



Tri-Municipal Region

2025 Alberta Provincial
Estimations and Service Needs

Community Report



Prepared By:
Rural Development Network
(780)-964-2736
11443 - 143 Street, NW
Edmonton, AB



We Thank You.

This report and the information within were made possible through the efforts of many dedicated individuals and groups. First and foremost, we would like to thank the residents of the Tri-Municipal Region for sharing their experiences and insights about housing and service needs in the community. We appreciate your time, effort, and knowledge! Additionally, we want to thank the front-line staff at participating service provider locations for their support, dedication, and commitment to this project:

- City of Spruce Grove
- Town of Stony Plain
- Parkland County
- WestView PCN
- Parkland Food Bank
- Bredin Institute
- Parkland Pregnancy Support Centre
- Neighbourlink Parkland
- Turning Points
- Alberta Parenting for the Future Association



Parkland Pregnancy Support Centre

NEIGHBOURLINK PARKLAND
...compassion in action...



PARKLAND TURNING POINTS SOCIETY
COUNSELLING SERVICES



Alberta Parenting for the Future Association

This project is funded in part by the Government of Canada's Reaching Home: Canada's Homelessness Strategy

Canada 

About this Report

In 2025, the Rural Development Network (RDN) partnered with 19 organizations representing 64 communities across Alberta to conduct the fourth iteration of a province-wide Housing and Service Needs Estimation.

This report outlines the Tri-Municipal Region's results within the provincial estimation, highlighting the number of residents who are housing insecure and their experiences with housing insecurity. This report is complemented by the Alberta Provincial Report, which highlights the combined results of all 64 communities across the province.

This report is intended to support decision-making across organizations, funders, and government around housing insecurity by providing reliable and up-to-date data on housing and service needs in the Tri-Municipal Region. It can also be used in the community for program planning and advocacy purposes related to housing insecurity, housing stock, and service needs.

Contact info@ruraldevelopment.ca for more information on Housing and Service Needs Estimations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
About this Report	iv
Table of Contents	v
Definitions: What Does “Homelessness” Mean?	1
Introduction	3
Methodology	6
• Limitations	9
Data Highlights for the Entire Tri-Municipal Region	11
• Tri-Municipal Region Population Overview	11
• Housing & Service Needs Estimation Survey Respondent Population Overview	13
• Living Situation	14
• Education, Employment, and Income Sources	16
• Community Supports	18
• “What Would You Like to See More of in Your Community?”	19
Detailed Results by Community: Stony Plain, Spruce Grove, and Parkland County	20
• Objective Housing Situation	21
• Housing Secure vs. Housing Insecure Survey Respondent Population Overview	23
• Exploring the Spectrum of Homelessness in the Tri-Municipal Region	26
• Living Situation	29
• Education, Employment, and Income Sources	35
• Community Supports	41
• “What Would You Like to See More of in Your Community?”	46
Opportunities Moving Forward	50
References	54

Definitions: What Does “Homelessness” Mean?

Homelessness

According to the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness (Gaetz et al., 2012), homelessness is the situation of an individual, family, or community without stable, safe, permanent, appropriate housing, or the immediate prospect, means, and ability to acquire it. It is the result of systemic or societal barriers, domestic violence, a lack of affordable and appropriate housing, the individual/household’s financial, mental, cognitive, behavioural, or physical challenges, and/or racism and discrimination.

Further, Indigenous homelessness, more recently termed “houselessness,” considers the traumas imposed on Indigenous Peoples through colonialism. Indigenous houselessness is not only defined as lacking a structure of habitation; rather, it is more fully described and understood through a composite lens of Indigenous worldviews, including: “individuals, families, and communities isolated from their relationships to land, water, place, family, kin, each other, animals, cultures, languages, and identities” (Thistle, 2017).

Most people do not choose to be homeless, and the experience is generally negative, unpleasant and stressful. The national definition of homelessness notes that individuals who become homeless experience a range of physical living situations, including:

Unsheltered: Absolutely homeless, living on the streets or in places not intended for human habitation (e.g. living on sidewalks, squares, parks, vehicles, garages, etc.).

Emergency Sheltered: People who are staying in overnight shelters due to homelessness as well as those staying in shelters due to family violence.

Provisionally Accommodated: People with an accommodation that is temporary or that lacks security for tenure (e.g. couch-surfing, living in transitional housing, living in abandoned buildings, living in places unfit for human habitation, people who are housed seasonally, people in domestic violence situations, etc.).

At Risk of Homelessness: People who are not yet homeless but whose current economic and/or housing situation is precarious or does not meet public health and safety standards (e.g. people who are one rent payment missed from eviction, people whose housing may be condemned for health, by-law, or safety violations, etc.).

(Canadian Observatory on Homelessness, 2012).

In this report, we will use “housing insecure.” The term will be used to encompass the entire spectrum of homelessness, including unsheltered, emergency sheltered, provisionally accommodated, and at risk of homelessness, as well as those experiencing Indigenous houselessness.



Introduction



Housing insecurity is a continued and increasing concern in rural, remote, and Indigenous communities across Alberta and the entire country. When it comes to housing insecurity, the urban experience tends to dominate the conversation, mainly due to the visibility of unsheltered individuals experiencing housing insecurity in urban centres. The issue of housing insecurity in rural and remote areas is far less understood and acknowledged because of its hidden nature. Recent data suggests that rural homelessness is prevalent at rates equivalent to or greater than urban per capita rates (Schiff et al., 2022).

In 2023, the Alberta Provincial Housing and Service Needs Estimation identified 2,429 survey respondents as experiencing housing insecurity. An additional 2,354 dependents under 18 and 2,537 adults reported living with housing insecure survey respondents, meaning there were at least 7,320 community members experiencing housing insecurity across the 21 participating communities in rural and remote Alberta (Rural Development Network, 2023). While some housing insecure respondents had experiences of being unsheltered or emergency-sheltered, the majority of housing insecure respondents were provisionally accommodated or at risk of homelessness, further speaking to the issue of visibility, or rather invisibility, of housing insecurity in rural and remote communities.

As rural, remote, and Indigenous communities continue to experience growth amidst a national housing and affordability crisis, it has become more apparent than ever that more evidence is required to support decision-making on housing insecurity, housing stock, and services across the province.

Recognizing this, RDN conducted the 2025 Alberta Provincial Housing and Service Needs Estimation with 19 organizations representing roughly 64 rural, remote, and Indigenous communities across Alberta in an attempt to better understand what housing insecurity looks like in each community and across the rural provincial landscape. Specifically, the purpose of this estimation is to:

1. Provide a comprehensive picture of housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region and across Alberta, including demographic information on who is experiencing housing insecurity and details on service use and gaps.
2. Help inform service providers and municipal, provincial, and federal policies, practices, and funding decisions on housing insecurity, housing stock, and support services.
3. Develop recommendations and next steps for service providers and all levels of government to address housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region and across Alberta.
4. Elevate and incorporate the voices of people experiencing housing insecurity in local, provincial, and federal responses to housing insecurity.

This is the fourth iteration of the Alberta Provincial Housing and Service Needs Estimation. It was also conducted in 2018, 2020, and 2023, with 20, 24, and 21 communities, respectively. Table 1 details the Tri-Municipal Region's participation in previous Provincial and custom Housing and Service Needs Estimations.

Table 1: Past Participation in Provincial Estimations

	Total # of Respondents	# of Housing Insecure Respondents	# of Housing Insecure Dependents and Additional Adults	Total # of Housing Insecure Community Members
2018	264	142	265	407
2020	359	197	435	632
2022 (custom)	428	396	737	1,133



Methodology

The methodology employed in this Housing and Service Needs Estimation comes from the Step-by-Step Guide to Estimating Rural, Remote, and Indigenous Homelessness, published by the Rural Development Network (2022). RDN initially developed the Step-by-Step Guide due to the lack of available, accurate, and current data on rural housing insecurity. A lack of data limits the ability of rural communities like the Tri-Municipal Region to advocate for better resources for their residents.

The guide is unique in that it tackles the issue of housing insecurity and homelessness from a rural perspective. It recognizes the difficulties of conducting standard Point-in-Time (PiT) counts in rural and remote areas and instead uses a service-based population estimation approach, which allows for anyone, including small nonprofits and local front-line agencies, to gather data on gaps in local housing and service needs without adding additional strain to workloads and organizational capacities.

