. Participants were asked what was most useful to them about the training to inform the development of future STEP Spokesperson Trainings if deemed necessary. The survey respondents each found different components of the training to be most useful. Their comments included:

- “Role playing different scenarios.”
- “Discussion about how the issue should be presented and what points should be avoided.”
- “Learning what ‘Reasonable Accommodation’ means.”

Least Useful Aspects of Training. All (100%) of the respondents were unable to find any aspect of the training which was least useful when asked to comment on what was least useful to them about the training.

Moving Forward. In an effort to assess the proficiency levels and future needs of the North County spokespersons, the survey asked respondents what they needed from the STEP Project Manager to effectively communicate with decision makers and/or the media about STEP. The respondents’ comments were as follows:

- “Continue to keep consistent with content, delivery and methods of communication.”
- “Joint visits with decision makers to build confidence and comfort level.”
- “Just the great direction she gives us.”

Additional Comments. When encouraged to give any additional comments or input about the training at the end of the survey, only one respondent provided a comment stating that it was “Very exciting, great teamwork, very worthwhile.”

Tool Kit Training Survey Methodology and Content

A paper survey was developed and administered to participants immediately following the STEP Tool Kit Training to evaluate the impact of the training on participants and to gather feedback on how to improve future trainings. The survey included six likert-scale items asking respondents to indicate their levels of agreement about things such as the usefulness of the training workbook/materials, the training’s ability to help participants better understand land use issues and fair housing laws, and the participants’ ability to apply the information from the training. A five-point scale was used to obtain agreement levels (i.e., ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). In addition to the closed-ended survey items, a total of three open-ended

items were included. The open-ended survey questions assessed what was most useful about the training, what else participants needed to effectively communicate with local government decision makers about discriminatory land use regulations and practices, and asked respondents to share any additional comments.

Results from Tool Kit Training

There were 33 attendees at the onset of the Tool Kit Training “Ending Discrimination in Land Use.” However, as several participants had to leave early due to work obligations, there were only 21 participants in attendance at the end of the training when the surveys were administered. Nineteen of the 21 surveys handed out were returned, resulting in a 90 percent response rate.

Ratings on Training Content. Participants’ ratings were predominantly positive on all items assessed. All (100%) of the survey respondents either *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the presenters were easily understood, the training workbook/materials were useful, and the training was a valuable experience overall. Although 11% of the participants were neutral in their opinion, most (88%) participants agreed that they would be able to use and/or apply the information from the training and that the content of the training helped them better understand land use issues and fair housing laws as they apply to housing and residential services for persons with disabilities.

Table 3. Levels of Agreement Regarding Training Content

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenters communicated in a way that was easy to understand.	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%
The training workbook/materials were useful.	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%
The training helped me to better understand land use issues and fair housing laws as they apply to housing and residential services for persons with disabilities.	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%
The training gave me the tools needed to effectively communicate with local government staff and decision makers on potential discriminatory land use regulations and practices.	78%	11%	11%	0%	0%
I will be able to use/apply the information from the training.	83%	6%	11%	0%	0%
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%

Most Useful Aspects of Training. In order to ensure that future Tool Kit Trainings are useful and meet the needs of residential service providers and advocates for alcohol and other drug programs, mental health programs, seniors programs, and other congregant and supportive living programs for persons with disabilities, as well as county health services staff, developers and city planners, Tool Kit Training participants were asked to share what they felt was most useful to them about the training. The majority (74%) found the general or specific material presented on land use and fair housing laws to be of most use, 16% found the materials to be most useful, and 10% stated that it was useful to become aware that they needed to learn more about land use law. Sample comments included the following:

- “General information.”
- “Information provided in the presentation.”
- “Understanding my rights on land use.”
- “Learning about land use law.”
- “Fair housing law and Housing Element.”
- “The ‘six and under’ rule.”
- “Sober living info; how to contact proper people in regards to law.”
- “The contacts and the informational overview.”
- “The booklet gave plenty of information. The instructions explained all the details.”
- “Workbook.”
- “That I need to keep learning.”

What Else Was Needed. When asked what else was needed for participants to communicate effectively with local government staff and decision makers about discriminatory land use regulations and practices for residential providers for persons with disabilities, a total of 10 responses were given with four participants (45%) wanting contact information or an appointment with someone to go to for assistance, two participants (22%) not knowing what else was needed, two participants (22%) requesting no additional information and indicating that they could use the information provided, and one participant (11%) requesting additional materials. Respondents’ comments included:

- “Who are the people to talk to? Where do we start?”
- “Know who and where to go to for help.”
- “Ongoing office, consulting etc. or a person on the council who will do that for the public in specific situations without necessarily giving legal advice.”
- “Not sure yet!”
- “I feel a much better understanding and ability to read and interpret the laws.”
- “Creating a pamphlet to give them.”

Additional Comments. The final item on the survey welcomed any additional comments or input about the training. The majority (91%) of the responses were positive, thanking the presenter and/or commenting on the presenter’s abilities along with other suggestions. One (9%) of the responses was negative, stating that the room was uncomfortable. Sample comments from the respondents are listed below:

- “Thank you for your time and effort to educate us in our rights.”
- “Thank you so much for your good work!”
- “You are such a great presenter, very useful.”
- “Fabulous speaker, incredibly informative, thorough and interesting.”
- “Excellent job! It would be useful to have global page numbers and refer to them for greater ease in following along.”
- “Really well done!”
- “This room is just a pain to sit in. Stuffy, hot and uncomfy chairs.”

Mental Health Presentation Survey Methodology and Content

A survey was designed to assess the impact of a presentation made by the STEP Project Manager to the Mental Health Services Housing Council in November 2007 regarding the application of fair housing laws to residential mental health facilities. Although the survey was intended for paper copy distribution immediately following the presentation, time constraints did not allow for the administration of the survey. The following week an online version of the survey

was developed and a link to the survey was sent via email to the presentation participants. The content of the survey consisted of seven likert-scale items asking respondents to indicate their levels of agreement about things such as the presenters' knowledge of the fair housing laws as they applied to residential mental health facilities, the usefulness of the training and the training materials/handouts, and whether or not the participants desired further information or resources. A five-point scale was used to obtain agreement levels (i.e., ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). Following the closed-ended survey items, an additional three open-ended items were included. The open-ended survey questions evaluated what was most useful and valuable about the presentation and solicited additional comments or suggestions from the respondents.

Results from the Mental Health Presentation Survey

The STEP Project Manager's presentation to the Mental Health Services Housing Council was attended by an estimated audience of 25 individuals. Because the presentation was cut short due to time constraints, the survey was not administered immediately as intended. Instead the participants were asked to complete the online survey the following week. A total of five surveys were returned, resulting in a 20 percent response rate. The abbreviated nature of the presentation and/or the delayed administration of the survey may have contributed to the low response rate.

Ratings on Presentation Content. Survey respondents rated the presentation positively on all items. As seen in Table 4, all (100%) of the survey respondents either *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that the presenter was knowledgeable about the application of fair housing laws to residential mental facilities and that the presentation-related materials/handouts were useful. Eighty percent of the respondents agreed that the presentation was useful, valuable, and helped them better understand the applicability of fair housing laws to mental health residential facilities. Although 20 percent disagreed with the above, the presentation's time constraints may have contributed to these ratings as revealed in the respondents' additional comments. Of particular note is the fact that all (100%) of the survey respondents either *strongly agreed* or *agreed* that they would like additional information and could benefit from additional resources to advocate for enforcement of existing fair housing laws as applied to residential facilities.

