

EXAMPLE OF CHILD/YOUTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF COUNTY/CITY-LEVEL PROPOSAL

Developed by [Kids Impact Initiative](#) Re: Clark Co. NV Anti-Discrimination in Housing Policy

This completed example of a county/city level impact assessment was developed by Kids Impact Initiative as a prototype. This mock-up is designed to show what a completed assessment looks like, using our ten suggested questions. While the policy described is an actual proposal, the assessment was not actually used as part of the policymaking process.

Name of Proposal: Ordinance #4798 – Clark County, Nevada (2020/2021)

Please provide a one- to two- sentence description of its key provisions and a link to the proposed policy.

The proposed policy extends—through the effective period of the Governor of Nevada’s COVID-19 pandemic Declaration of Emergency—an August 4, 2020, emergency ordinance prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of the following:

- source of income (i.e., renter’s or buyer’s sources of income and/or housing assistance paid on behalf of a renter or buyer); or
- a COVID-19-related eviction (e.g., loss of income due to the pandemic).

This Child/Youth Impact Assessment is based on the following version of Ordinance #4798:

<https://files.clarkcountynv.gov/clarknv/clerk/ORD%204798.pdf?t=1608232471531&t=1608232471531>

SUMMARY OF CHILD/YOUTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Positive Impacts of Proposal on Children and Youth

The proposal will support children and youth—especially children of color, low-income children, and children in mixed-immigration-status families—during the COVID-19 pandemic by doing the following:

- Helping to prevent homelessness among children and families;
- Helping to ensure families have more stable housing; and
- Providing families with the option to move to higher-opportunity neighborhoods.

Potential Negative Impacts of Proposal on Children and Youth

The proposal could potentially harm children and youth for these reasons:

- It is temporary, dependent on the Governor’s COVID-19-related Declaration of Emergency; and
- It could result in discrimination against LGBTQ+ youth by not calling out the fact in its materials for the public that the county already has a policy of prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression.

Ways to Minimize Potential Harm to Children and Youth

To strengthen the proposal and minimize potential harm on children and youth, the policy could do the following:

- Make permanent the source-of-income discrimination protections in this emergency proposal after the Governor’s Declaration of Emergency ends.
- Put in place measures to protect against evictions once the Declaration of Emergency ends, such as requiring landlords to negotiate repayment plans with tenants for back-owed rent and other actions to keep children and families housed.
- Make more explicit in public materials Clark County’s policy of prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression.
- Engage youth, especially youth of color and other marginalized groups of children, in decisions about housing that impact their lives.

Assessment Questions

1. What are the goals of the proposed policy, practice, or program?

The goal of the proposed policy is to ensure that all Clark County residents (including families with children) who have suffered financial hardship due to COVID-19 can access stable housing during the COVID-19 pandemic. It accomplishes this goal by removing barriers to finding housing for those who have historically faced discrimination in housing, including those who receive housing assistance (e.g., Section 8 vouchers) and those who receive public benefits (e.g., unemployment insurance, cash assistance, Social Security benefits, disability benefits, and child support). It also accomplishes the goal by allowing renters who have experienced financial hardship due to COVID-19 to avoid eviction.

2. Is the proposal likely to have an impact on children and youth—either positive or negative?

Yes

If yes, explain how?

This proposal will help children and youth avoid homelessness by preventing them from being evicted due to COVID-19-related reasons or denied housing because of their families' sources of income. Nearly 250,000 renter households in Clark County are at risk of eviction due to the pandemic. A significant number of these households include children: the average renter household size in Clark County is 2.7.

Further, this proposed policy will support families with children in securing a place to live by prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of source of income, including housing assistance. For example, in addition to the renters mentioned above, those who will benefit include approximately 11,000 families, comprised of 38,000 children and adults, who are served by the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority's Housing Choice Voucher Program (i.e., Section 8).

In addition, by prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of source of income, this proposed policy makes available to Clark County residents housing opportunities in higher-opportunity neighborhoods. Research has shown that living in higher-opportunity neighborhoods and having stable housing are critical determinants of multiple outcomes for children. Compared to children with poor housing quality, children with stable, high-quality housing in higher-opportunity neighborhoods tend to have fewer mental health problems, better overall health outcomes, and higher educational achievement.

Does the proposal have a disproportionate impact on children and youth who are Black, Latinx, Asian-American, Indigenous, or identify with other racial or ethnic groups?

Yes

If yes, which groups and how?

The proposal will have a greater positive impact on children of color because people of color—as well as low-income and undocumented renters—in Clark County are most vulnerable for eviction. Further, a greater proportion of people of color live in rental housing, so the policy proposal could especially benefit communities of color. In Clark County, nearly 71 percent of Black residents, nearly 58 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native residents, and more than 57 percent of Hispanic/Latino residents live in rental housing. This is compared to 39 percent of the White population that rents.