Please note: *As with a PiT count, this estimation is an undercount and represents only those individuals identified during the four-week period. The number of people experiencing housing insecurity is greater than presented in this report.*

Following the model proposed in the Step-by-Step Guide, RDN worked with communities and academics across Canada to develop a survey that reflected the contexts of rural and remote communities. The survey was developed following the definitions of homelessness proposed by the Canadian Observatory on Homelessness and adopted by the federal government. However, the survey itself was advertised as a Housing and Service Needs survey. This is a result of feedback from multiple service providers who are committed to minimizing the stigma associated with homelessness, which could cause distress to their clients. By reframing the language of the survey, service providers were able to encourage all clients to participate, instead of targeting specific individuals.

To further minimize stigma throughout the survey, rather than asking respondents to identify themselves as homeless or housing insecure, they were asked whether they considered their living conditions secure or insecure and to indicate scenarios in a “select all that apply” question that determined their objective housing situation. Based on responses to the latter survey question, along with subsequent data analysis, RDN was able to determine which respondents were housing insecure. As shown in the results below, some individuals who did not consider themselves housing insecure qualify as such based on the national definitions of homelessness.

The same survey was used across all communities participating in the 2025 Alberta Provincial Housing and Service Needs Estimation project, with one exception: each community’s survey was customized to meet their location parameters. Figure 1 showcases the Tri-Municipal Region’s location parameters.

Figure 1: The Tri-Municipal Region's Location Question on Survey
Q2. Where do you currently live (or which community do you live closest to)?

- Stony Plain
- Spruce Grove
- Parkland County
- Other: _____

RDN worked with the Tri-Municipal Region to develop a survey administration process to ensure the greatest participation level possible. For the Tri-Municipal Region, surveys were advertised at service provider locations and online as an open SurveyMonkey link across the community. Surveys were available through these locations and online for a period of four weeks, from October 1 to October 31, 2025.

Before the survey period began, RDN conducted orientation and training sessions with staff from participating agencies. During the training, emphasis was placed on clarifying survey terms, ensuring respondents' confidentiality and privacy, and securing participants' informed consent. During each training session, resources were provided to staff to improve their understanding of the project and increase comfort in administering the survey. Training and resources also included the various ways to administer the survey in an open, non-intrusive manner, prioritizing the individual's reasons for visiting the agency before offering the survey.

Important to note about the survey: to ensure the trust and anonymity of participants, each respondent was asked to give consent at the beginning of the survey and create a unique identifier. The unique identifier allowed RDN to maintain the integrity of the data without knowing respondent identities. The unique identifier was a combination of letters and numbers from a participant's name and birthdate.

Figure 2: Unique Identifier Question on Survey

Q1. Anonymous Unique Identifier (ex. John Smith, born on 15th November 1964)

H	N	What are the last two letters of your FIRST name?
T	H	What are the last two letters of your LAST name?
1	5	What is the DAY you were born?
6	4	What are the last two numbers of the YEAR you were born?

The Tri-Municipal Region collected 551 survey responses during the four weeks. Of the 551 surveys, 114 were excluded. Surveys were deemed unsuitable and excluded for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Survey respondent(s) declined to give consent.
2. Survey respondent(s) declined to provide the unique identifier or provided improper unique identifier information (e.g., characters instead of numbers, etc.).
3. Survey respondent(s) submitted multiple surveys (determined based on unique identifier(s)).
4. Survey respondent(s) indicated they were located outside of community boundaries.
5. Survey respondent(s) did not complete enough questions to determine housing stability (e.g., abandoned the survey).

Based on this, 437 were deemed suitable for further analysis and will be the focus of the results outlined below.

Limitations


Despite our best attempts to reduce stigma and increase the accessibility of the survey, not all clients who were offered a survey chose to participate. Additionally, staff at participating service providers were informed that participants under 14 years old required guardian consent to participate in the survey. We recognize that this is inherently problematic and exclusionary, as most youth experiencing homelessness would not have a guardian to provide consent. However, to maintain survey ethics, this requirement complies with the Alberta College of Social Workers' Standards of Practice.

Additionally, the data does not represent the Tri-Municipal Region as a whole; rather, it represents only those who accessed services in the region during the four-week enumeration period.

As a result, there remains some people experiencing housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region whose voices were not captured in this project. Therefore, while the trends and highlights discussed in this report are informative, it is always important to remember that this report presents a conservative picture of the housing and services needs in the Tri-Municipal Region.



**Data Highlights for the Entire
Tri-Municipal Region**




Tri-Municipal Region Population Overview

According to Statistics Canada (2021a-c), the Tri-Municipal Region covers 2,448.6 square km of geographical land base and has a population size of 87,843.

50% (43,940) of the Tri-Municipal Region indicated they were women, while 50% (43,905) indicated they were men (Statistics Canada, 2021a-c).

Figure 3: Tri-Municipal Region Population Age Breakdown (2021a-c)



The average age in the Tri-Municipal Region is 40.2 years.

According to Statistics Canada (2021a-c) Census numbers, 8.3% (7,290) of the Tri-Municipal Region's population were immigrants to Canada. Further, 7.6% (6,750) of The Tri-Municipal Region's population identified as Indigenous: 2.7% (2,385) were First Nations, 4.8% (4,225) were Métis, and 0.1% (140) were Inuk.

The 2021 Census also reported that the Tri-Municipal Region has 36,325 private dwellings with an average of 2.6 people per household. Of the 36,325 private dwellings in the Tri-Municipal Region, 81.2% (27,100) were owned, while 23% (6,245) were rented, with average monthly shelter costs for rented dwellings reported as \$1,395.33. Additionally, 71.2% (23,740) were single-detached houses, 11.6% (3,865) were apartments,¹ 7.9% (2,635) were semi-detached houses, 5.7% (1,920) were moveable dwellings,² and 3.4% (1,160) were row houses.

22.8% (8,315) of households in the Tri-Municipal Region reported one or more of the following:

- Spending more than 30% of their income on shelter costs,
- That their dwelling is "not suitable," and/or,
- That their dwelling has "major repair needs."

¹ Includes apartments or flats in a duplex and apartments in both buildings with fewer than five storeys and with five or more storeys.

² According to Statistics Canada (2021), a moveable dwelling includes mobile homes and other movable dwellings such as houseboats, recreational vehicles and railroad cars.

The median after-tax income in the Tri-Municipal Region (Statistics Canada, 2021a-c) can be broken down by community:

- City of Spruce Grove: \$40,000 for individuals and \$79,500 for households
- Parkland County: \$42,000 for individuals and \$98,000 for households
- Town of Stony Plain: \$46,800 for individuals and \$91,000 for households

The Economic Research Institute (2026a; 2026b) estimates the cost of living in the City of Spruce Grove to be 10% higher than the national average and 6% higher than the Alberta provincial average. In the Town of Stony Plain, cost of living is estimated to be 7% higher than the national average and 3% higher than the Alberta provincial average. There is no data available by the Economic Research Institute for Parkland County on cost of living.

Housing & Service Needs Estimation Survey

Respondent Population Overview

Gender and Sexuality

75% (328) of participants identified as women, 23% (99) as men, 1% (3) as gender non-conforming, 0% (1) as trans-men, and 0% (1) as trans-women. Additionally, 1% (3) of respondents preferred not to answer.

86% (371) of respondents identified as straight, 5% (20) as bisexual/pansexual, 1% (6) as lesbian/gay, 1% (3) as asexual, 1% (3) as Two-Spirit, and 1% (3) were unsure of the gender identity. Additionally, 5% (23) preferred not to answer.

Age

3% (11) of respondents were between the ages of 15 and 24, 41% (177) were 25 to 44, 39% (172) were 45 to 65, and 18% (77) were 65 and older.

Household Makeup

5% (11) of respondents noted that they or someone in their home was pregnant, 22% (48) indicated they live in a multi-generational home, and 73% (158) were in single-parent households.

Time Spent in Care

8% (34) of respondents indicated they spent time in foster care, a youth group home, or in a youth/young adult agreement. 1% (5) preferred not to answer.

Immigration

80% (342) of respondents were born in Canada, while 20% (85) immigrated to Canada. 20% (85) of respondents who immigrated to Canada have lived here for less than a year, while 77% (85) of respondents who immigrated to Canada have lived here for more than ten years.

Race and Indigenous Identity

87% (348) of respondents identified as white, compared to 9% (39) of racially diverse respondents. 4% (17) of respondents preferred not to answer, and 1% (4) self-disclosed as "Canadian," and "Mixed."

Further, 14% (61) of respondents self-identified as Indigenous, while 1% (6) preferred not to answer. Of those respondents who self-identified as Indigenous, 44% (27) identified as First Nations, 49% (30) as Métis, and 10% (6) as other Indigenous ancestry.