Table 4. Levels of Agreement Regarding Presentation Content

Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenter was knowledgeable about the applicability of fair housing laws to residential mental health facilities.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%
The presentation-related materials/handouts were useful.	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%
The presentation helped me better understand the applicability of fair housing laws to mental health residential facilities.	20%	60%	0%	20%	0%
I will be able to use/apply the information from today's presentation.	20%	60%	0%	20%	0%
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.	60%	20%	0%	20%	0%
I would like additional information on the applicability of fair housing laws to residential facilities.	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
I would benefit from additional resources that I can use to advocate for enforcement of existing fair housing laws (applied to residential facilities) in my community.	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%

Most Useful Aspects of Presentation. To inform the development and selection of future presentations, respondents were asked what was most useful to them about the presentation. With 60 percent of the respondents answering this question, the primary theme was that the information and resources provided about the application of fair housing to residential facilities was of most use. The comments received included:

- “The resources that were provided along with the overall information.”
- “The fact that we could combat NIMBYISM which has made it so difficult to site many needed services.”
- “Learning how fair housing applies to residential facilities.”

Most Valuable Aspects of Presentation. Survey respondents were also asked to list anything that they found particularly valuable from the presentation. One participant found the concept of the conditional use permits and NIMBYism valuable. Another replied, “The fact that we can arm ourselves with knowledge that might convince the various city attorneys that they are skating on thin ice when it comes to denying needed services that discriminates on the basis of fair and equal treatment for the disabled.”

Additional Comments. When welcomed to make any additional comments through the final item on the survey, all of the participants provided responses. The overall theme was that the respondents thought that the presentation should have been longer so that it could have covered more information. Comments made by the respondents are listed below:

- “It was a wonderful presentation, I only wish we had more time to have gone more in-depth.”
- “I would like to have the information in a brochure that outlines the highlights of the presentation.”
- “Thank you -- very helpful to learn this.”
- “Next time we should be sure that she will have more time to present.”
- “Unfortunately, the presenter was not allotted a lot of time to present the topic so the presentation was rushed and I don't feel like I got much out of it. I really needed a basic overview of fair housing and the presentation seemed to just jump right into it w/out providing the audience with much background on fair housing and what fair housing means.”

Key Informant Interviews

Qualitative interviews with key informants were conducted by telephone during October and November 2007. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain perceptions, experiences, lessons learned, and recommendations for future similar initiatives as STEP neared the end of the second year of implementation.

Participants and Interview Content

A total of 26 key informants were identified in conjunction with STEP staff and were invited to participate in the interviews to inform the evaluation. Key informants included treatment providers and advocates, county and statewide alcohol and drug administrators, directors of statewide alcohol and drug organizations, key informants to government officials, and consultants to providers and/or local governments. Thus, a broad range of perspectives are reflected in the interview responses.

All of those identified as key informants were contacted by the evaluators several times inviting them to take part in the interviews. All but two individuals participated, resulting in a total of 24 completed interviews and a response rate of 92.3 percent. One informant declined when asked to be interviewed and another one was unable to be reached. All interviews with the key informants were conducted via telephone. The interviews took between 10 and 45 minutes to complete. A breakdown of the key informants by their role in the community is listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Key Informants' Role in the Community

Key Informants' Role in the Community	Percent
<i>Treatment Provider</i>	20.8%
<i>Treatment Advocate</i>	16.7%
<i>County AOD Administrator</i>	16.7%
<i>Director of Statewide AOD Organization</i>	12.5%
<i>Key Informant to Government Official</i>	12.5%
<i>Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments</i>	12.5%
<i>Statewide AOD Administrator</i>	8.3%
<i>Total</i>	100.0%

The interview protocol developed for the evaluation consisted of 10 open-ended items, divided into several categories: (1) Involvement with the STEP Initiative, (2) Importance of STEP, (3) Lessons Learned, and (4) Looking Ahead (see Appendix H). Analyses of all completed interviews revealed that, for the most part, there were no substantial or systematic differences in response patterns.

Involvement with STEP

In order to put responses in context, interviewees were asked how they had been directly or indirectly involved with the STEP initiative. Of all of the key informants, 33.3 percent heard the STEP Project Manager present and initiated follow-up conversations and presentations, 29.2 percent were colleagues with the STEP Project Manager and shared information regarding the project, 16.7 percent were North County Regional STEP Team members, 12.5 percent had occasional contact and conversations with the STEP Project Manager regarding the project, and 8.3 percent were fair housing professionals.

An additional question was asked only of the three key informants who participated in the Year One STEP key informant interviews to determine what specific activities they engaged in locally to forward the STEP initiative during the past year. All three of the informants (100%) had been working with local treatment providers regarding the CUP application process and meeting with local government officials. Further activities by the informants to promote the goals of STEP included submitting Letters to the Editor or Op-Ed pieces, attending Spokesperson Trainings, and presenting information at community meetings.

Importance of STEP

To determine perceptions regarding the importance of the fair housing laws to the STEP project, all of the interviewees were asked questions about the perceived importance of the inclusion of fair housing laws in the STEP initiative and the knowledge level of individuals who should know about fair housing laws as they applied to residential treatment programs.

Inclusion of Fair Housing Laws. When asked to rate how important they believed the inclusion of the promotion of fair housing laws in the STEP initiative was for residential treatment providers for alcohol and drug addiction, mental health, seniors, and other persons with disabilities on a likert-scale of 5 to 1 (with 5 being *very important* and 1 being *not at all important*), all of the participants said it was *very important* or *important*. The majority of interviewees (75%) rated it a 5, *very important*, or higher as two interviewees rated the importance level at 10. The remaining 25 percent of informants rated the inclusion of fair housing Information as a 4, *important*. Select comments representative of the primary themes of the responses included:

- “5. The local government is trying to find a way to exert control over the siting of these facilities and fair housing laws provide a set of overarching guidelines that will make it more consistent from one jurisdiction to another.” *Key Informant to Government Official*
- “5. Because it is so critical to have the fair housing regulations incorporated into what we are trying to do, siting residential programs.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “I would say 4. The information that they have found and are promoting is very beneficial for alcohol and drug treatment programs for siting their facilities or siting new facilities. I think the challenge is going to be what they are doing now which is educating people and to actually test it and find out how it tests out.” *County AOD Administrator*

Knowledge of Fair Housing Laws. Informants were then asked if they believed that the majority of persons who “should know” about the implications of fair housing law for residential facilities/group homes for persons in recovery/mentally ill/seniors/etc. actually did know. An overwhelming majority of interviewees (87.5%) replied no, explaining that in their experiences there was a high level of ignorance among local government, policy makers, and treatment providers about the application of fair housing laws to residential facilities. Only 8 percent of the interviewees responded yes, clarifying that they thought that people actually did know but choose to ignore it. Finally, 4.5 percent said that the knowledge level was moderate with a lot more work to be done. Representative responses are listed below.

- “No. What I have seen is an amazing lack of information on the part of city attorneys, county councils, and elected officials. And actually, even providers are not aware of their rights under fair housing laws to site their program.” *Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments*
- “No, I don’t. I think there is a high level of ignorance among policy makers.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “No they don’t. From my experiences, it is clear that nobody knows about it.” *Treatment Advocate*
- “I think some of them know, but I have the feeling that they don’t know enough. In other words they say they understand it, but sort of ignore it.” *Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments*
- “I think that is very moderate at this point. There is a lot of work to be done in terms of specifically how to apply it and how to use it. The more specifics, rather than the global and again, it has to be tested, it has to be won and then it will trickle down more.” *County AOD Administrator*

Lessons Learned

Providing an overview of key outcomes achieved by the STEP initiative, all key informants were asked about the most important “take-away” they had gained through their involvement with STEP and how they had been able to use and apply the information they had learned from the project.