The proposed policy also has the potential to increase the percentage of Black and Latino children who live in higher-opportunity neighborhoods. In the Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise area (a significant proportion of Clark County, Nevada), 58.8 percent of Hispanic/Latino children and 53 percent of Black children live in very low- or low-opportunity neighborhoods.

3. Does the proposal affect other groups of children and youth in particular, such as low-income children, youth with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, or youth in foster care?

Yes

If yes, which groups and how?

As mentioned, in addition to people of color, low-income and undocumented renters are [most vulnerable for eviction](#). Therefore, these groups stand the most to gain from the proposed policy.

However, by ignoring the need for clear communications around LGBTQ+ individuals' rights to housing, this proposal could perpetuate housing discrimination against LGBTQ+ children and youth and those with LGBTQ+ family members. Specifically, the proposal could make more publicly explicit the county's policy prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression. While this policy is outlined on Clark County's [website](#), it is not included in [public-facing materials](#) related to Clark County's list of prohibited bases of discrimination in housing. Without the policy being more publicly explicit, families with LGBTQ+ children and other members may not know their rights to housing and be refused housing both during and after the pandemic, putting children and their families at risk of homelessness.

4. Are the needs of children and youth living in rural areas adequately addressed?

Yes

Explain:

The policy does not distinguish between residents who live in urban vs. rural areas and, therefore, should not impact children and youth living in rural areas differently than those living in urban/suburban areas of Clark County. The vast majority of residents in Clark County live in urban areas with [fewer than 4 percent](#) living in rural areas.

5. Does the proposal affect parents' ability to support their children's health and wellbeing? For example, does it impact employment opportunities, access to affordable transportation, quality child care, etc?

Yes

Explain:

There are [data](#) to suggest that source-of-income anti-discrimination laws increase the likelihood of housing voucher recipients both finding a place to live and moving to a higher-opportunity neighborhood. The [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities](#) documents that "where families live largely determines the quality of their children's schools, the safety of the streets and playgrounds, and the characteristics of their neighbors. It also can affect adults' access to jobs, transportation costs to work, access to fresh and reasonably priced food and other basic goods and services, and the distance between child care and jobs."

Please identify particular impacts on the parents of children of color and other marginalized groups.

This policy will support the ability of families with children of color to move to higher-opportunity neighborhoods, improving their access to resources to support their children's health and well-being. As mentioned, a significant proportion of Black and Hispanic/Latino families live in low- and lower-opportunity neighborhoods. In addition, since a greater proportion of families of color rent, this policy will have a greater

impact on their ability to avoid eviction due to COVID-19 impacts, providing families with children of color the safety and stability they need to support their children.

6. Does the proposal affect the institutions that are part of everyday life for children—for example, schools, local parks, transportation, or housing—especially for marginalized groups?

Yes

If yes, which institutions and how?

This proposal, first and foremost, affects housing for children, especially children of color and low-income children, by making more and higher-quality housing available to families during the COVID-19 pandemic. The proposal also improves children and their families' access to other valuable assets in the community—such as better schools, safer transportation, and more parks and green space—because the proposal allows for greater movement for low-income families from lower- to higher-opportunity neighborhoods.

7. Did young people most affected by this proposal provide input into the proposal and/or this assessment?

No

If yes, how?

If no, why not?

Organizations that represent children and families provided input and testified on behalf of the policy. However, youth—including youth of color and other marginalized groups of youth— themselves did not provide input.

8. If applicable, what are ways to prevent or minimize negative impacts on children and youth resulting from the proposed policy or program?

Please include ways to prevent or minimize negative impacts of the proposal that disproportionately affect children and youth of color and other marginalized groups.

Clark County could take the following actions to prevent and minimize negative impacts of the proposal on children and youth.

- Make permanent the source-of-income discrimination protections in this emergency proposal after the Governor's Declaration of Emergency ends by following the example of [18 states and nearly 100 local jurisdictions](#) (cities and counties) that have some form of source-of-income discrimination protections in housing.
- Put in place measures to protect against evictions once the Declaration of Emergency ends, such as requiring landlords to negotiate repayment plans with tenants for back-owed rent and other actions to keep children and families housed.
- Make more explicit in public materials Clark County's policy of prohibiting discrimination in housing on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity or expression.
- Engage youth, especially youth of color and other marginalized groups of children, in decisions about housing that impact their lives.

9. Once implemented, will the policy be assessed over time for its actual impacts on children and youth, including marginalized groups?

Unclear

If yes, how?

Date completed: January 6, 2021

Name and affiliation of person who completed the assessment: Jane Doe, Clark County Policy & Analytical Services

Excerpted from "Using Child Impact Assessments in Your Community or State: A Starter Guide," Kids Impact Initiative, <http://bit.ly/Using-CIAs>.
Copyright © 2021 Kids Impact Initiative, a project of Community Partners. All rights reserved. Permission to copy, disseminate or otherwise use this work is normally granted as long as ownership is properly attributed to Kids Impact Initiative, a project of Community Partners.