Veteran Status

6% (28) of total respondents indicated that they served in the Canadian Armed Forces, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), or emergency services. 21% (6) served in the Canadian Armed Forces, 7% (2) served in the RCMP, and 79% (22) served in emergency services.

Living Situation

Residents in the Tri-Municipal Region responded to the survey, as seen in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Breakdown of Survey Respondents by Location



13% (56) of all respondents, 87% (49) of which are housing insecure, have always lived in the Tri-Municipal Region.

Respondents were also asked: *“What are the main reasons you came to this community? If you have always lived here, why have you chosen to stay in this community?”*

The top three reasons housing insecure respondents came to the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- For the lifestyle the community offers
- Housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.)

In comparison, the top three reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- For the lifestyle the community offers
- The connection to culture, community, and traditions

Did you know...

- 16% (17) of housing insecure respondents have moved between three and six times in the past 12 months

Experiences of Violence, Abuse, and Unwanted Sexual Activity Amongst Housing Insecure Respondents



18% (27) of housing insecure respondents indicated they were experiencing violence, abuse, and/or unwanted sexual activity at the time of the survey. Based on additional analysis, we know that:



- **85%** identified as women, **15%** identified as men
- **93%** were straight, **4%** were asexual, and **4%** preferred not to answer

Age Breakdown

15-24	4%
25-44	56%
45-64	37%
65+	4%

Indigenous Identity

- 22%** were Indigenous
- **50%** were First Nations
 - **33%** were Métis
 - **17%** other Indigenous ancestry



- **52%** were employed in some capacity at the time of the survey and **4%** were retired

Education, Employment, and Income

Education

Respondents indicated various education levels when responding to the question, “What is the highest level of education you’ve completed?”

In The Tri-Municipal Region:

- 1% (5) of respondents had completed some grade school
- 12% (52) had completed some high school
- 20% (86) had completed high school or received their GED,
- 13% (56) had an apprenticeship, trades certificate, or diploma
- 22% (92) had some post-secondary (college, university)
- 31% (131) had a post-secondary degree (college, university)

Additionally, 0% (1) of respondents were unsure what their highest level of education was and 1% (4) respondents preferred not to answer.

Employment

49% (150) of housing insecure respondents were employed at the time of the survey. Additionally, 11% (39) of respondents indicated they were retired. Comparatively, 91% (50) of housing secure respondents were employed at the time of the survey and 32% (27) of respondents were retired.

Unemployment Amongst Housing Insecure Respondents

50% (151) of housing insecure respondents were unemployed at the time of the survey. Based on additional analysis, we know that:

75% identified as women, **21%** men, **1%** as trans-men, **1%** as trans-women, **1%** as gender non-conforming, and **1%** preferred not to answer

84% were straight, **5%** were bisexual/pansexual, **3%** were lesbian/gay, **1%** were asexual, **1%** were Two-Spirit, **1%** wasn’t sure their sexual orientation, and **5%** preferred not to answer



Age Breakdown

15-24	1%
25-44	46%
45-64	48%
65+	5%

Indigenous Identity

- 21%** were Indigenous
- **47%** were First Nations
 - **44%** were Métis
 - **9%** other Indigenous ancestry

Income

Housing insecure respondents were also asked to disclose their approximate household income for the previous year. Responses varied widely, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Housing Insecure Respondents Approximate Household Income in the Last 12 Months

Total Household Income in the Last 12 Months	# of Respondents
Less than \$22,000	104 (30%)
Between \$22,001 and \$55,000	136 (40%)
Between \$55,001 and \$88,000	42 (12%)
Between \$88,001 and \$132,000 ³	28 (8%)
More than \$132,001	16 (5%)
Prefer not to answer	15 (4%)

³ It is important to remember the spectrum of homelessness when considering income rates amongst housing insecure respondents. Someone who is experiencing domestic or family violence, for example, is considered housing insecure no matter their annual household income. Additionally, it is important to remember that people cycle through the spectrum of homelessness regularly and just because some reported an annual household income of \$88,001 or more in 2024, for example, does not mean they were not experiencing housing insecurity in 2025 - this could have occurred as a result of job loss, a death in the family, increasing interest and utility rates, or any number of reasons.

Community Supports

To better understand service needs and gaps in the Tri-Municipal Region, respondents were asked: *“Which support services do you access and where do you most often access them?”*

Housing insecure respondents primarily accessed services in the Tri-Municipal Region for:

- Basic needs (91%)
- Health and wellness supports (42%)
- Family/parenting services and supports (26%)

In comparison, those accessing services outside of the Tri-Municipal Region did so primarily for:

- Health and wellness supports (47%)
- Legal services (38%)
- Financial supports (38%)

Shelter Use

13 unique housing insecure respondents reported staying in a shelter in the past year. Among them:

- 50% (9) stayed in an emergency shelter,
- 22% (4) stayed in an emergency weather space or shelter,
- 17% (3) stayed in a women’s/domestic violence shelter, and
- 11% (2) stayed in a shelter but were not sure what type of shelter.

Additionally, 1% (4) of housing insecure respondents reported stays in transitional housing.

13% (47) housing insecure respondents reported needing emergency shelter services at some point in the 12 months before completing the survey, but did not access them. The top three reasons respondents did not access shelter services when they needed them were because:

1. There were no shelters in their area.
2. Their pets were not allowed in the shelter.
3. They didn’t feel safe.

“What Would You Like to See More of in Your Community?”

To gain more insight into respondents' perceptions of service provision in the Tri-Municipal Region, they were asked: *“Does your community provide enough... accessible and affordable housing; access to food; addictions and mental health supports; employment services; free/accessible recreation/social opportunities; public transportation services; social services?”*

Table 3: Total Respondents' Perceptions of the Tri-Municipal Region's Provision of Services

Does the Community Provide Enough:	Yes	No	Unsure
Accessible, affordable housing	44 (11%)	242 (61%)	110 (28%)
Access to food (grocery stores, markets, food banks, etc.)	328 (82%)	43 (11%)	31 (8%)
Addictions and mental health supports (counselling, treatment, post-treatment support, etc.)	91 (23%)	147 (37%)	156 (40%)
Employment services (resume writing, job searching, etc.)	97 (25%)	122 (31%)	169 (44%)
Free/accessible recreation/social opportunities	114 (29%)	175 (44%)	106 (27%)
Public transportation services	153 (39%)	140 (36%)	97 (25%)
Social services (libraries, emergency services, outreach programs, etc.)	227 (58%)	83 (21%)	81 (21%)



**Detailed Results by Community:
Stony Plain, Spruce Grove, and
Parkland County**

Objective Housing Situation

The Tri-Municipal Region, including the City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County, and the Town of Stony Plain, received 437 survey responses. They can be broken down by community:

- City of Spruce Grove: 197
- Parkland County: 70
- Town of Stony Plain: 170

As part of the survey, participants were asked: *“Do you consider your housing situation unstable or feel you could easily lose your housing?”* Respondents were given the options “yes,” “no,” and “I’m not sure” to guide their responses.

Of the 437 survey respondents, 162 self-identified as housing insecure, 57 indicated “I’m not sure,” while 211 indicated they were housing secure, and seven skipped the question. Using the national definitions of homelessness to guide further analysis, 354 survey respondents were identified as housing insecure and 83 as housing secure. An additional 360 dependents under 18 and 443 adults were reported as living with housing insecure survey respondents.

Tables 4 and 5 show breakdowns of respondents by housing security status and highlight the number of dependents and adults who reported sharing living conditions with housing insecure respondents in the Tri-Municipal Region.

Table 4: Breakdown of Respondent Housing Status

# of Individuals	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Housing Secure	25	9	49
Housing Insecure	172	61	121

Table 5: Breakdown of Dependents & Adults Sharing Insecure Housing Living Conditions

# of Additional Individuals	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Dependents	206	41	113
Adults	219	79	145

Based on survey results, there were at least 1,157 community members experiencing housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region. Important to remember here is that this number (1,157) only captures those who accessed services during the 30-day enumeration period and agreed to complete a survey. Knowing this, it is safe to assume that there are more than 1,157 community members experiencing housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region.