Most Important Take-Away. Reflecting on the influence of the STEP initiative, interviewees were asked to comment on what had been the most important “take-away” they had learned through their involvement/interactions with the STEP Project Manager. Almost half (45.8%) found the fair housing information to be of the greatest value, 20.8 percent thought it was the information on property values and crime rates showing that residential treatment centers were not a detriment to communities, 12.5 percent valued most the aid provided to treatment providers in siting CUPs due to STEP’s work and findings, 8.3 percent learned about the importance of understanding laws and local mandates, and 8.3 percent realized the importance of collaborating with others to bring about change. Select quotes representing the above mentioned themes included:

- “The fact that the ADA fair housing Act is very clear and very protective. It also indicates that any city or county that wants to come up with sanctions or requirements or barriers to siting programs that they are probably in violation.” *Statewide AOD Administrator*
- “The fair housing information. The fact that so many plans just go down in the city council, this information gives us some ammunition to come back with. I am just sorry we didn’t know about this information sooner.” *County AOD Administrator*
- “When I first listened to Deborah it was about AOD, but I have heard her speak a number of times now and it has become much more far-reaching. Now we are talking about people with a broad disability range. So that is really what I am finding useful now.” *Key Informant to Government Official*
- “There have been a number of things, but I would say the thing that was most important is understanding that fair treatment for people in residential facilities is not a detriment to communities to neighborhoods. If anything it increases property values and contributes to the betterment of communities.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “That we are not limited and that we could obtain more beds. It opens up more doors.” *Treatment Provider*
- “Probably the importance of doing all the research and clearly understanding all the innuendos within existing laws and regulations.” *County AOD Administrator*

Use of Information from STEP. When asked how they have been able to use/apply the information learned through their interactions with STEP, 45.8 percent of the interviewees responded that they have passed the information on to others (such as government officials, decision makers, treatment providers and communities), 33.3 percent have applied the information to assist treatment centers in the CUP process, 12.5 percent have not yet used that information but intend to when given the opportunity, and 4.2 percent have referred treatment providers to the STEP Project Manager as a resource. Examples of how the key informants have used the information from STEP included:

- “I have been briefing my boss, an elected official representing a district, and another elected official in a community where there are legal actions against AOD residential treatment programs.” *Key Informant to Government Official*

- “Because my staff goes out to deal with reviews, they have the Frequently Asked Questions and other information like that that they share. For me in particular because I go out into the communities, I provide the handouts educating them.” *Statewide AOD Administrator*
- “What I did was to take the information back to providers in our community. Now we have something to deal with the NIMBY issue a little differently.” *County AOD Administrator*
- “Yes. I have had to educate my board of directors, I have included excerpts from fair housing law in my application, I have discussed it with city officials in ____ and _____. They have been real open and candid about what they know and don’t know. We have also educated engineers, architects, contractors, and the people who are helping us build.” *Treatment Provider*
- “We are on the front end of our relocation process and we are in the middle of sensitive negotiations right now which might expedite our relocation. As a leverage point, fair housing might help us not have to push this in as a mandated situation with our local elected officials. So I am using it as leverage at this time.” *Treatment Provider*
- “Not at this time but we certainly are looking forward to it in this next year.” *Treatment Provider*

Looking Ahead

Based on the activities engaged in and experiences that key informants have had to date, questions were asked of them to obtain insights that could inform similar initiatives in the future. Interviewees were asked what types of things still needed to happen to ensure a level playing field for residential treatment providers, if they changed their view of the probability of getting a CUP based upon what they had learned, if they anticipated having continued involvement with STEP, what needed to occur to combat the power of NIMBY, and how they would know if the STEP initiative is working.

What Still Needs to Happen. When asked what types of things still need to happen to ensure that residential treatment providers for persons with disabilities get a “level playing field” in the use permitting process and other land use decisions, almost all of the responses involved education and changes in the legislative process and policies. Seventy five percent of the interviewees discussed the need to educate policy makers and work on the legislative process for CUPs, 12.5 percent commented on the need to educate community members and change stigmas associated with residential treatment centers, 12.5 percent cited the need for changes in legislative policies, 8.3 percent added that more media needed to be done on fair housing information, and 4.2 percent also saw the need for education among treatment providers.

Probability of Getting CUPs. Key informants were then asked if, through their interaction with STEP, they had changed their view of the probability of getting a CUP. Two thirds of the interviewees (66.7%) responded that yes their outlook had improved, 12.5 percent said that their outlook had probably changed, and 8.4 percent were not sure if their outlook had changed. Selected responses demonstrating the key themes are listed below.

- “Absolutely. I absolutely felt that we never would again, and now I feel that we can.” *Treatment Provider*
- “I am quite optimistic that the information from the initiative will provide me with a successful outcome to the relocation of our facility.” *Treatment Provider*

- “It has greatly improved because of the information that Deborah has developed and can be used when working with local planning offices.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “Yes. I believe that breakthroughs have occurred. Deborah has been involved in meetings with many groups and has turned many heads.” *Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments*
- “Probably. The case certainly can be made for it, by pressing the need for reasonable accommodation. That is one way in which it can be framed. However, in the end it is still going to be a political decision.” *Key Informant to Government Official*
- “I don’t know. I think that CUPs are still difficult to come by.” *Statewide AOD Administrator*

Continued Involvement with STEP. Interviewees were also asked if they anticipated having continued involvement with STEP to increase awareness and enforcement of fair housing laws among providers and local governments. All (100%) of the participants responded yes. When asked in what capacity they anticipated their future involvement, 33 percent will continue to use STEP as a resource and to refer treatment providers to STEP, 25 percent will continue to share information and promote the message of fair housing laws, 16.7 percent will work with STEP on local issues and CUP applications, 12.5 percent will invite STEP to make presentations, and 12.5 percent will serve on a future committee or advisory groups. Responses included:

- “Absolutely. I will utilize Deborah as often as I can. She helps us make sense of a very complex issue.” *Statewide AOD Administrator*
- “The BOS planning department will have continued involvement with Deborah. I recommend that the county use her as a resource. She is fabulous.” *Key Informant to Government Official*
- “I absolutely need her as resource both in offering community training around treatment and recovery facilities but also as a think-tank.” *Treatment Advocate*
- “Definitely. I could bring Deborah into contact with providers and fair housing, to see that everybody gets as much information as possible on this.” *Key Informant to Government Official*
- “Absolutely. I would definitely be willing to work in partnership with other collaboratives to get this message out to other providers.” *Treatment Provider*
- “I have actually asked her to come back and speak at our next conference.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “From our association’s perspective, after Deborah’s presentation we made a commitment that the administrators would be available to help her in any way that we could so that we could look at this from a state wide perspective.” *County AOD Administrator*
- “Deborah wants to have an ongoing, advisory group that is going to be dealing with this issue and I think we are going to have some representation on that.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “I have discussed it with the top management in the Department of Mental Health and received their blessing and support in doing so.” *County AOD Administrator*

How to Combat NIMBY. In addition to their future involvement in STEP, key informants were asked to comment on what they believed needed to occur to combat the political power of NIMBY on local government decision makers. The majority of informants (79.1%) mentioned the need for further education on fair housing laws and stigmas associated with treatment centers, 12.5 percent discussed the need for media advocacy on the benefits of treatment centers to a

community, 4.2 percent said that a task force was needed, and another 4.2 percent stated that a lawsuit would bring about the necessary changes. Representative responses are listed below:

- “I think a very big piece of that is education. It is interesting that a lot of planning staffers don’t understand that the fair housing Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act as it applies to the siting of AOD programs. On top of that, is the fact that they never understand the characteristics of the type of people we are talking about. ... They don’t really understand that sober individuals make great neighbors and are at low-risk for these problems. There is a great lack of information.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “A combination of getting additional information to decision makers, city council, and others with decision making authority, as well as getting information to the general public.” *Treatment Advocate*
- “I guess they need to be educated. To get this information to them, and try to get across the point that treatment facilities are good neighbors and legally have a right to be there.” *County AOD Administrator*
- “Media campaigns about the benefits of treatment centers being in a community.” *Treatment Advocate*
- “Well I think that if we had some type of a work group made up of state field people and community leaders such as mayors of cities and come to some compromise.” *Statewide AOD Administrator*
- “The reality is that changes come out of lawsuits.” *Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments*

