Housing & Health Services Coordination Council

HHSCC Provider Capacity Survey Results

Presentation Background

❖ Provider Capacity Survey open for 6 wks, March 4 - April 15

❖ Yielded 349 participants:
  - ❖ 125 housing organizations (36%)
  - ❖ 197 service organizations (56%)
  - ❖ 27 other (8%)

❖ Housing Organizations
  - ❖ Property Management Entities - 36.0%
  - ❖ Non profit developers - 30.4%
  - ❖ For profit developers - 15.2%
  - ❖ Public Housing Authorities - 9.6%
  - ❖ Local Government - 8.8%

❖ Service Organizations
  - ❖ Provider of non-health related services 45.7%
  - ❖ Provider of health related services 45.2%
  - ❖ Government 4.6%
  - ❖ Resource Center 4.6%

Housing Provider: Background

❖ Majority of respondents (81%) perform multifamily housing development activities

❖ Mix of small (42%) and large (50%) developers

❖ Most popular ownership structures were self ownership (31%) & public-private partnership (28%)

❖ Fixed site - 44.9%; Scattered site - 26.5%; Both - 28.6%

❖ Majority of respondents' properties located in urban areas (73%)

❖ Majority of respondents (78%) hold portfolios where 75%-100% of the units are affordable

Housing Provider: Targeted Populations

- ❖ Populations Targeted by Housing Providers
  - ❖ 61% target persons with physical disabilities
  - ❖ 30% target homeless individuals or families
  - ❖ 29% target persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities

- ❖ Percentage of units targeted to these populations varied greatly
  - ❖ 33.3% of respondents targeted 0-10% of their units
  - ❖ 40.5% of respondents targeted 75-100% of their units

- ❖ Of these targeted households, the majority had incomes between 30-80% of Area Median Income
  - ❖ Most respondents (71%) stated that the majority of targeted tenants were at 30-80% AMI
  - ❖ Most respondents (67%) stated that only 0-10% of targeted tenants had incomes below 15% AMI

Housing Provider: Rental Subsidy

❖ Half of respondents stated that their properties have received funding to provide rental subsidies.

    ❖ Most popular sources were Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contracts, Project Based Section 8, and USDA Rural Development funding.

❖ The majority (71.6%) stated that their tenants receive rental assistance themselves

    ❖ Most popular sources were Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and tenant based rental assistance from the local housing authority

Housing Provider: Housing Funding Sources

❖ Most frequently used funding sources were state and local government assistance (average rating of 3.17 & 3.51 respectively)
  ❖ Least frequently used – Fundraising/Charitable Donations (5.43)

❖ Most important funding sources to make a development deal financially feasible were state and federal government assistance (average rating of 2.05 & 2.21 respectively)
  ❖ Least frequently used – Fundraising/Charitable Donations (4.10)

❖ Although a majority (58%) of respondents stated the use of only 1-2 funding sources to develop housing for the targeted population, another 37% of respondents stated the use of 3-5 funding sources.

Housing Provider: Service Provision

- ❖ 65% of respondents provide services to their housing developments
  - ❖ Of those, 64% are the service provider and the services are located on-site

- ❖ Most frequent services provided to residents:
  - ❖ Job/skills training, placement and supports
  - ❖ Income stability/Financial Literacy education

- ❖ Least frequent services provided to residents:
  - ❖ Medication management
  - ❖ Personal attendant services for ADLs or IADLs
  - ❖ Home health services

- ❖ Providers evenly split in percentage of units receiving services
  - ❖ 34% stated that 0-25% of units received services; 28% said 25-75% of units; 38% said 75-100% of units

Housing Provider: Services Funding Sources

❖ Most frequently used funding sources were federal government assistance and non-profit funding (average rating of 2.91 & 3.00 respectively)

  ❖ Least frequently used – Lending Institutions (5.05)

❖ Most important funding sources needed to provide supportive services were federal government assistance and non-profit funding (average rating of 2.26 & 2.60 respectively)

  ❖ Least frequently used – Lending Institutions (4.00)

❖ Majority of respondents (58.5%) utilize one to two sources of funding for service provision