The top three reasons for housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region, as reported by survey respondents, were:

1. High housing costs⁴
2. Health challenges⁵
3. Conflict & violence⁶

⁴ "My rent/mortgage is too high for my current income"

⁵ "Illness/medical condition," "Mental health concerns," "Mental disability," and/or "Physical disability"

⁶ "I am experiencing domestic/family violence or abuse," "I am experiencing family conflict/rejection," "I am experiencing conflict with my spouse/partner"

Housing Secure vs. Housing Insecure Survey

Respondent Population Overview

Table 6: Housing & Service Needs Estimation Survey Population Overview Comparison by Housing Stability

Demographic Characteristic	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure
# of Survey Respondents	25	172	9	61	49	121
Gender	Gender non-conforming: 0	Gender non-conforming: 2	Gender non-conforming: 0	Gender non-conforming: 0	Gender non-conforming: 0	Gender non-conforming: 1
	Man: 4	Man: 44	Man: 1	Man: 18	Man: 9	Man: 23
	Trans-man: 0	Trans-man: 1	Trans-man: 0	Trans-man: 0	Trans-man: 0	Trans-man: 0
	Trans-woman: 0	Trans-woman: 0	Trans-woman: 0	Trans-woman: 1	Trans-woman: 0	Trans-woman: 0
	Woman: 20	Woman: 123	Woman: 8	Woman: 42	Woman: 38	Woman: 97
	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0
Sexual Orientation	Asexual: 0	Asexual: 2	Asexual: 0	Asexual: 0	Asexual: 1	Asexual: 0
	Bisexual/Pansexual: 0	Bisexual/Pansexual: 13	Bisexual/Pansexual: 0	Bisexual/Pansexual: 1	Bisexual/Pansexual: 0	Bisexual/Pansexual: 6
	Lesbian/Gay: 0	Lesbian/Gay: 3	Lesbian/Gay: 0	Lesbian/Gay: 1	Lesbian/Gay: 0	Lesbian/Gay: 2
	Straight: 22	Straight: 142	Straight: 8	Straight: 55	Straight: 40	Straight: 104
	Two-Spirit: 0	Two-Spirit: 2	Two-Spirit: 0	Two-Spirit: 0	Two-Spirit: 0	Two-Spirit: 1
	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 3	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0	Not sure: 0

Demographic Characteristic	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure
Age	0-14 years: 0	0-14 years: 0	0-14 years: 0	0-14 years: 0	0-14 years: 0	0-14 years: 0
	15-24 years: 0	15-24 years: 6	15-24 years: 0	15-24 years: 1	15-24 years: 2	15-24 years: 2
	25-44 years: 10	25-44 years: 73	25-44 years: 1	25-44 years: 25	25-44 years: 10	25-44 years: 58
	45-64 years: 9	45-64 years: 70	45-64 years: 5	45-64 years: 28	45-64 years: 18	45-64 years: 42
	65+ years: 6	65+ years: 23	65+ years: 3	65+ years: 7	65+ years: 19	65+ years: 19
Household Makeup	Pregnancy in household: 1	Pregnancy in household: 5	Pregnancy in household: 0	Pregnancy in household: 2	Pregnancy in household: 1	Pregnancy in household: 2
	Multi-generational household: 0	Multi-generational household: 23	Multi-generational household: 0	Multi-generational household: 8	Multi-generational household: 3	Multi-generational household: 14
	Single-parent household: 3	Single-parent household: 69	Single-parent household: 0	Single-parent household: 26	Single-parent household: 5	Single-parent household: 55
	Spent time in care: 2	Spent time in care: 19	Spent time in care: 0	Spent time in care: 5	Spent time in care: 0	Spent time in care: 8
Immigration Status	Born in Canada: 18	Born in Canada: 123	Born in Canada: 9	Born in Canada: 53	Born in Canada: 43	Born in Canada: 96
	Born outside of Canada: 7	Born outside of Canada: 43	Born outside of Canada: 0	Born outside of Canada: 0	Born outside of Canada: 6	Born outside of Canada: 23
Racial Identity	White: 19	White: 124	White: 8	White: 51	White: 45	White: 101
	Racialized: 2	Racialized: 33	Racialized: 0	Racialized: 0	Racialized: 0	Racialized: 9

Demographic Characteristic	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure	Housing Secure	Housing Insecure
Indigenous Identity	First Nations: 0	First Nations: 17	First Nations: 0	First Nations: 1	First Nations: 0	First Nations: 9
	Métis: 2	Métis: 15	Métis: 1	Métis: 2	Métis: 1	Métis: 9
	Inuk: 0	Inuk: 0	Inuk: 0	Inuk: 0	Inuk: 0	Inuk: 0
	Other Indigenous ancestry: 0	Other Indigenous ancestry: 1	Other Indigenous ancestry: 0	Other Indigenous ancestry: 2	Other Indigenous ancestry: 0	Other Indigenous ancestry: 3
Served in Canadian Armed Forces, RCMP, Emergency Services	Canadian Armed Forces: 1	Canadian Armed Forces: 2	Canadian Armed Forces: 0	Canadian Armed Forces: 1	Canadian Armed Forces: 1	Canadian Armed Forces: 1
	RCMP: 0	RCMP: 1	RCMP: 0	RCMP: 0	RCMP: 0	RCMP: 1
	Emergency Services: 2	Emergency Services: 8	Emergency Services: 0	Emergency Services: 2	Emergency Services: 3	Emergency Services: 7

Based on this survey population overview breakdown, we can summarize the following:

- Respondents identifying as women in Parkland County and the Town of Stony Plain are 4.2 times more likely than their male counterparts to be housing insecure.
- All respondents in the City of Spruce Grove who identified as 2SLGBTQIA+ were housing insecure.
- All racialized respondents in Parkland County and the Town of Stony Plain were housing insecure.
- 95% of Indigenous respondents in Parkland County and the Town of Stony Plain and 94% of Indigenous respondents in the City of Spruce Grove were housing insecure.
- All respondents in Parkland County and the Town of Stony Plain who spent time in care were housing insecure.
- All respondents living in a multi-generational household in the City of Spruce Grove were housing insecure.

Exploring the Spectrum of Homelessness in the Tri-Municipal Region

Recognizing that the national definition of homelessness is complex, encompassing various housing situations across a continuum, it is important to better understand what housing insecurity looks like in the Tri-Municipal Region. This understanding can be achieved by exploring the experiences of the 172 housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, the 61 housing insecure respondents in Parkland County, and the 121 housing insecure respondents in the Town of Stony Plain.

To accurately place respondents along the spectrum of homelessness, a series of measures were used to understand their situations. These measures included their self-identified housing security response, calculated housing security, current housing situation, and the amenities they lack in their current situation.

Early in the survey, respondents were asked to outline their current housing situation and were able to choose all situations that applied to them from a variety of statements. Statements included, but were not limited to, “I slept in a vehicle,” “I slept in a hotel overnight because I had nowhere else to go,” “I live in supported or transitional housing,” and “I live in housing that needs major repairs.”

Respondents were able to select more than one statement. To accurately represent what housing insecurity might look like for respondents over a month, all responses have been included.

When reading this table, an important consideration is that people experiencing housing insecurity often fluctuate in and out of their situation. Someone who was unsheltered one night may have been emergency sheltered or provisionally accommodated the next. As a result, we have highlighted every incident of insecurity respondents experienced in the past month to understand the complexities of housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region. This means that more incidents of housing insecurity are reported in the table below than the number of housing insecure respondents.

Table 7: Respondents by Housing Situation on the Homelessness Spectrum

Place on the Homelessness Spectrum	# of Incidents by Community		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Unsheltered	27	12	7
Emergency Sheltered	7	2	2
Provisionally Accommodated	72	33	50
At Risk of Homelessness	236	82	171

The above table illustrates respondents' diverse experiences with housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region, emphasizing that homelessness presents itself in more ways than simply sleeping outside.

Respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County, and the Town of Stony Plain identified as **at risk** reported:

- Difficulty paying their rent or mortgage,
- Spending more than 30% of their monthly income on housing,
- Living in overcrowded accommodations with not enough bedrooms for the number of people staying in the unit,
- Staying in a home needing major repairs (e.g., heating or plumbing problems, mould, leaky roof, etc.), and/or
- Staying in a home with unsafe conditions (e.g., exposed wiring, no railing or banisters, physical hazards, etc.).

Respondents in the City of Spruce Grove who indicated they experienced being **provisionally accommodated** noted:

- Staying in a hotel overnight because they had nowhere to go,
- Living in accommodations provided by their employer,
- Living in a home owned/rented out by a First Nation or Métis Settlement,
- Living in supported or transitional housing (e.g. Housing First)
- Staying in an RV/trailer,
- Staying in a medical/detox facility,
- Staying in a jail/prison/remand centre,
- Staying with friends/family because they had nowhere else to go,
- Staying with a stranger because they had nowhere else to go,
- Staying in a home where they experienced violence because they had nowhere else to go, and/or
- Enduring unwanted sexual activity to have a place to stay.