Indicators of Success. For the final question, interviewees were asked how they would know whether the STEP initiative was working or had made an impact (i.e., what were their “indicators of success” for the STEP initiative). The majority of informants (83%) believed that a successful acquisition of CUPs or a change in the CUP application process would be a sign of success; 8.3 percent stated that educated legislators, planners, and attorneys would be a successful result; 4.2 percent said that a change in stigmas associated with treatment facilities would be an indicator of success; and, 4.2 percent thought that a successful outcome of STEP would be the formation of a task force continuing the dialog that STEP initiated. Sample responses included:

- “The successful acquisition of CUPs.” *Director of Statewide AOD Organization*
- “That it is faster and simplified for a new program to get a facility sited.” *County AOD Administrator*
- “First there should increased applications filed by treatment providers to open or expand their facilities. Second, there should be more approvals. Third, there should be a decrease in NIMBYism when more applications are granted.” *Treatment Advocate*
- “I think that the indicators are not going to be something that you can measure in the short term. It is a long term kind of effect which is that hopefully you will see zoning codes revised and you will see more siting in appropriate districts. But I don’t think that for a project like this that you can have siting x number programs as a measurable tool. That would be extremely unfair to the program because the dynamic is beyond the control of something like (STEP). What (STEP’s) role is to try to educate, to bring the issue forward. But I don’t think it would be reasonable to assume that when the project is complete, x number of programs would be sited. It is much more about reaching people.” *Consultant to Providers and/or Local Governments*
- “When a staff report comes out of a planning department, when going to a planning commission or city council, that identifies the fair housing issue and a city attorney says

you have got to be very careful of not violating fair housing. In our area attorneys are not quick about it, but if it comes down through the planning department and the attorneys recognize the fair housing component, then you have won the day.” *Key Informant to Government Official*

- “If there was a development of a task force involving the community, including government officials, treatment providers, fair housing administrators and community members, as an ongoing group. If there could be an ongoing dialog between all parties concerned it would promote good relations.” *Key Informant to Government Official*

STEP Staff Interviews

Qualitative interviews with STEP staff were conducted in person and by phone during April 2008 to obtain staff perceptions and experiences; information on outcomes, challenges, lessons learned; and recommendations for similar initiatives as STEP neared the end of the extension period and completion of the project.

Participants and Interview Content

Interviews took place with two STEP staff members. As both staff members who were asked to be interviewed agreed to participate, the response rate was 100 percent. The interview with the Project Manager was conducted by phone, and the other with the Executive Director was conducted in person. The interviews took 30 and 45 minutes to complete. The interview protocol developed for the evaluation consisted of 10 open-ended items covering the following content areas: (1) Impact and Outcomes of STEP, (2) Challenges, (3) Lessons Learned, and (4) Looking Ahead. Analyses of the completed interviews revealed that there were no substantial or systematic differences in response patterns.

Impact and Outcomes of STEP

To ascertain staff perceptions regarding the significant outcomes and impacts of the STEP initiative, interviewees were asked a series of questions about the most significant impact, other significant outcomes, unexpected outcomes, long term investments, and long term impact of STEP on the organization.

Most Significant Impact. When asked what was the most significant impact of STEP, both staff members (100%) interviewed stated that it was the increased level of knowledge about the application of fair housing laws to residential treatment programs that occurred among not only alcohol and drug treatment providers, but also extended to mental health providers, advocates, funders, local government officials, planning departments, and county and statewide alcohol and drug programs and organizations who were previously unaware of the information. One interviewee commented, “The knowledge of fair housing and the Housing Element flipped the perspective to show that NIMBY isn’t an issue.”

Other Significant Outcomes. Staff members were then asked what other significant outcomes were realized with the STEP initiative. Along with listing other outcomes, both interviewees (100%) believed that public dialog and perceptions were beginning to change as a result of the project. The Project Manager stated, “It was the start of empowering people to realize that there is something they can do.” Other outcomes discussed by staff included: realizing that advocacy voices were not affecting local government so other strategies needed to be employed; gaining a comprehensive understanding of fair housing laws throughout the project; becoming aware of and advocating for the Housing Element; and bridging connections among providers,

advocates, local government decision makers, and organizations. Sample responses are listed below.

- “Each step led to more information, which led to something else. It was all a building block to a comprehensive approach and understanding of fair housing issues.”
- “The beginning of changing the public dialogue so that instead of providers defending themselves against something they can’t defend, the fears, put the burden on local governments that they are violating the law.”
- “Hopefully, one of the outcomes is that people have begun to open their minds a little.”

Unexpected outcomes. When asked to describe any unexpected outcomes of STEP, staff discussed how the project really “caught fire” spreading from a local initiative to county, statewide, and even national levels, how the scope of the project expanded beyond residential alcohol and drug programs to fair housing and land use issues among service providers for persons with disabilities, how sober living providers quickly became engaged in community action, and how the project was able to change people’s perspectives. Other unexpected outcomes mentioned included:

- “The fact that treatment providers are getting lawyers and fighting back. The success we had in impacting the Rooming Housing Ordinance in San Diego. Being invited by elected officials to discuss this with them. A work group is being formed now with CADPAAC to look at this issue. These are all powerful things.”
- “It gets at people thinking about treatment in a different way. Seeing a person in treatment as a person with disabilities, from a different perspective.”
- “When you are talking about fair housing and discrimination; that is a federal scope. To be able to shine a light on something that big; people cannot hide from it and cannot ignore it.”

Long Term Impact. To ascertain the far reaching impact of the project, interviewees were asked what long lasting investments were made as a result of STEP. Both staff members (100%) believed that the project had a lasting effect on public awareness and perceptions, stating, “The Genie is out of the bottle; and it can’t be put back,” and “People at the state understand this issue from a different perspective now; which is huge.” Both staff members also cited the fact that more treatment providers are moving forward in the CUP application process and/or are considering pursuing a CUP when they previously would not have had any confidence in the outcome to do so. However, interviewees both cautioned that there may not be enough momentum or critical mass at this point to sustain providers through this process if the project does not continue.

STEP staff were then asked how the initiative impacted their organization, if the impact was long term, and if so, how. Both staff members (100%) stated that it was considered a successful project, with a long term impact on their organization, as well as on other organizations that STEP has partnered with and provided technical assistance to. The Project Manager discussed the contributions of STEP to the Institute for Public Strategies’ prevention work with the Safe Streets Now program in dealing with nuisance abatement and issues of NIMBY and technical assistance and materials provided to the community group in Spring Valley. The Executive Director stated, “It has absolutely had a long term impact on our organization. We can keep building on it.”

Challenges

To determine their perceptions regarding challenges the project encountered, STEP staff were asked if there was something they thought would be easy to do but was actually challenging to implement. After stating, “I knew none of it would be easy,” the Project Manager revealed that “The biggest challenge has been to light a fire under people to do something. I thought I would get people to sign on a little sooner.” The interviewee discussed the reluctance of treatment providers and county alcohol and drug administrators “to get on board” due to their fear of offending the public and local government. She also described difficulties accessing fair housing experts at a community level stating that “fair housing people come from a legal perspective and not community action; they are not easy to engage. It has been touchy working with fair housing individuals. It is a very turf-conscious business.” With this in mind, STEP’s role was to successfully interpret fair housing laws, which was not being done sufficiently by fair housing advocates. The other interviewee discussed the challenges in coalescing the Regional STEP Teams and Local Government Planning Groups as initially planned, although stating, “It made sense in some ways because as this has evolved it really required more of a focused effort on treatment providers, especially with The Fellowship Center. Through this project, it shifted the focus into a real life experience.”