Housing Provider: Obstacles

- ❖ Most frequent obstacles to developing service-enriched housing
  - ❖ Lack of funding resource to provide services and supports (3.06)
  - ❖ Lack of funding resources to subsidize rent (3.48)

- ❖ Methods for overcoming obstacles
  - ❖ Establish formal partnerships with outside service providers
    - ❖ Networking & relationship-building skills
  - ❖ Develop strong communication with community
    - ❖ Education, outreach, and coalition building
  - ❖ Creative financing – diversifying resources and fundraising

Service Provider: Background

❖ Located throughout the state with main concentrations in greater DFW and Houston areas & Central Texas

❖ Large and small provider organizations represented
  ❖ 31% have 10 staff or less; 38% have 11-75 staff; 31% have over 75 staff

❖ Populations targeted by respondents
  ❖ Individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities (73%)
  ❖ Individuals with physical disabilities (57%)
  ❖ Individuals with mental illness and/or substance abuse disorders (56%)
  ❖ Other category included persons with HIV/AIDS, victims of domestic violence and/or sexual assault, and the elderly

❖ Vast majority of respondents (94%) are the provider of services and supports

Service Provider: Background

❖ Number of clients served varies greatly
  ❖ 36% serve 0-100 persons a year
  ❖ 38% serve 101-1,500 persons a year
  ❖ 26% serve over 1,500 persons a year

❖ Most frequent services provided by respondents: Case management; Independent living supports; and Job/Skills training, placement and supports
  ❖ Least frequent: Preventative care services
  ❖ Other category included: Psychiatric/Counseling services, Substance abuse treatment, and Food/Nutrition provision

❖ Half of respondents said they provide these services both at their location and the location of the client

Service Provider: Funding Sources

❖ Most frequently used funding sources were state and federal government assistance (average rating of 2.35 & 3.52 respectively)

  ❖ Least frequently used – Lending Institutions (5.72) & Private Foundation or Corporation Funding (4.78)

❖ Most important funding sources to provide supportive services were again state and federal government assistance (average rating of 1.27 & 1.76 respectively)

  ❖ Least frequently used – Lending Institutions (4.04) & Non-profit Funding (2.93)

Service Provider: Client Information

- Majority of respondents listed Medicaid services (89%), SSI (89%), and SSDI (73%) as the types of assistance typically received by their clients
  - Other responses included Medicare, SNAP, TANF, and Veterans Benefits

- The majority of respondents collect income data on over 75% of their clients
  - Half of respondents found that 75-100% of their clients have incomes below 150% of federal poverty guidelines

- Number of clients under 100% of federal poverty varies
  - 23% of respondents stated less than 25% of their clients were under this level
  - 42% of respondents stated over 75% of their clients were under this level

Service Provider: Housing Provision

❖ Most common living arrangement for clients is private home (74%), followed by subsidized rental property (51%) or public housing (50%)

❖ Biggest obstacles to clients living in community-based residential housing are: Availability & Affordability
  ❖ Availability: Long waiting lists for subsidized housing, no options with supportive services, no options that will accept targeted population
  ❖ Affordability: Income limitations, no rental subsidies available, no funding for services provided in community settings available

14

Service Provider: Housing Provision

❖ Majority of respondents (62%) make referrals to community-based residential housing

❖ Half of respondents have a working relationship with a local housing provider
  ❖ Majority have relationship with local PHA
  ❖ Others partner with local mental health authority, transitional housing provider, or permanent supportive housing provider

Service Provider: Obstacles

❖ Most frequently obstacles to providing community based services and supports to targeted population
  ❖ Lack of funding resource to provide services and supports (2.41)
  ❖ Eligibility restrictions (3.75)

❖ Methods for overcoming these obstacles
  ❖ Establishing partnerships, coalitions, and collaboratives
    ❖ Local and state government, housing providers, other service organizations
  ❖ Providing ongoing community education, outreach, and advocacy
  ❖ Doing the most with a limited budget
    ❖ Applying for grants, utilizing volunteers, fundraising
  ❖ Applying effective case management practices

Next Steps:

❖ How does the Council want to use this information?

  ❖ Guiding future actions or resources – tracking database, information clearinghouse
  ❖ Possibility for follow-up communication with those respondents who expressed interest in receiving it
    ❖ 78% of housing providers; 76% of service providers