Respondents in Parkland County who indicated they experienced being **provisionally accommodated** noted:

- Staying in a hotel overnight because they had nowhere to go,
- Living in accommodations provided by their employer,
- Staying in an RV/trailer,
- Staying in a medical/detox facility,
- Staying with friends/family because they had nowhere else to go,
- Staying in a home where they experienced violence because they had nowhere else to go, and/or
- Enduring unwanted sexual activity to have a place to stay.

Respondents in the Town of Stony Plain who indicated they experienced being **provisionally accommodated** noted:

- Staying in a hotel overnight because they had nowhere to go,
- Living in a home owned/rented out by a First Nation or Métis Settlement,
- Living in supported or transitional housing (e.g. Housing First)
- Staying in an RV/trailer,
- Staying in a jail/prison/remand centre,
- Staying with friends/family because they had nowhere else to go,
- Staying with a stranger because they had nowhere else to go,
- Staying in a home where they experienced violence because they had nowhere else to go, and/or
- Enduring unwanted sexual activity to have a place to stay.


Respondents the City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County, and the Town of Stony Plain who had experiences of being **emergency sheltered or unsheltered** reported:

- Staying in an emergency shelter,
- Staying in a women's/domestic violence shelter, and/or
- Staying in makeshift shelters such as a vehicle, tent, or shack.

Living Situation

13% (56) of all respondents, 87% (49) of which are housing insecure, have always lived in and around the Tri-Municipal Region. Figure 5 outlines the various lengths of time respondents have lived in the City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County, and the Town of Stony Plain.

Figure 5: Breakdown of Housing Insecure Respondents' Length of Time Lived in the Tri-Municipal Region



Respondents were also asked: *“What are the main reasons you came to this community? If you have always lived here, why have you chosen to stay in this community?”*

In the **City of Spruce Grove**, the top three reasons respondents came to the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- Housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.)
- Employment-related reasons (look for work, work-related transfer, more work opportunities, etc.)

Other reasons housing insecure respondents moved to the community included for the lifestyle the community offers, access to services, education opportunities (to attend school, access better educational opportunities, etc.), fear for safety/fleeing from violence, the connection to culture, community, and traditions, and environmental displacement (flooding, wildfire, lack of clean drinking water, etc.).

In comparison, the top three reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)

- For the lifestyle the community offers
- Employment-related reasons (look for work, work-related transfer, more work opportunities, etc.)

Other reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the community included the connection to culture, community, and traditions, housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.), access to services, education opportunities (to attend school, access better educational opportunities, etc.), fear of safety/fleeing from violence, and access to emergency shelters.

In **Parkland County**, the top three reasons respondents came to the area are:

- Housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.)
- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- Employment-related reasons (look for work, work-related transfer, more work opportunities, etc.)

Other reasons housing insecure respondents moved to the community included for the lifestyle the community offers, access to services, fear for safety/fleeing from violence, the connection to culture, community, and traditions, education opportunities (to attend school, access better educational opportunities, etc.), and environmental displacement (flooding, wildfire, lack of clean drinking water, etc.).

In comparison, the top three reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- The connection to culture, community, and traditions
- Access to services

Other reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the community included fear of safety/fleeing from violence, access to emergency shelters, for the lifestyle the community offers, education opportunities (to attend school, access better educational opportunities, etc.), and employment-related reasons (look for work, work-related transfer, more work opportunities, etc.).

In the **Town of Stony Plain**, the top three reasons respondents came to the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- For the lifestyle the community offers
- Housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.)

Other reasons housing insecure respondents moved to the community included education opportunities (to attend school, access better educational opportunities, etc.), access to services, the connection to culture, community, and traditions.

In comparison, the top three reasons housing insecure respondents stayed in the area are:

- Family-related reasons (to be closer to family, to follow family, etc.)
- For the lifestyle the community offers
- Housing-related reasons (to access affordable and appropriate housing, etc.)

The other reason housing insecure respondents moved to the community was for the connection to culture, community, and traditions.

Noteworthy here is that 16% (17) of housing insecure respondents across the entire Tri-Municipal Region have moved between three and six times in the past 12 months and 6% (6) have moved more than six times in the past 12 months. This is broken down further by community in Table 8.

Table 8: Number of Times Housing Insecure Respondents Have Moved in the Past 12 Months by Community

How Many Times Have You Moved in the Past 12 Months?	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
1-2 times	36 (80%)	7 (50%)	33 (83%)
3-6 times	4 (9%)	7 (50%)	6 (15%)
More than 6 times	5 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)

Housing Situation and Missing Amenities

To better understand respondents' current living situations, they were asked to indicate if they rent or own their home (or if neither was true for them). This can be compared across housing secure and housing insecure respondents.

In the **City of Spruce Grove**:

- 36% (60) of housing insecure respondents indicated that they owned their homes,
- 57% (95) indicated that they rented their homes, and
- 7% (12) noted that they neither owned nor rented.

Additionally, 1% (1) preferred not to answer.

Comparatively:

- 84% (21) of housing secure respondents owned their homes,
- 12% (3) rented their homes, and
- 4% (1) noted they neither owned nor rented.

In Parkland County,

- 51% (30) of housing insecure respondents indicated that they owned their homes,
- 32% (19) indicated that they rented their homes, and
- 15% (9) noted that they neither owned nor rented.

Additionally, 2% (1) preferred not to answer.

Comparatively:

- 89% (8) of housing secure respondents owned their homes, and
- 11% (1) rented their homes.

In the Town of Stony Plain,

- 34% (41) of housing insecure respondents indicated that they owned their homes,
- 60% (71) indicated that they rented their homes, and
- 4% (5) noted that they neither owned nor rented.

Additionally, 2% (2) preferred not to answer.

Comparatively:

- 84% (41) of housing secure respondents owned their homes,
- 10% (5) rented their homes, and
- 6% (3) noted they neither owned nor rented.

Across the entire Tri-Municipal Region, 103 unique housing insecure respondents, whether they rented, owned, or were in a different situation entirely, indicated that they lacked specific amenities in their current housing situation, many of which are considered necessary for a secure living situation. At the time of the survey, 59% (61) of these respondents did not have sufficient and affordable heating, and 46% (47) did not have fire protection (including fire extinguishers, smoke alarms, and a safe exit out of their space).

Table 9: Breakdown of Housing Insecure Respondents’ Missing Amenities

Missing Amenities	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Indoor plumbing/bathing facilities	10 (23%)	4 (16%)	7 (21%)
Sufficient and affordable heating	29 (66%)	13 (52%)	19 (56%)
Safe drinking water	7 (16%)	9 (36%)	8 (24%)
Refrigeration	7 (16%)	4 (16%)	3 (9%)

Missing Amenities	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Electricity	11 (25%)	4 (16%)	3 (9%)
Cooking facilities	7 (16%)	2 (8%)	3 (9%)
Fire protection (smoke alarms, fire extinguishers)	20 (45%)	11 (44%)	16 (47%)

This breakdown highlights respondents who lacked basic amenities and is one way respondents' objective housing situation is calculated. Some respondents self-identified as housing secure but lacked amenities required for their housing to be considered stable according to the Canadian definitions of homelessness, including indoor plumbing/bathing facilities, sufficient and affordable heating, electricity, access to safe drinking water, and fire protection.

Further, Table 10 highlights respondents' missing amenities by whether they rented or owned.

Table 10: Breakdown of Housing Insecure Respondents' Missing Amenities by Housing Situation

Missing Amenities	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned
Indoor plumbing/bathing facilities	1 (6%)	3 (16%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	4 (18%)	1 (13%)
Sufficient and affordable heating	11 (61%)	12 (63%)	4 (40%)	5 (56%)	11 (50%)	5 (63%)
Safe drinking water	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	3 (30%)	2 (22%)	6 (27%)	1 (13%)
Refrigeration	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	1 (5%)	1 (13%)
Electricity	3 (17%)	2 (11%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (13%)

Missing Amenities	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned	# (%) of Respondents who Rented	# (%) of Respondents who Owned
Cooking facilities	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (13%)
Fire protection (smoke alarms, fire extinguishers)	8 (44%)	7 (37%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)	10 (45%)	4 (50%)

Education, Employment, and Income

Education

Respondents indicated various education levels when responding to the question, “What is the highest level of education you’ve completed?”