Lessons Learned

Reflecting on their experience and knowledge gained through the implementation of STEP, interviewees were asked what, if anything, they would change if they were to do this project again. Resoundingly, both staff members (100%) said that they “Don’t think they could have done anything differently.” Although staff mentioned that in retrospect they would have liked to have done more community action and media advocacy, they both said that the process needed to unfold as it did, with STEP discovering and learning about information on fair housing laws in an incremental manner. Select responses included:

- “I was spending most of my energy keeping on top of that. New things would keep coming up, and each new thing would alter my previous strategy.”
- “We wouldn’t have stumbled onto Housing Element, if we were not talking to fair housing lawyers.”
- “It has been a massive learning curve, for us, as well as for other people.”

Additionally, interviewees were asked if they would change anything to their original proposal for STEP funding based upon their current knowledge. One staff member suggested taking out the regional groups, doing more media advocacy, forming “an advisory committee with participation from key organizations or groups to move this in a much bigger way” than was originally planned, and perhaps expanding further to get federal funds. The other interviewee commented, “I don’t see how I could have known what I know now” and added that she was glad that the funder allowed the project “to go where it needed to go,” allowing modifications to STEP’s goals and objectives in order to bring about the ultimate outcomes.

Looking Ahead

In order to ascertain interviewees’ knowledge and perceptions that could inform future efforts to reduce discrimination in land use issues against residential service providers, STEP staff members were asked questions about what work still needed to happen to combat the political power of NIMBY on local government decision makers and to ensure that residential treatment providers for persons with disabilities get a level playing field in the use permitting process and other land use decisions.

How to Combat NIMBY. To assess interviewee’s perceptions on the role of NIMBY in land use decisions and how best to address it in future efforts, STEP staff members were asked what still needs to occur to combat the political power of NIMBY on local government decision makers. The interviewees acknowledged that NIMBY still influences decision makers, is based on fear and stigma, and “may take years to change.” However, they reiterated that progress is being made as providers pursue the application of fair housing laws to their CUP applications and that pressure needs to be put back on the decision makers in effective ways so that they will follow the law. Additional responses included:

- “There need to be some successes with providers.”
- “The Fellowship Center is using a fair housing attorney and moving forward in its pursuit of a CUP. Once that progresses, media needs to be done around it to show that you can not violate the laws and discriminate due to reasons of NIMBY.”
- “Tables need to be effectively turned on decision makers, so they realize it is their problem to deal with and not the providers.”

What Still Needs to Happen. When asked what additional work needs to happen to ensure that residential providers for persons with disabilities get a level playing field in the use permitting process and other land use decisions, both interviewees (100%) stated that STEP needed to continue working, with one interviewee stating, “We need to keep doing what we are doing.” Although they both thought it would take years to get to a level playing field, staff members discussed the following strategies to bring about the desired change.

- engage and educate local people, getting them to take the initiative;
- use media advocacy to get people talking about it;
- keep working with attorneys and advocates for fair housing;
- facilitate extensive training on how to use this information for community action;
- implement a “train the trainer” model that would educate a core group of people around the state about fair housing; and
- build a working task force or advisory committee to take it to a higher level with state and possibly federal involvement.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At the end of year two and the completion of the project, STEP has met its goals, objectives, and intended outcomes as they have been modified throughout the implementation process. At the culmination of the initiative, STEP evolved into a community change project that seeks to reduce discrimination in land use against housing and other residential services for persons with disabilities, and to change the norms governing how other treatment providers and local governments approach the land use decision making process.

Several significant accomplishments were made during the second year of STEP’s implementation when the project’s objectives were expanded beyond a regional approach to combating NIMBY against residential treatment programs in order to integrate the application of fair housing laws to reduce discrimination in land use decisions. Significant outcomes included:

1. Extensive research conducted on federal fair housing laws as they applied to the use permitting process for residential treatment programs which led to shifts in the projects goals, strategies, and outcomes expanding the scope to include residential service providers for persons with disabilities at the local, county, state, and national levels.

2. Discovery and promulgation of the California Housing Element mandated updates requiring the elimination of all discriminatory land use policies and the implementation of reasonable accommodation procedures.
3. Crime related research and proximity scan conducted which found no direct relationship between alcohol and drug treatment centers and increases in crime and decreases in property values. This data was used to inform decision-making among local governments, providers, advocates, community groups, and media in order to expand licensed residential treatment in targeted communities.
4. Advocacy and outcomes achieved in conjunction with the North County Regional STEP Team including a revised CUP Addendum, adoption of the STEP Addendum to the CUP Application in the City of Vista for administrative use by the planning department, and numerous meetings with city officials and planners, along with multiple media outputs to support The Fellowship Center's CUP application to the City of Oceanside.
5. Two North County RST Spokesperson Trainings were presented integrating fair housing information and applied research and data to ensure that spokespersons understood STEP's modified goals, strategies, and talking points well enough to utilize them in advocacy with the public and local government decision makers.
6. Tool Kit Training conducted to inform service providers, advocates, funders, and local officials of the specifics of how fair housing laws apply to residential facilities for persons with disabilities in order to promote compliance with those laws.
7. STEP Briefing Books, Tool Kit, and numerous documents/media pieces were produced to increase competency of identified providers, community partners, and collaboratives to advocate in support of the adoption of a streamlined CUP process and enforcing compliance to fair housing laws in land use decisions. Documents produced included Briefing Books, Fact Sheets, Message Triangles, Op-Ed pieces, Letters to the Editor, and Tool Kit. A website also was established.
8. Presentations and technical assistance provided to local, county, and statewide organizations; alcohol and drug program administrators; treatment providers; mental health service providers; fair housing professionals; and government decision makers. Resulting from STEP's presentations, a work group from the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC) and a committee from the state Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP) licensing staff and committees have been formed specifically to promote treatment expansion in their own communities. Additionally, STEP's strategies and technical assistance have impacted outcomes in The Fellowship Center's CUP application process in the City of Oceanside, in the successful advancement of a proposed bed increase by an eldercare provider in Vista, and in changes to a Rooming Housing Ordinance in the City of San Diego.

As part of the initiative's goals and objectives, STEP developed and facilitated two North County RST Spokesperson Trainings and a Tool Kit Training during the second year of implementation. To evaluate the trainings' ability to help participants understand and apply fair housing information and to collect feedback useful to the development of future trainings, surveys were conducted following each training, as well as at a STEP presentation to the Mental Health Services Housing Council. In all four instances, survey findings were very positive with the majority of participants agreeing that the trainings and presentation had been a valuable experience.

For the North County RST Spokesperson Training Part II held in Vista in April 2007, survey findings showed that all of the respondents agreed that the training had been a valuable experience and that nothing about the training was least useful. The majority of respondents found the discussion of the application of the Fair Housing Amendment Act to be particularly

useful and it was suggested that future trainings include role-playing scenarios. Utilizing feedback from the prior Spokesperson Training, the North County RST Spokesperson Training Part IIA held in Escondido in May 2007 was also rated very positively in the follow up survey. All respondents strongly agreed that the training was a very valuable experience, helped them better understand the applicability of fair housing information, and would be useful in their role as STEP spokespersons.

