



Mountain Housing Council Supportive Housing Work Group Call

Meeting Summary

Mountain Housing Council
Support Housing Programs Work Group
2.13.2018 | 3pm-4:30pm
By Phone

Meeting Participants:

Alison Schwedner, Director, Tahoe Truckee Community Collaborative
Brendan Phillips, Housing Program Manager, Nevada County
Cathie Foley, Coordinator, Emergency Warming Center
Justin Yavorsky, Homeless Outreach Coordinator, Project Mana
Kathie Denton, Program Manager, Adult System of Care Placer County
Luke Watkins, Affordable Housing Developer, Neighborhood Partners
Phebe Bell, Interim Behavioral Health Director, Nevada County
Teresa Crimmens, Executive Director, Truckee Family Resource Center

Staff Support:

Seana Doherty, Freshtracks, Lead Facilitator
Debbie Daniel, Freshtracks Associate

Topics in this Summary

- Welcome/introductions
- Goals of Work Group
- Discussion: Who is served by supportive housing, current Programs, what model works best?
- Next Steps: How do we want to work together, what do we want to focus on, who wants to be part of the TT?

Materials Shared

- Supportive Housing 1 page Summary
- Placer County Supportive Housing Programs Summary

Meeting In Brief

There is currently a lack of knowledge about supportive housing in the Truckee-North



Tahoe region. The goal of the meeting was to bring together program experts from each of the jurisdictions (Placer County and Nevada County) and other stakeholders to:

- 1) Determine if there is energy around forming a Work Group
- 2) Share information, resources, and experiences regarding supportive housing
- 3) Identify the need for supporting housing in the region
- 4) Define next steps for Work Group

Feedback:

- a. There is a lack of supportive housing in the region; how do we move forward with getting some in our community
- b. There is a developer (Luke Watkins) interested in supportive housing projects in the region; currently working on 2 other pre-development stage projects now without supportive housing component; knowledgeable about funding available
- c. Suggestions:
 - i. Better distribution of county supportive housing in Eastern Counties
 - ii. Need supportive housing for homeless clients – family resource centers can only provide so much support to these individuals

Summary of Discussion

I. What demographic does Supportive Housing Serve

- a. Families or individuals depending on site + situation
- b. Homeless + Chronically Homeless
- c. Disabled Individuals
- d. Special Needs
- e. Individuals with Mental Health disorders
- f. Very Low Income individuals or families

II. Supportive Housing Services

- a. Research best practices
- b. Concern: how do you pay for services/management?
 - i. Tenants rent pays for onsite Care Manager at one house
 - ii. Operating budget for Onsite Manager, but need to tie other funding streams for full service partnerships
 - iii. Apply for MHS System Transformation dollars to pay for services

III. Models

- a. New construction



- b. Use an existing home/building/old hotel
- c. With new affordable housing going in, advocate for a %age to be used for Supportive Housing

Feedback + Suggestions for Best Model:

- Jurisdiction should own the housing to eliminate possibility of a landlord that would not want to house very high risk that a landlord would not tolerate
- People can't always use a voucher since landlords don't want to rent to them
- Use AMI to manage project
- Apply a "Housing First" philosophy: get people that really need it into housing first
- Small individual cabins with supportive housing services available
- Individual studios with onsite manager and services coming in to the community
- Placer County has several successful models:
 - Gave \$ (MHSA) to AMI to purchase a 5-bedroom house
 - Rehab of property/condo that was not completed: 2 BR/2BA units, housed 12 people (100% MHSA \$'s to build)
 - Used vouchers to pay for ongoing expenses
 - Residents have to pay 30% of income
 - Rehab of 100-year-old 18-unit building
 - Will give to AMI, deed restrict for 45 years
 - Used MHSA to purchase building

IV. Programs + Funding

- a. Review existing supportive housing programs in the area

Placer County:

- i. Shelter Plus Care Vouchers in NLT region
- ii. Allocated yearly
- iii. Tenant takes voucher + uses it where they want to use it
- iv. Vouchers are getting priced out
- v. APSH includes case management paid for with the grant

Nevada County

- i. Approximately 30 permanent supportive housing vouchers available for entire County
- ii. Used at scattered sites managed by Nevada County Housing Development Corporation
- iii. Looking to apply funding to lease a home in Truckee – would need to approach regional housing authority to increase voucher amount

- b. No Place Like Home: funding for chronically homeless individuals with mental health disorders



- i. Nevada County could use \$500K non-competitive No Place Like Home funds for a project in the Tahoe Truckee area.
 - ii. Could purchase a house or seed money for a hotel.
 - iii. Can apply for more money in a competitive process.
 - c. HUD811: available funds to keep individuals out of nursing homes; not exactly Supportive Housing
 - d. MHTSA Systems + Transformation
 - i. Could site be located in Truckee and apply for Placer County MHTSA money? Most likely as long as Placer County residents will also be served.
 - e. Placer County has \$1 million available each year for housing/capital facilities
 - i. Placer could also use Housing Trust Fund money if in an unincorporated part of Placer County
 - f. Funding will vary depending on county owning property or master lease

Feedback: Economy of scale of projects with 50 units or more, can leverage a lot of funding, such as tax credits, and be more successful – need a property that is 2 acres or larger or get jurisdiction to allow a higher density, apartment complexes work best with a split between disabled and workforce, and need a nonprofit partner like AML. Rehab can sometimes cost more than new construction.

V. Potential Partnerships

- a. Tahoe Forest Hospital
 - i. Condos behind Joseph Center

VI. Potential Site Locations in Region

- a. Kings Beach
- b. Donner Pass Rd (near hospital)
- c. Deerfield Drive (old hotel)

VII. Next Steps

The group agreed to move forward with a Supportive Housing Work Group. Several next steps discussed are listed below:

- a. Identify 4 to 5 existing properties as potential sites
 - i. Rehab potential
 - ii. Establish criteria
 - 1. Proximity to transportation
 - 2. Vacant property (better than property already occupied)
 - iii. Meet in person and visit sites to evaluate



- b. Include individual with funding + relative project expertise
- c. Contact AMI to see if they are interested in working in the region + lessons learned
- d. Reach out to Tahoe Forest Hospital District
 - iv. Include Brendan
- e. As a group, we want to support the HUD 811 Project in pre-development stage.