In the **City of Spruce Grove:**

- 2% (3) of respondents had completed some grade school
- 13% (24) had completed some high school
- 16% (30) had completed high school or received their GED,
- 14% (27) had an apprenticeship, trades certificate, or diploma
- 21% (41) had some post-secondary (college, university)
- 34% (65) had a post-secondary degree (college, university)

Additionally, 1% (1) of respondents were unsure what their highest level of education was

In **Parkland County:**

- 7% (5) of respondents had completed some high school
- 29% (20) had completed high school or received their GED,
- 16% (11) had an apprenticeship, trades certificate, or diploma
- 22% (15) had some post-secondary (college, university)
- 24% (16) had a post-secondary degree (college, university)

Additionally, 1 (1%) of respondents preferred not to answer.


In the **Town of Stony Plain:**

- 1% (2) of respondents had completed some grade school
- 14% (23) had completed some high school
- 21% (36) had completed high school or received their GED,
- 11% (18) had an apprenticeship, trades certificate, or diploma
- 21% (36) had some post-secondary (college, university)
- 30% (50) had a post-secondary degree (college, university)

Additionally, 2% (3) of respondents preferred not to answer.

Figure 6 provides a more detailed look at respondents' education levels.

Figure 6: Housing Secure and Housing Insecure Respondents' Education Levels



● Housing Secure ● Housing Insecure

Employment

In the **City of Spruce Grove**, 47% (69) of housing insecure respondents were employed at the time of the survey. Additionally, 18 respondents indicated they were retired. Of employed housing insecure respondents:

- 55% (38) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 28% (19) were part-time (e.g., less than 30hrs/week)
- 3% (2) were casual
- 1% (1) were on contract
- 1% (1) were seasonal
- 4% (3) were self-employed
- 6% (4) indicated "other;" one stated they were on medical leave and three were working multiple jobs

Additionally, 1% (1) preferred not to answer.

Comparatively, 89% (16) of housing secure respondents were employed at the time of the survey and six respondents were retired. Of those employed:

- 88% (14) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 6% (1) were casual
- 6% (1) were self-employed

In **Parkland County**, 42% (22) of housing insecure respondents were employed at the time of the survey. Additionally, seven respondents indicated they were retired. Of employed housing insecure respondents:

- 36% (8) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 27% (6) were part-time (e.g., less than 30hrs/week)
- 9% (2) were casual
- 5% (1) were on contract
- 18% (4) were self-employed
- 5% (1) indicated "other" and stated they were working multiple jobs

Comparatively, 83% (5) of housing secure respondents were employed at the time of the survey and three respondents were retired. Of those employed:

- 80% (4) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 20% (1) were self-employed

In the **Town of Stony Plain**, 56% (59) of housing insecure respondents were employed at the time of the survey. Additionally, 14 respondents indicated they were retired. Of employed housing insecure respondents:

- 68% (41) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 12% (7) were part-time (e.g., less than 30hrs/week)
- 8% (5) were casual
- 5% (3) were self-employed
- 5% (3) indicated "other;" one stated they were on medical leave and two were working multiple jobs

Additionally, 2% (1) preferred not to answer.

Comparatively, 94% (29) of housing secure respondents were employed at the time of the survey and 18 respondents were retired. Of those employed:

- 69% (20) were full-time (e.g., more than 30hrs/week)
- 28% (8) were part-time (e.g., less than 30hrs/week)
- 3% (1) were self-employed

Income

Housing insecure respondents were also asked to disclose their approximate household income for the previous year. Responses varied widely, as seen in Table 11.

Table 11: Housing Insecure Respondents Approximate Household Income in the Last 12 Months

Total Household Income in the Last 12 Months	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
Less than \$22,000	54 (32%)	23 (39%)	27 (24%)
Between \$22,001 and \$55,000	72 (43%)	17 (29%)	47 (41%)
Between \$55,001 and \$88,000	20 (12%)	5 (8%)	17 (15%)
Between \$88,001 and \$132,000 ⁷	12 (7%)	5 (8%)	11 (10%)
More than \$132,001	4 (2%)	4 (7%)	8 (7%)
Prefer not to answer	6 (4%)	5 (8%)	4 (4%)

This can be broken down further to understand household income level by housing security status, as seen in Table 12.

⁷ It is important to remember the spectrum of homelessness when considering income rates amongst housing insecure respondents. Someone who is experiencing domestic or family violence, for example, is considered housing insecure no matter their annual household income. Additionally, it is important to remember that people cycle through the spectrum of homelessness regularly and just because some reported an annual household income of \$132,000 in 2024, for example, does not mean they are not experiencing housing insecurity in 2025 - this could have occurred as a result of job loss, a death in the family, increasing interest and utility rates, or any number of reasons.

Table 12: Respondents' Household Income in the Last 12 Months by Housing Status

Total Household Income in the Last 12 Months	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	# (%) of Housing Secure Respondents	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents	# (%) of Housing Secure Respondents	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents	# (%) of Housing Secure Respondents	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents
Less than \$22,000	1 (4%)	54 (32%)	0 (0%)	23 (39%)	1 (2%)	27 (24%)
Between \$22,001 and \$55,000	3 (13%)	72 (43%)	2 (22%)	17 (29%)	5 (10%)	47 (41%)
Between \$55,001 and \$88,000	6 (25%)	20 (12%)	0 (0%)	5 (8%)	8 (16%)	17 (15%)
Between \$88,001 and \$132,000	4 (17%)	12 (7%)	2 (22%)	5 (8%)	10 (20%)	11 (10%)
More than \$132,001	6 (25%)	4 (2%)	4 (44%)	4 (7%)	12 (24%)	8 (7%)
Prefer not to answer	4 (17%)	6 (4%)	1 (11%)	5 (8%)	13 (27%)	4 (4%)

Of the housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 75% (126) reported a household annual income of \$55,000 or less compared to 42% (10) of housing secure respondents who reported an annual income of \$88,001 or more. Similarly, in Parkland County, 68% (40) of housing insecure respondents reported a household annual income of \$55,000 or less compared to 66% (6) of housing secure respondents who reported an annual income of \$88,001 or more. In the Town of Stony Plain, 65% (74) of housing insecure respondents reported a household annual income of \$55,000 or less compared to 44% (22) of housing secure respondents who reported an annual income of \$88,001 or more.

Interestingly, 12% of housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 8% of housing insecure respondents in Parkland County, and 15% of housing insecure respondents in the Town of Stony Plain reported a household annual income of between \$55,001 and \$88,000. This suggests that respondents who reported moderate income levels were experiencing housing insecurity, and again speaks to the spectrum of housing insecurity - respondents can and were making moderate income while unsheltered, emergency sheltered, provisionally accommodated, and/or at risk of housing insecurity.

Further, 68% (117) of housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 57% (35) of housing insecure respondents in Parkland County, and 71% (86) of housing insecure respondents in the Town of Stony Plain indicated they spent more than 30% of their household income on housing (e.g., rent or mortgage payments) in the 12 months prior to completing the survey.

Community Supports

To better understand service needs and gaps in the Tri-Municipal Region, respondents were asked: *“Which support services do you access and where do you most often access them?”*

In the **City of Spruce Grove**, housing insecure respondents primarily accessed services for:

- Basic needs (94%)
- Health and wellness services (44%)
- Family/parenting supports (28%)

In comparison, those accessing services outside of the community did so primarily for:

- Health and wellness services (57%)
- Legal services (35%)
- Crisis financial supports (35%)

In **Parkland County**, housing insecure respondents primarily accessed services for:

- Basic needs (94%)
- Health and wellness supports (40%)

In comparison, those accessing services outside of the community did so primarily for:

- Legal services (60%)
- Financial supports (60%)

In the **Town of Stony Plain**, housing insecure respondents primarily accessed services for:

- Basic needs (86%)
- Health and wellness supports (41%)
- Family/parenting supports (28%)

In comparison, those accessing services outside of the community did so primarily for:


- Financial supports (34%)
- Health and wellness supports (34%)
- Legal services (32%)