Similar responses were given on the survey for the Tool Kit Training that was conducted in April 2008 in the City of San Diego. All of the respondents agreed that the survey had been a valuable experience, with the majority of respondents indicating that the training helped them better understand land use issues and fair housing laws, that they would be able to apply the information from the training, and that the training workbook/materials were useful. Overall findings were also positive from the survey administered following STEP's presentation to the Mental Health Services Council in November 2007. All respondents agreed that the presenter was knowledgeable about the applicability of fair housing to residential mental health facilities and that the presentation materials were useful. The majority of respondents also agreed that the presentation helped them better understand fair housing laws, was a valuable experience, and that they would be able to apply the information from the presentation. Interestingly, all respondents indicated that they could benefit from additional information and resources to advocate for enforcement of fair housing laws in their community.

To gain a more in-depth perspective of the outcomes and impact of the STEP initiative and to obtain perceptions, experiences, lessons learned, and recommendations for similar future initiatives, key informant Interviews were conducted by phone in October and November 2007. A total of 24 individuals were interviewed representing treatment providers and advocates, county and statewide alcohol and drug administrators, directors of statewide alcohol and drug organizations, key informants to government officials, and consultants to providers and/or local governments. Findings revealed that the majority of informants thought the promotion of fair housing laws was very important to the STEP initiative and that the majority of persons who "should know" about the implications of fair housing laws for residential providers were not aware of it. When asked to comment on the most important "take-away" of the project, almost half of the participants found the fair housing information to be the most useful, and others valued STEP's crime related research, technical assistance, emphasis on understanding laws and local mandates, and collaboration with other entities to bring about change. Additionally, the majority of informants have used the information and materials provided by STEP. Looking ahead, the majority of informants discussed the need to educate the public and policy makers regarding fair housing laws, the legislative process for CUPs, and the stigma associated with treatment centers. Showing the impact of STEP, the majority of informants had more positive views about the probability of providers to obtain CUPs, and all of the informants expressed a desire to continue working with STEP to increase awareness and enforcement of fair housing laws among providers and local governments.

As the initiative neared completion in April 2008, structured interviews were conducted with two STEP staff members to obtain their perceptions and experiences regarding the project's outcomes, challenges, lessons learned, and suggestions to inform future efforts to reduce discrimination in land use issues against residential service providers. Both staff members stated that the most significant impact of STEP was the increased level of knowledge about the application of fair housing laws to residential treatment providers, which was expanded to mental health providers, advocates, funders, local government decision makers, regulatory agencies, and organizations at a local, county, state, and national level. Other significant outcomes included changes to public perceptions and dialog, the comprehensive understanding

of fair housing laws and Housing Element, increased incidence of providers pursuing CUPS, changes made to the Room Housing Ordinance in San Diego, work groups being formed from CADPAAC and state DADP licensing staff and committees, and the connections made among providers, advocated local governments, and county and statewide organizations. Looking ahead, interviewees acknowledged that NIMBY still influences decision makers but that progress is being made as more providers are applying fair housing laws as they proceed in their efforts to increase beds and acquire CUPs. They stated that pressure needs to be put back on decision makers in effective ways so that they will follow the laws. Staff emphasized that education, media advocacy, extensive training, and a larger-scale working task force was needed in the future to ensure that residential providers for persons with disability get a level playing field in the use permitting process and other land use decisions.

Based upon findings from the multiple evaluation methods employed, it is recommended that the work of STEP be continued through similar initiatives in the future. Evaluation findings have demonstrated the need for continued education and advocacy regarding the application of fair housing laws to residential service providers for persons with disabilities existing among government administrators and decision makers, treatment providers, and fair housing professionals. The initiative's approach of conducting extensive research, producing presentations and documents to inform the public as well as key decision makers, and collaborating with regional, county, and statewide work groups and organizations, has resulted in numerous successful outcomes that can be built upon in future programs.

CONCLUSION

The STEP initiative has achieved its purpose, goals, and objectives through its comprehensive approach in engaging in extensive research, collaboration, advocacy efforts, production of materials and presentations, media advocacy, and community action throughout the two years of the project's implementation. The discovery and greater understanding of the application of fair housing laws to the CUP process for residential treatment programs necessitated modifications to the project's goals and strategies as the initiative progressed. Due to the experience, ability, flexibility, and tenacity of the STEP project and staff, along with their comprehensive connections in the community, the initiative evolved into a large scale, community change project promoting the enforcement of fair housing laws to reduce discrimination in land use decisions for service providers for persons with disabilities. The outcomes and impacts of the program have been far reaching, extending far beyond the original scope of the project. Through the multiple methods of advocacy employed by STEP, change has begun in the public dialogue, perceptions, knowledge levels, and norms governing how service providers and local governments approach the land use decision making process. With the knowledge gained and the momentum built through this STEP initiative, future projects can extend the preliminary successful outcomes of STEP to a larger scope in order to reduce discrimination and increase compliance with fair housing laws in land use decisions for residential services for persons with disabilities.

Appendix A. Revised Addendum to CUP Application

ADDENDUM TO CUP APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

The (name of city/county) requires that any organization seeking a use permit for a residential alcohol and drug treatment facility within (name of city/county) is required to complete this “Addendum to CUP Application for Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs” and submit it with the completed CUP application.

The State of California requires that all residential facilities that provide non-medical alcoholism or drug abuse recovery, treatment, or detoxification services to adults must be licensed by the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP), and that adolescent alcohol and drug treatment services be licensed by the State Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division. DADP also certifies programs. Health and safety concerns are the primary focus of licensure, and program issues and client care are the concerns of certification. DADP at this time does not require that residential alcohol and drug programs be certified by them. However, (name of city/county) strongly encourages all residential alcohol and drug treatment providers to obtain DADP program certification, and at such time when certification becomes mandatory will require it as a condition of this CUP.

Applicants proposing to serve clients age 18 and above shall submit completed applications for licensure and supporting documents to the Licensing and Certification Branch, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, 1700 K Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. Applicants proposing to serve adolescent age clients shall send applications for licensure to Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division, 744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

If the applicant does not receive state mandated licensure (and certification when so mandated) within eight months of the granting of this CUP, the CUP may be rendered invalid. Likewise, if the applicant loses state licensure (or mandated certification) for any reason, this CUP may be rendered invalid.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Please provide the following information:

- 1) The name and address of the facility;
- 2) The name and mailing address of the applicant;
 - a) If the applicant is a partnership, the name and principal business address of each partner, and a copy of the partnership agreement as filed with the county or state, as applicable;
 - b) If the applicant is a corporation or association, the name, and address of the principal place of business of the corporation or association;
 - c) The name and title of the officer or employee who acts on behalf of the corporation or association; and a copy of the articles of incorporation and bylaws.
- 3) The name and address of owner of facility premises if applicant is leasing or renting.
- 4) Please list any additional licensed and alcohol and drug treatment programs the applicant operates within the State of California, including their years of operation.

- 5) When will the program submit its application to the California State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) for facility licensure and program certification, or to Community Care for Adolescent services?

LAND USE ISSUES

- a. What is the maximum number of clients proposed to be housed in the residential facility on a daily basis?
- b. What is the organization's rationale for the number of beds/clients served?
- c. Will there be additional treatment services offered to non-residents at this site? If yes, please describe services.
- d. What is the number of parking spaces to be provided on this site? In the site plan be sure to include a parking plan.
- e. Address how the street system serving the proposed site is adequate to properly handle any traffic generated by the proposed use.
- f. Please describe how the facility and its program will or will not impact street parking in the neighborhood.
- g. Please describe how the facility will maintain quiet on its property.
- h. Will the facility have outdoor safety lighting for use during evenings and nights? If so, describe how will it not be an inconvenience for neighbors.
- i. Will the facility display exterior signs? If yes, please describe size and location.
- j. If water for human consumption is not from a municipal source, the applicant shall provide evidence of an on-site inspection of the source of the water and bacteriological analysis which establishes the safety of the water for human consumption. The inspection and analysis shall be conducted by the local health department, the State Department of Health Services, or a licensed commercial laboratory. The applicant shall repeat the on-site inspection and water analysis at least once each calendar year.
- k. Please describe in detail the types of services and benefits the applicant facility can offer the community.

