

LONG TERM CARE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Guiding the development of an integrated system of home, community-based, and institutional long term care services for older adults and adults with disabilities_

HOUSING AND SERVICES WORKGROUP Workgroup Meeting

May 18, 2006

Present: Marie Jobling, Nancy Brundy, Meg Cooch, Tricia Webb, Jennifer Walsh, Bill Hirsh, Paul Isakson, Ken Stein, Rick Zawadski, Laura Byrne, Norma Satten, Marc Trotz, Joel Lipski, Ty Robinson

- Community Living Fund legislation – draft language has been developed. Supervisor Alioto-Pier will introduce. Supervisors Peskin and Ammiano will be co-sponsors.
- Section 8 housing. Residents now have to pay 40% (or about 20% above market rate). There are accessibility issues in buildings that are supposed to be accessible and affordable.

1. Discussion of a prevention strategy to support people to remain in their own housing.

- How do we identify people who need support to remain in their existing housing?
- How do we identify people who are at risk for leaving their home?

Rick Zawadski: We could identify the types of issues that people confront:

- a. financial issues – it may be too expensive to stay in the community.
- b. adaptability issues – the housing is no longer adaptable to meet their needs.
- c. service issues – what is needed to stay in the community.

Norma Satten: there are different problems for all three if you are a renter versus an owner.

Prevention Strategy:

1. The follow-up on the survey completed, entitled: *Seniors and Adults with Disabilities Living in San Francisco's Public Housing* is one piece of this prevention strategy. The first follow-up meeting will take place on Monday, June 5th.
2. Senior affordable housing is less important.
3. The most important group is seniors and adults with disabilities living in non-subsidized housing.

How do we identify the people who need support to remain in their housing?

- The Community Living Fund (CLF) could be a vehicle to identify people who need help to remain independent.
- The CLF is for 300% of poverty so it could cover a larger group of people.
- We are talking about people 18 and over who may be unable to remain independently and reside in their own homes.

- The idea of having resources does not mean that people don't have needs. We need to consider people with assets in our overall planning.

What are the challenges to remaining at home? Finance, Accessibility, Support Services. What are the resources for each of these areas? How does each group fit into that? How many have finance issues, how many have accessibility issues, how many have support issues:

Rick Zawadski: The Housing and Services Workgroup could coordinate information about each of these areas.

Paul Isakson: The prevention idea, so people could have a place to call, before needing to go into an institution, is a good idea.

Marie Jobling: We could talk with United Way's Help Link/211, the DAAS I&R staff, and the Mayor's Office on Disability I&R staff, in order to determine what resources are requested, used, and not available for people who call up. "Ask Betsy Eddy re Resource Centers.

Bill Haskell: A session with 211, 311, DAAS I&R, and MOD I&R could be set up to look at issues and the critical pathways. In essence, this would demonstrate the demand

Norma Satten: One issue is augmented funding for RCFEs. This is patch funding.

Marc Trotz: AB 2968 would create a Medi-Cal rate for residential settings and services. This would be a supportive services living fund (same as sent out the LTCCC). This bill would require the state to create this waiver. If this gets through the senate, will the governor veto it. This could be a San Francisco pilot. This could help with the RCFEs.

Ken Stein: We haven't talked about supply side. There are things being done to get money for services and benefits counseling. On the MOH website, the MOH Consolidated Action Plan for FY 2006-07. This would demonstrate some of the supply.

Rick Zawadski: In Hawaii, there are residential settings using Medicaid funds. Also in New York.

San Francisco would pay the state match. San Francisco already spends the funds that could be used as the match. It would be no fiscal impact to the state.

2. Notice of Funding Availability – Mayor's Office on Housing (MOH)

\$4.5 million set aside for new supportive housing – homeless.

\$4.5 million set aside for seniors including frail seniors

Unresolved Issues:

- Target population
- Project design
- Scoring system to identify the best products.

Questions:

1. How can we define the target better?
2. Can we assist with design guidelines? Amenities.
 - What should housing for seniors, and frail seniors look like?
3. Income ranges 30% to 50% of Area Median Income ?
4. Definition of frail elderly?
5. Typically, some % is to be made available for people who are homeless or at risk for homeless.
6. How to distinguish between projects. Amenities, locations?
7. All units will be accessible. Universal design.

Feedback:

1. Can you incorporate the availability of support services?
2. A mix of incomes can be successful.
 - A mix of non-seniors adults with disabilities and seniors in the same building.
3. Definition of frail – use Mission Creek Community definition.
4. Space for community services.
5. Garden or court space.
6. Some of the units could be two bedrooms.
7. Accommodations for pets. Pet friendly buildings.

SFGOV.org/moh/announcements

Send comments to Ty Robinson and cc Joel Lipski.

3. Discussion with MOH on accessibility issues:

1. Housing production goals – new construction or rehabilitation. MOH is on track for new construction and below for rehabilitation. MOH is below target because many years this was not addressed. (CADA will continue to look at housing production goals.)
2. How do you ensure that the accessible units are housing people who need them.
 - MOH would support work in the community to address this need.
 - Could do an audit of housing units that are accessible.
 - Could determine who would qualify for that housing.
 - Could explore what to do when adults with disabilities get evicted when a building is converted to senior housing.

4. Assisted Living At Laguna Honda Hospital

Marc Trotz will be providing guidance for the 140 units. Target population, overarching vision are needed.

Joel Lipski needs this to select a contractor. This is up to Marc Trotz, Joel Lipski, Larry Funk, Norma Satten, and Marie Jobling will be doing the initial draft. Marc Trotz has no idea for this yet.

The planning for this 140 unit development needs to be integrated into the planning for the rest of the LHH site. This needs to relate to the adult day health care that is being developed on the LHH campus.

The 320-bed tower that may not be built. Will that be built or not?

5. Next Steps on Assessing Demand for Services to Remain at Home – and the development of a prevention strategy

Bill Haskell will arrange a meeting to explore the demand for services that help people to remain in their own homes -- with United Way's Help Link/211 staff, the DAAS I&R staff, and the Mayor's Office on Disability I&R staff.

To be invited to this meeting: Marie Jobling, Tricia Webb, Nancy Brundy, Ken Stein, Meg Cooch, Rick Zawadski, Jennifer Walsh, Rick Zawadski, Heidi Sieke. MSSP and Linkages will be invited. The Resource Centers will be invited.

NOTE: Do a grid in advance about what resources there are for the three areas.

NOTE: Should Human Services Agency do a summary of services – prevention services, community services contractors.

NOTE: Jennifer suggests a follow-up – a series of focus groups around the city. Ask people what is it that would make it possible to stay in the community. How do we find the people we don't know about. These could be kitchen-table discussions.

6. Next steps on follow-up on Services Connection Survey for Seniors and Adults with Disabilities Living in Public Housing

The results of the Services Connection Survey of Housing Authority Residents was presented to the LTCCC on May 11, 2006. Bill Haskell will arrange a meeting to explore potential buildings for a pilot project, the need for confidence building

7. Next Meeting of this workgroup: Thursday, June 29th, 1:00 pm to 2:30 pm

NOTE: THIS MEETING WAS POSTPONED TO THURSDAY, JULY 27TH, AT 1:00 PM TO 2:30 PM.