Table 13: Reasons Housing Insecure Respondents Accessed Support Services

Total Household Income in the Last 12 Months	Spruce Grove		Parkland County		Stony Plain	
	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services in the Community	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services Outside of the Community	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services in the Community	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services Outside of the Community	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services in the Community	# (%) of Respondents who Primarily Accessed Services Outside of the Community
Basic needs (Food bank, clothing donations, public washrooms, etc.)	136 (94%)	0 (0%)	45 (94%)	4 (27%)	74 (86%)	9 (24%)
Shelter (Emergency shelter, domestic violence shelter, transitional housing, affordable housing, etc.)	19 (13%)	6 (16%)	5 (10%)	4 (27%)	3 (3%)	10 (26%)
Financial (Rental assistance, non-market housing, financial life skills training/education, etc.)	39 (27%)	12 (32%)	8 (17%)	9 (60%)	23 (27%)	13 (34%)
Crisis financial support (Eviction notices, utility shutoffs, damage deposits, etc.)	17 (12%)	13 (35%)	4 (8%)	4 (27%)	14 (16%)	10 (26%)
Family/Parenting (Child care, parental resources, relationship issues, child developmental assessment tools/referrals, etc.)	41 (28%)	5 (16%)	8 (17%)	6 (40%)	24 (28%)	7 (18%)
Health and wellness (Addictions, mental health, physical health care, spiritual or cultural well-being, etc.)	64 (44%)	21 (57%)	19 (40%)	8 (53%)	35 (41%)	13 (34%)
Legal (Separation/divorce/custody, wills/estates, employment/labour, landlord/tenant issues, immigration, criminal/misdemeanour, etc.)	26 (18%)	13 (35%)	8 (17%)	9 (60%)	12 (14%)	12 (32%)

Housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County, and the Town of Stony Plain travelled between 30 minutes to one hour when accessing services outside their individual communities, as seen in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7: Distance Travelled by Housing Insecure Respondents for Services Outside of the Community



In the **City of Spruce Grove**, 83% (116) of housing insecure respondents travelled by car or truck, 1% (1) took an e-bus, 14% (20) took public transportation, 19% (26) relied on a family member or friend, 9% (12) took a taxi or ride-share service, 2% (3) relied on a service agency or non-profit to arrange a ride for them, and 1% (2) hitchhiked or caught a ride with a stranger to access the services they need.

In **Parkland County**, 85% (46) of housing insecure respondents travelled by car or truck, 2% (1) took an e-bus, 9% (5) took public transportation, 15% (8) relied on a family member or friend, 6% (3) took a taxi or ride-share service, 2% (1) hitchhiked or caught a ride with a stranger, 2% (1) walked to access the services they need.


In the **Town of Stony Plain**, 85% (80) of housing insecure respondents travelled by car or truck, 2% (2) took an e-bus, 7% (7) took public transportation, 20% (19) relied on a family member or friend, 2% (2) took a taxi or ride-share service, 1% (1) relied on a service agency or non-profit to arrange a ride for them, 1% (1) hitchhiked or caught a ride with a stranger, and 3% (3) walked to access the services they need.

It is important to consider that respondents who are unable to access supports and services are more likely to continue experiencing housing insecurity than those who can access the necessary supports and services to stabilize their housing situation.

Shelter Use

Respondents across the Tri-Municipal Region reported staying in a shelter in the past year, as highlighted in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Shelter Use Breakdown by Community



Further, 13% (47) of housing insecure respondents reported needing emergency shelter services at some point in the 12 months before completing the survey, but did not access them. The main reason respondents did not access shelter services when they needed them was because there was no shelter available in their area. Table 14 further details the reasons housing insecure respondents did not access emergency shelter services when they needed them by community.

Table 14: Reasons Housing Insecure Respondents Did Not Access Shelter Services When Needed

Reason for Not Accessing Shelter Services	# (%) of Housing Insecure Respondents		
	Spruce Grove	Parkland County	Stony Plain
The right kind of shelter wasn't available (for example, I needed a women's or family shelter where I could stay with my kid(s) and couldn't access one)	7 (28%)	2 (18%)	1 (8%)
The shelter was full	8 (32%)	2 (18%)	3 (25%)
I exceeded my stay at a shelter	1 (4%)	1 (9%)	1 (8%)
No shelters in my area	10 (40%)	5 (45%)	7 (58%)
I didn't meet the intake criteria to access the shelter	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)
I didn't feel safe	8 (32%)	3 (27%)	4 (33%)
The shelter was unclean	4 (16%)	1 (9%)	2 (17%)
The shelter did not welcome me because of my gender identity	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Alcohol/substance use is not permitted on-site	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
Lack of disability accommodations	2 (8%)	1 (9%)	3 (25%)
Lack of transportation	8 (32%)	0 (0%)	4 (33%)
No pets allowed	9 (36%)	6 (55%)	4 (33%)
The shelter was too far away from my family and/or friends	6 (24%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)

“What Would You Like to See More of in Your Community?”

To gain more insight into respondents’ perceptions of service provision in the Tri-Municipal Region, they were asked: “Does your community provide enough... accessible and affordable housing; access to food; addictions and mental health supports; employment services; free/accessible recreation/social opportunities; public transportation services; social services?”

Table 15: Total Respondents’ Perceptions of the Tri-Municipal Region’s Provision of Services

City of Spruce Grove			
Does the Community Provide Enough:	Yes	No	Unsure
Accessible, affordable housing	19 (11%)	117 (66%)	40 (23%)
Access to food (grocery stores, markets, food banks, etc.)	140 (80%)	20 (11%)	15 (9%)
Addictions and mental health supports (counselling, treatment, post-treatment support, etc.)	39 (22%)	62 (35%)	74 (42%)
Employment services (resume writing, job searching, etc.)	52 (30%)	51 (30%)	69 (40%)
Free/accessible recreation/social opportunities	46 (26%)	84 (48%)	44 (25%)
Public transportation services	73 (43%)	63 (37%)	33 (20%)
Social services (libraries, emergency services, outreach programs, etc.)	94 (56%)	37 (22%)	38 (22%)
Parkland County			
Does the Community Provide Enough:	Yes	No	Unsure
Accessible, affordable housing	8 (13%)	34 (54%)	21 (33%)
Access to food (grocery stores, markets, food banks, etc.)	54 (81%)	11 (16%)	2 (3%)

Parkland County			
Does the Community Provide Enough:	Yes	No	Unsure
Addictions and mental health supports (counselling, treatment, post-treatment support, etc.)	19 (30%)	26 (41%)	19 (30%)
Employment services (resume writing, job searching, etc.)	13 (21%)	21 (34%)	28 (45%)
Free/accessible recreation/social opportunities	14 (23%)	48 (45%)	20 (32%)
Public transportation services	18 (28%)	29 (45%)	17 (27%)
Social services (libraries, emergency services, outreach programs, etc.)	37 (58%)	18 (28%)	9 (14%)
Town of Stony Plain			
Does the Community Provide Enough:	Yes	No	Unsure
Accessible, affordable housing	17 (11%)	91 (58%)	49 (31%)
Access to food (grocery stores, markets, food banks, etc.)	134 (84%)	12 (8%)	14 (9%)
Addictions and mental health supports (counselling, treatment, post-treatment support, etc.)	33 (21%)	59 (38%)	63 (41%)
Employment services (resume writing, job searching, etc.)	32 (21%)	50 (32%)	72 (47%)
Free/accessible recreation/social opportunities	54 (34%)	63 (40%)	42 (26%)
Public transportation services	62 (39%)	48 (31%)	47 (30%)
Social services (libraries, emergency services, outreach programs, etc.)	96 (61%)	28 (18%)	34 (22%)

In Table 15, there is a significant discrepancy in housing secure and housing insecure respondents who, at the time of the survey, believed there was enough accessible and affordable housing versus those who believed more housing was needed:

- 11% of respondents believed there was enough housing in the City of Spruce Grove compared to 66% who believed more housing was needed and 23% who were unsure.
- 13% of respondents believed there was enough housing in Parkland County compared to 54% who believed more housing was needed and 33% who were unsure.
- 11% of respondents believed there was enough housing in the Town of Stony Plain compared to 58% who believed more housing was needed and 31% who were unsure.



Opportunities Moving Forward

Based on the findings outlined in this report, RDN has identified three opportunities to address housing insecurity moving forward. They are:

- Foster community awareness and understanding of housing insecurity,
- Increase awareness of, and access to, services, and
- Encourage sustainable housing growth in the Tri-Municipal Region.

Foster community awareness and understanding of housing insecurity.

Implementing a community engagement strategy is crucial to addressing housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region. The purpose of implementing a community engagement strategy is to support community learning on issues related to housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region. More specifically, this will help inform residents about the spectrum of housing insecurity and the different experiences and realities of housing insecurity in their community. In addition, community conversations will aim to shift public perceptions of housing insecurity, ensuring that residents experiencing housing insecurity and any projects specific to addressing housing insecurity are met with understanding, empathy, and support.

Of the 437 survey respondents, only 162 self-identified as housing insecure. However, upon further analysis, 354 survey respondents were identified as housing insecure. This means that 192 respondents were unaware of their housing insecurity status and likely have not accessed social or housing services that could help improve their housing situation. A community engagement strategy would help increase residents' understanding of housing insecurity and make them aware of the current service offerings available to support their housing situations.