BUILDING AND LOT PLANS

Be sure plot plan shows all buildings or other structures, fences/walls (and their height), play area(s), landscaping or other relevant physical features, driveways, parking areas, recreational areas, and outdoor lighting. Indicate whether an improvement is existing or proposed, as well as its size and proximity to other buildings/structures and to respective property lines.

Appendix B. List of Media/Documents Produced

STEP Final Evaluation – List of Media/Documents Produced

1. STEP Packet for the El Cajon Collaborative (including handouts on project goals, policy advancement, supporting data)
2. STEP Readiness Assessment for Local Governments: Vista
3. STEP Packet: How to Submit a CUP Application to Your Local Government
4. Spokesperson Training Part I Manual
5. Online STEP Fact Sheet: Community Stability and Safety: The Impact of Licensed Residential AOD Treatment Centers
6. Program on “These Days”
7. Spokesperson Training Part II Manual
8. Fact Sheet (Original)
9. FAQ Sheet (Original)
10. Addendum to CUP Application
11. Message Triangle: Residential AOD Treatment Facilities and the CUP Process
12. Letter to Tobin Vaughn (re: Fair Housing laws and CUP process)
13. Spokesperson Training Part IIA Manual
14. Message Triangle: Residential Treatment Facilities and Fair Housing Laws
15. Article: Urban myths grow best in the dark
16. Op-Ed: Finding a home for residential treatment programs
17. Series of Letters to the Editor supporting the above Op-ed
18. What’s this Problem Residence in my Neighborhood and What Can I Do About It?
19. Residential/Facility Matrix: Distinction Among Facility Types San Diego County
20. Editorial Board Meeting with North County Times
21. Revised FAQ Sheet: How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Conditional Use Permit Process for Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs
22. Revised Fact Sheet: How Local Governments Discriminate Against Local Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs in Land Use Decisions
23. Message Triangle: Discrimination Against Residential Alcohol & Drug Treatment Facilities
24. Crime Mapping: PowerPoint Slides
25. Proximity Scan: Survey of Children’s Services within a Two Block Radius of the 76 Licensed Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs in San Diego County
26. Op-ed in North County Times
27. Series of Letters to the Editor supporting above Op-ed
28. Futures Associates, Inc. Website
29. A Call to Action for Advocates for Sober Living and Supportive Housing for the Mentally Ill and Other Persons with Disabilities in the City
30. Update to City of San Diego Proposed Mini-Dorm Ordinance
31. STEP Tool Kit Training Manual: Ending Discrimination in Land Use

Appendix C. List of Presentations Produced

STEP Final Evaluation – List of Presentations Produced

#	Presentation Title	Author	Organization/Audience	Date
1	Key Points on Treatment Expansion Initiative	STEP, Deborah Parker	Re-Entry Roundtable	March 21, 2006
2	Key Points on Treatment Expansion Initiative	STEP, Deborah Parker	El Cajon Collaborative	April 4, 2006
3	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project	STEP, Deborah Parker	East County Human Services Coalition	April 13, 2006
4	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project	STEP, Deborah Parker	El Cajon Collaborative Executive Committee	May 19, 2006
5	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project	STEP, Deborah Parker	No. Coastal Prevention Collaborative	May 25, 2006
6	Facts about Licensed Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs and How They Contribute to Safe & Healthy Neighborhoods	STEP, Deborah Parker	Citizens Group in Oceanside: In support of Fellowship Center CUP	June 19, 2006
7	Expanded Facts about Licensed Residential Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs and How They Contribute to Safe & Healthy Neighborhoods	STEP, Deborah Parker	Citizens Group in Oceanside: Follow-up Presentation to Larger Audience	June 28, 2006
8	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project: Siting New or Expanded Licensed Residential Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	La Mesa Collaborative	August 1, 2006
9	Spokesperson Training Part I: Talking with Decision Makers	STEP, Deborah Parker	North County Regional STEP Team	August 24, 2006
10	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project: Siting New or Expanded Licensed Residential Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	Vista Weed and Seed Executive Committee	September 6, 2006
11	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project: Siting New or Expanded Licensed Residential Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	Lemon Grove Collaborative	September 19, 2006
12	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project: Siting New or Expanded Licensed Residential Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	SD Meth Strike Force Coordinating Committee	October 6, 2006

13	Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project: Siting New or Expanded Licensed Residential Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency—San Diego	November 8, 2006
14	STEP: A San Diego Project Combating NIMBYism that Targets Residential AOD Treatment Programs and Its Journey to Fair Housing	STEP, Deborah Parker	Fair Housing Conference	February 15, 2007
15	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs-ADPSA	STEP, Deborah Parker	San Diego Alcohol & Drug Services Providers Association (ADSPA)	March 15, 2007
16	Spokesperson Training Part II: Talking with Decision Makers	STEP, Deborah Parker	North County Regional STEP Team	April 11, 2007
17	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs: Re-Entry Roundtable	STEP, Deborah Parker	San Diego Re-Entry Roundtable	April 17, 2007
18	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs: CAARR	STEP, Deborah Parker	California Association of Addiction Recovery Resources (CAARR)	April 20, 2007
19	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs: DADP Licensing Staff & Committee	STEP, Deborah Parker	California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP)	May 1, 2007
20	Spokesperson Training Part IIA: Talking with Decision Makers	STEP, Deborah Parker	North County Regional STEP Team	May 23, 2007
21	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs	STEP, Deborah Parker	County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC)	September 27, 2007
22	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential Treatment Programs-CCAP	STEP, Deborah Parker	California Conference on Alcohol Problems (CCAP)	October 2007
23	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential Mental Health & AOD Treatment Programs: M. H. Services Housing Council	STEP, Deborah Parker	Mental Health Services Housing Council	November 1, 2007
24	Combating Land Use Discrimination Against Residential Programs for Persons with Disabilities Must Be a Community Action Effort	STEP, Deborah Parker	Fair Housing Conference	February 14, 2008
25	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential Treatment Programs: Update	STEP, Deborah Parker	San Diego Re-Entry Roundtable	February 19, 2008

26	How Fair Housing Laws Impact the Siting of Residential AOD Treatment Programs: NCADD-SD	STEP, Deborah Parker	National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency—San Diego	April 5, 2008
27	How to Use Fair Housing Laws and Housing Element Law to End Discrimination in Land Use against residential treatment for Persons with Disabilities	STEP, Deborah Parker	Sacramento County Expansion Committee	April 15, 2008
28	Ending Discrimination in Land Use Decisions: STEP Tool Kit Training	STEP, Deborah Parker	Residential Service Providers and Advocates	April 24, 2008

Appendix D. Spokesperson Training Part II Follow-up Survey

Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (STEP) North County Spokesperson Training Part II Participant Follow-up Survey

The following survey is intended to obtain your perceptions and input regarding the recent STEP Training held on April 11, 2007 at the Vista Community Clinic.

Please note that this survey is one component of an ongoing comprehensive evaluation of the STEP initiative. The evaluation is being carried out by EVALCORP, an independent research and evaluation consulting firm contracted by Futures Associates. All of your responses will be kept confidential and reported only in aggregate form to STEP staff. We appreciate your willingness to answer all of the items as honestly as possible.

Closed-ended Survey Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenter communicated in a way that was easy to understand.					
The training materials/handouts were useful.					
The content of the training will be useful in my role as a STEP spokesperson.					
The training helped me to better understand the applicability of FHAA laws to the STEP initiative.					
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.					

