

**MHSA Housing Program
Ad Hoc Committee Meeting**

Held at: San Joaquin County Behavioral Health Services, Dorothy Chase Room
Held on: Tuesday, August 19, 2008
Facilitator: Lois Lang
Attendees: Nancy Cross, Marie Ramos, Joseph Wood, Jeff Giampetro, Shirley Rogers, Georgia Bernard, Lyn Thomas, Rae Nelson, Cal Parker, and Clifford Hatanaka.

HOUSING AD HOC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Housing Type and Geographical Location:

The following is meant to serve as a broad guideline. Participants also noted that the guidelines may take into consideration developments, already in a planning process, that MHSA may be able to combine with to maximize funding.

Guidelines for the non-profit developers:

- a. Mixture of single population sites (efficiencies in service and funding leverage) and scattered shared housing (consumer request for options);
- b. Lodi – single population site with minimum of 12 units for MHSA tenants;
- c. Tracy – single population site with minimum of 8 units for MHSA tenants;
- d. Stockton – scattered shared housing with total of 18 units for MHSA tenants, and;
- e. Throughout the rest of the county – scattered shared housing with total of 4 units for MHSA tenants.

2. Age Focus

The question of what age would be the focus for MHSA unit tenants resulted in the decision that the non-profit developers need to consider:

1. The match of age percentages of Severely Emotionally Disturbed / Severely Mentally Ill in the county;
2. Safety and risk considerations of mixed age populations; and
3. Other funding specific to age populations that will increase the leverage of MHSA dollars.

For example, there is funding through August 2009 specifically for housing the homeless transitional age youth from 18-25 (younger if emancipated). We might decide on joining that funding source to maximize the MHSA funds.

The following table is from the original San Joaquin County Community Supports and Services Plan and details the estimated ages and numbers of residents with SED/SMI in the county.

Age Group	Est. # County Residents with SED/SMI	% Share of Total County Residents with SED/SMI	# Fully Served	% Share of Fully Served
Children & Youth (0-15)	11,192	30%	416	59%
Transitional Age Youth (16-25)	8,188	18%	125	18%
Adult (26-59)	16,671	41%	158	22%
Older Adult (60+)	4,357	11%	8	1%
Total	40,408	100%	707	100%

3. Service Priorities

The Ad Hoc committee reviewed and discussed input from the community meetings regarding service priorities. The following service priorities should be considered by the non-profit developer during their planning process:

- a. Affordability
- b. Public transportation access
- c. Employment opportunities
- d. Vocational education access
- e. Resource/services space
- f. Recreation area for different age groups

The rest of this document are flip chart notes from the Ad Hoc Committee meeting:

(from notes pages 1-4)

Type of Housing

- Affordability
- Single site and mixed survey (both single and scattered)
- Options 2 degrees to state of recovery
- Single site with levels of support and security
- Two planned developments
- New units vs. rehab
- Rental housing developments as cost efficient
- Scattered with 5 units
- 30% rent restrictions, i.e. 10 unit apartment, 4 units MHSA, 6 units as low income, Section 8, etc.
- Tax credits as minimum of units in apartment building
- Service satellites attached to housing
- Lodi senior focus, MHSA ~10 unit possibility, look at nearby property for sxs, "PAM" project
- Single site more efficient to operate
- Survey current work

- Mixed goal, developer single site, individual investor to do scattered
- Developer single population use site - many units - at least more than 5
- Minimal scattered
- Ideally every community
- Lodi-Stockton-Tracy

(from notes page 5)

1. Supervisor acceptance
2. Community acceptance
3. What projects can we join with
4. Developers
 - Single site in Tracy and Lodi
 - Lodi more so than Tracy
 - Lodi single 12
 - Tracy single 8
 - Stockton scattered 18
 - Rest of county scattered home 4

(from notes page 6)

Age priorities

- TAY (transitional age youth)
- Older Adults
- Look at challenge of mixed age populations
- Who placing where?
- Safety and risk considerations
 - 18-24 years old, or emancipated, bond money homeless youth program for 1 year (2009 by August), combine with this as a possibility
 - Adult
- C.Age looking for developer partners to look at compatible funding to ideally mimic age needs and percent in county remembering safety and risk considerations.