With at least 1,157 residents experiencing housing insecure living conditions, public perceptions of housing insecurity must be met with understanding and empathy to successfully address housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region.

Recommendations:

- Host community conversations on housing insecurity.
- Host community conversations and opportunities to learn about emergency shelters and transitional housing developments.
- Promote programs and service offerings that support residents experiencing housing insecurity widely.
- Encourage inclusive and welcoming events that bring the whole community together.
- Identify and share community initiatives that focus on community connection.
- Offer orientation and training sessions around housing insecurity to support elected officials in leading the community to address housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region.

Increase awareness of, and access to, services.

47% of housing insecure respondents indicated that they had to access health and wellness services (i.e., addictions supports, mental health supports and services, physical health care services, spiritual or cultural well-being services, etc.) outside of the Tri-Municipal Region. Additionally 38% had to access legal services outside of the Tri-Municipal Region. Further, of the housing insecure respondents who accessed services outside of the Tri-Municipal Region, between 51% from the City of Spruce Grove, 40% from Parkland County, and 49% from the Town of Stony Plain had to travel between 30 minutes to one hour to access services. While the majority travelled by car or truck, many had to rely on a family member or friend to take them, walk, bike, hitchhike, or catch a ride with a stranger to access services.

Additionally, 37% of total respondents, both housing secure and insecure, indicated more addictions and mental health supports (counselling, treatment, post-treatment support, etc.) were needed in the community.

Also important to note is that 54% of housing insecure respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 57% of housing insecure respondents in Parkland County, and 44% of housing insecure respondents in the Town of Stony Plain are 45 years or older. With an aging housing insecure population, supports and services must be designed and offered specifically to reach older adults struggling with their housing situation. People experiencing housing insecurity age physiologically and psychologically at much higher rates than people who are housing secure. Most 45+ year-olds experiencing housing insecurity are considered seniors, as their physiological and psychological health match or surpass that of a 65+ year-old person who is housing secure; this is called “functionally geriatric” (Campbell et al., 2017; Demallie et al., 1997; Rota-Bartelink and Lipmann, 2007; McDonald et al., 2007). Moving forward, it is important to promote and increase awareness of current senior support services and to consider implementing new support services designed specifically for older adults experiencing housing insecurity.

Given this, efforts should be made to further identify service gaps in the community and address these gaps, either by offering new services or by better promoting the availability of current services that community members may not be aware of. Additionally, given that 100% of 2SLGBTQIA+ respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 100% of racialized respondents in Parkland County and the Town of Stony Plain, and 94-95% of Indigenous respondents in the Tri-Municipal Region were housing insecure, it is important to consider whether services offered are inclusive and culturally appropriate.

Recommendations:

- Conduct an informal audit of services (also called service mapping) in the Tri-Municipal Region.
- Determine gaps in service delivery in the Tri-Municipal Region and develop or implement an action plan for filling any gaps in services.

- Promote current programs and service offerings that support community members experiencing housing insecurity and/or with health and wellness concerns.
- Promote current seniors-specific programs and service offerings.
- Conduct an Age-Friendly Assessment to review outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation and housing, respect and inclusion, social participation, civic participation and employment opportunities, communication and information, and community support and health services for their age-friendliness and develop an Age-Friendly Action plan.
- Host training sessions for service providers in the Tri-Municipal Region focused on providing inclusive and culturally appropriate services.

Encourage sustainable housing growth in the Tri-Municipal Region.

It is critical to highlight the need for accessible, affordable, adaptive, and appropriate housing projects to increase housing options in the Tri-Municipal Region. The number one reported reason for housing insecurity in the Tri-Municipal Region was high housing costs. Additionally, 66% of respondents in the City of Spruce Grove, 54% of respondents in Parkland County, and 58% of respondents in the Town of Stony Plain believed there was not enough accessible and affordable housing in the Tri-Municipal Region compared to 11-13% who believed there was enough accessible and affordable housing in the Tri-Municipal Region. Further, 16% of housing insecure respondents have moved between three and six times in the past 12 months while 6% of housing insecure respondents have moved more than six times in the past 12 months, suggesting a need for increased accessible and affordable housing to ensure respondent stability.

103 housing insecure respondents in the Tri-Municipal Region indicated that they lack specific amenities in their current housing situation, many of which are considered necessary for a secure living situation. At the time of the survey, 59% did not have sufficient and affordable heating, and 46% did not have fire protection (including fire extinguishers, smoke alarms, and a safe exit out of their space).

4% of respondents reported staying at an emergency shelter, extreme weather space, or women's/domestic violence shelter and 1% in transitional housing units in the past twelve months. Additionally, 6% of housing insecure respondents reported accessing shelter services outside of the Tri-Municipal Region.

It is also important to consider that 13% of housing insecure respondents reported needing emergency shelter services at some point in the 12 months before completing the survey, but did not access them. The main reason respondents did not access shelter services when they needed them was because there were no shelters in their area.

Recommendations:

- Conduct a regional housing needs and demands assessment to better understand housing need in the Tri-Municipal Region.
- Work with all levels of government to develop a model to deliver short- and long-term housing solutions in the community (e.g. emergency shelter, transitional housing, and affordable/below-market rate housing). This model should include wraparound supports (including basic needs supports) typically associated with a Housing First Program.
- Conduct community engagement sessions to address concerns and misconceptions around housing development.
- Implement a Housing First philosophy into service delivery in the Tri-Municipal Region.

References

- Abedin, Z. (2022). *Step-by-step guide to estimating rural homelessness, 2nd Ed.* Rural Development Network. <https://www.ruraldevelopment.ca/publications/step-by-step-guide-to-estimating-homelessness>
- Campbell, R., Falvo, N., & Smith, M. (2017). *Calgary Point-in-Time Count Report Fall 2016*. Calgary: Calgary Homeless Foundation.
- DeMallie, D., North, C., & Smith, E. (1997). Psychiatric disorders among the homeless: A comparison of older and younger groups. *The Gerontologist*, 37, 61-66. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/37.1.61>
- Economic Research Institute. (2026a). Cost of Living Data in Spruce Grove, Alberta, Canada. <https://www.eries.com/cost-of-living/canada/alberta/spruce-grove>
- Economic Research Institute. (2026b). Cost of Living Data in Stony Plain, Alberta, Canada. <https://www.eries.com/cost-of-living/canada/alberta/stony-plain>
- Gaetz, S., Barr, C., Friesen, A., Harris, B., Hill, C., Kovacs-Burns, K., Pauly, B., Pearce, B., Turner, A., & Marsolais, A. (2012). *Canadian Definition of Homelessness*. Toronto: Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press.
- McDonald L., Dergal, J., & Cleghorn, L. (2007). Living on the margins: Older homeless adults in Toronto. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 49, 19-46. https://doi.org/10.1300/J083v49n01_02
- Rota-Bartelink, A. & Lipmann, B. (2007). Causes of homelessness among older people in Melbourne, Australia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 31(3), 252-258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2007.00057.x>
- Rural Development Network. (2023). 2023 Alberta Housing and Service Needs Estimation Project: Provincial Report. Rural Development Network. https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/5f98899a0322266a90e2767f/651600d6f444e4a68680543e_2023%20Alberta%20Provincial%20Estimation%20Report%20V3.pdf
- Schiff, R., Wilkinson, A., Kelford, T., Pelletier, S., & Waegemakers Schiff, J. (2022). Counting the undercounted: Enumerating rural homelessness in Canada. *International Journal on Homelessness*, 3(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.5206/ijoh.2022.2.14633>
- Statistics Canada. (2021a). Census profile, 2021 Census of Population. Spruce Grove, City (CY) [census subdivision], Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Spruce%20Grove&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1,4&DGUIDlist=2021A00054811049&HEADERlist=2,5,6,20,22,27,23,9,21,19,1,3>

Statistics Canada. (2021b). Census profile, 2021 Census of Population. Stony Plain, Town (T) [census subdivision]. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Stony%20Plain&DGUIDlist=2021A00054717029,2021A00054811048&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1,4&HEADERlist=2,5,6,4,20,28,24,22,27,23,29,25,26,10,9,8,7,11,21,19,42,44,40,43,41,33,34,1,3>

Statistics Canada. (2021c). Census profile, 2021 Census of Population. Parkland County, Municipal district (MD) [census subdivision], Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&SearchText=Parkland%20County&GENDERlist=1,2,3&STATISTIClist=1,4&DGUIDlist=2021A00054811034&HEADERlist=2,5,6,20,27,23,9,19,1,3>

Thistle, J. (2017). *Indigenous Definition of Homelessness in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press.



RURAL
DEVELOPMENT
NETWORK