Open-ended Survey Items

1. What was most useful to you about the training?
2. What, if anything, was least useful to you about the training?
3. What suggestions do you have for the upcoming (May 1, 2007) STEP "Message Formation" Training?
4. We welcome any additional input or comments:

Appendix E. Spokesperson Training Part IIA Follow-up Survey

Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (STEP) North County Spokesperson Training Part IIA Participant Follow-up Survey

The following survey is intended to obtain your perceptions and input regarding the recent STEP Training held on May 23, 2007 at The Fellowship Center.

Please note that this survey is one component of an ongoing comprehensive evaluation of the STEP initiative. The evaluation is being carried out by EVALCORP, an independent research and evaluation consulting firm contracted by Futures Associates. All of your responses will be kept confidential and reported only in aggregate form to STEP staff. We appreciate your willingness to answer all of the items as honestly as possible.

Closed-ended Survey Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The presenter communicated in a way that was easy to understand.					
The training materials/handouts were useful.					
The content of the training will be useful in my role as a STEP spokesperson.					
The training helped me to better understand the applicability of FHAA laws to the STEP initiative.					
Overall, the training was a valuable experience.					

Open-ended Survey Items

1. What was most useful to you about the training?
2. What, if anything, was least useful to you about the training?
3. Moving forward, what do you need from the STEP Project Manager (Deborah) to effectively communicate with decision makers and/or the media about STEP?
4. We welcome any additional input or comments:

Appendix F. Tool Kit Training Follow-up Survey

STEP Tool Kit Training

Participant Survey – April 24, 2008 Training

Please check the extent to which you agree to the following survey items.

Survey Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The presenters communicated in a way that was easy to understand.					
2. The training workbook/materials were useful.					
3. The training helped me to better understand land use issues and fair housing laws as they apply to housing and residential services for persons with disabilities.					
4. The training gave me the tools needed to effectively communicate with local government staff and decision makers on potential discriminatory land use regulations and practices.					
5. I will be able to use/apply the information from the training.					
6. Overall, the training was a valuable experience.					

Please respond to the following survey items.

7. What was most useful to you about the training? _____

8. What else do you need, if anything, to effectively communicate with local government staff and decision makers about discriminatory land use regulations and practices for residential providers for persons with disabilities? _____

9. We welcome any additional input or comments: _____

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix G. Mental Health Presentation Survey

“How Fair Housing Laws Apply to the CUP Process and Other Land Use Decisions for Residential Facilities”

Participant Follow-up Survey

The following survey is intended to obtain your perceptions and feedback regarding the presentation you attended on November 1st at the monthly meeting of the Mental Health Services Housing Council by Deborah Parker of Futures Associates.

Please note that this survey is one component of an ongoing comprehensive evaluation of the Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (STEP) initiative. The evaluation is being carried out by EVALCORP, an independent research consulting firm contracted by Futures Associates. We appreciate your willingness to answer all of the items as honestly as possible. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The presenter was knowledgeable about the applicability of fair housing laws to residential mental health facilities.					
2. The presentation related materials/handouts were useful.					
3. The presentation helped me better understand the applicability of fair housing laws to mental health residential facilities.					
4. I will be able to use/apply the information from today's presentation.					
5. Overall, the training was a valuable experience.					
6. I would like additional information on the applicability of fair housing laws to residential facilities.					
7. I would benefit from additional resources that I can use to advocate for enforcement of existing fair housing laws (applied to residential facilities) in my community.					

Open-ended Survey Items

8. What was most useful to you about the presentation?
9. Please list anything that you found particularly valuable from the presentation.
10. We welcome any additional input or comments.

Appendix H. Key Informant Interview Protocol

STEP Initiative Year Two Final Evaluation -- Key Informant Interview Protocol

Overview and Informed Consent

[THE FOLLOWING IS TO BE READ AT THE START OF EACH INTERVIEW]

Deborah Parker, the Project Manager for the Solutions for Treatment Expansion Project (known as STEP), recommended that we speak with you to obtain your perceptions and experiences regarding the STEP project being conducted in San Diego County.

The interviews are one component of an overall evaluation of the STEP initiative, a project funded through the California Endowment. The evaluation is being carried out by EVALCORP Research & Consulting, an independent research firm contracted by Futures Associates to measure the implementation and resulting outcomes of the STEP initiative.

The purpose of the interviews is to determine the impact that STEP has made during the past two years and to identify next steps for moving forward.

Please know that your participation is voluntary. With your permission, we would like to record our conversation for transcription purposes to ensure that we capture everything as said. Each recording will be deleted immediately after the notes are typed and will never be shared with anyone other than our research team. Also – all of the information collected through the interviews will be reported in aggregate form – that is, nothing you say will be quoted or attributed to you directly without your express permission.

The interview is expected to take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you in advance for your participation -- your time and input are greatly appreciated.

Do you have any questions of me before we begin?

Proceed to begin interview →

STEP Initiative Year Two Final Evaluation -- Key Informant Interview Questions

Date: _____ **Interviewer Initials:** _____
Respondent: _____ **Agency:** _____
Title: _____ **Department:** _____

I. Involvement with the STEP Initiative

1. Please describe how you have been directly or indirectly involved with the STEP initiative (or Deborah Parker)? (ex: North County Regional Planning Team Member, occasional conversation/contact with Deborah, fair housing professional, heard a presentation Deborah gave, etc.)

[ASK ONLY OF LAST YEAR INTERVIEWEES]:

- 1a. In the past year, what types of specific activities have you engaged in locally to forward the STEP initiative (e.g., in your agency, with treatment providers, local community members, working with local governments)?

II. Importance of STEP

2. How important do you believe the inclusion of the promotion of fair housing laws in the STEP initiative is or will be for residential treatment providers for alcohol and drug addiction, mental health, seniors and other persons with disabilities?
(5 = very important, 1 = not at all important)
3. Do you believe that the majority of persons who “should know” about the implications of fair housing law for residential facilities/group homes for persons in recovery/mentally ill/seniors/etc. actually do know? Please explain.

III. Lessons Learned

4. What has been the most important “take-away” you have learned through your involvement/interactions with STEP Project Manager Deborah Parker?
5. Have you been able to use/apply the information learned through your interaction with Deborah Parker/STEP (e.g., within your agency, with other providers, state or county health professionals, working with or advocating with local government representatives or others, incorporating information on fair housing into current initiatives/efforts, etc.)? If yes, please describe.

IV. Looking Ahead

6. What types of things still need to happen to ensure that residential treatment providers for persons with disabilities get a “level playing field” in the use permitting process and other land use decisions?
7. Through what you have learned through your interaction with STEP/Deborah Parker, have you changed your view of the probability of getting a CUP? If so, please explain.
8. Do you anticipate having continued involvement with STEP/Deborah Parker to increase awareness and enforcement of fair housing laws among providers and local governments? If yes, in what capacity?
9. What steps do you believe need to occur to combat the political power of NIMBY on local government decision makers?
10. How will you know that the STEP initiative is working or has made an impact (i.e., what are your “indicators of success” for the STEP initiative)?

Appendix I. STEP Staff Interview Protocol

STEP Initiative Year Two Final Evaluation – STEP Staff Interview Questions

Date: _____

Interviewee: _____

Title: _____

1. What would you say was the most significant impact of the STEP initiative?
2. What other significant outcomes were realized with the STEP initiative?
3. If you were to do this project all over again, what, if anything would you do differently?
4. Was there something you thought would be easy to do, but was really challenging to implement?
5. Please describe any unexpected outcomes of the STEP initiative.
6. Knowing what you know now, would you change anything about your original proposal for STEP funding? If yes, what would you change and why?
7. What additional work needs to happen to ensure that residential treatment providers for persons with disabilities get a “level playing field” in the use permitting process and other land use decisions?
8. What still needs to occur to combat the political power of NIMBY on local government decision makers?
9. What long-lasting investments were made as a result of the STEP initiative?
10. How has the STEP initiative impacted your organization? Is this impact long-term, and if yes, how so?