QuickTime™ and a decompressor are needed to see this picture.

2011 County Housing Plan: County Boards and Housing Corporations

Analysis and Summary June 2011

Prepared by Disability Housing Network

PART ONE: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2011 Housing Plan, the second year to assess County Boards and Housing Corporations' process for housing planning, was completed in 27 counties between October 2010 and June 2011. The County Housing Plan for County Boards of Developmental Disabilities and Housing Corporations was distributed in September 2010 with the request that the plans be completed by January 31, 2011.

CONTEXT

The purpose of the Model Housing Plan is to provide a framework by which County Board staff and Housing Corporation staff can discuss current specialized housing operations, needs and options for future housing. It is intended to also aid the development of future operational plans and budgets.

DHN developed this tool in collaboration with the Department of Developmental Disabilities and DHN members, representing both Housing Corporations and County Boards.

ANALYSIS

Based on the 27 plans submitted, DHN has developed a series of conclusions listed below. The conclusions are limited, in part, because the response rate was low, and because the responses to the questions were varied and sometimes left unanswered.

INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

- **Priorities for development –** The housing plans submitted identified these following priority development areas:

- In both 2011 and 2012, developing three to four person units are the priority (condominiums, single-unit apartments, or single-story accessible duplexes or houses). The **2010** housing plan analysis indicated smaller units were identified as the priority.
- Units that can accommodate the following population groups: multiple-diagnosed individuals, residents aging out of the children service system, those residing with aging caregivers, and former residents of Developmental Centers.

- **Priorities for repair –** Housing plans identified typical maintenance and repair/replacement priorities, such as painting, flooring and appliances. These three items were identified most often as priorities for both 2011 and 2012. Other common projects include HVAC, doors and insulation/energy efficiency projects.

- **Smaller counties look shorter term –** Both the 2010 and 2011 housing plan analysis indicated that smaller counties were less likely to plan for longer-term repair or development priorities. While this might have been a function of the time spent on the reports, or the staff available to work on the reports, it appears that larger counties planned for longer-term priorities.

- **Direct and Indirect subsidies by County Boards** – The data shows smaller size Housing Corporations were more likely to receive indirect subsidy support such as office space, administrative, maintenance and professional staff. Housing Corporations that are of large or medium size are significantly more likely to receive vacancy payment support than smaller Housing Corporations.

  Although various subsidies exist in our system ranging from in kind services (loaned staff) from county boards to subsidies paid by the Boards to partner housing corporations, there is room for additional study on whether there is a direct correlation between the subsidy needed for operations and the subsidy provided by the County Board. An earlier national study by the Technical Assistance Collaborative indicated that in order to provide housing for people with significant disabilities, substantial subsidies are required because of the low income of the individuals served.

- **Future challenges facing the special needs housing industry -** Housing plans identified most often the need to develop affordable specialized housing to accommodate people with accessibility needs, challenging behaviors and criminal histories. Availability of funding for future development and modifications was identified through most of the plans as well. With potential changes to current funding sources, it is important to begin exploring other financing opportunities.

NEXT STEPS

Besides the policy implications of some of the data included in this report, there are additional next steps that DHN is recommending for the future implementation of this research and analysis process.

1. With the two years of housing data collected and analyzed, DHN is in the position to assist the Department of DD with policy recommendations and potential solutions to issues facing Housing Corporations today.
2. For future consideration, do we want to consider the idea of creating a subsidy in combination with housing? With the scarcity of Section 8 vouchers should Counties and the State consider providing a supplemental voucher for people that can rent on the private market? Housing provided by the Housing Corporations could then primarily serve people that cannot be served in housing found on the private market.
3. DHN will share information collected in the County Housing Plan report with various stakeholders as a means to continue the advancement of special needs housing in Ohio.

PART TWO: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

1. Who completed the plan?

As mentioned in the introduction, 27 County Boards completed the Housing Plan. Their responses are included in the analysis below.

The county plans incorporated into this analysis include:

• Allen	• Holmes
• Ashland	• Lawrence
• Auglaise	• Lucas
• Brown	• Madison
• Butler	• Ottawa
• Champaign	• Preble
• Clinton	• Putnam
• Cuyahoga	• Ross
• Delaware	• Scioto
• Erie	• Summit
• Franklin	• Union
• Greene	• Warren
• Hamilton	• Williams
• Hardin	

Ten counties have submitted a plan in both 2010 and 2011. DHN is recommending a plan be completed every three years at the minimum, with an annual review and update of the information.

2. Who participated in the planning process?

The participants in the planning process were:

- SSA/SSA Director = 11
- Superintendent = 16
- Housing Corporation executive director = 14
- Housing Corporation Board members = 17 (Board President, Vice President, Secretary, Board Member)
- Other Housing Corporation staff = 22 (COO, CFO, Treasurer, Director of Administration, Director of Facilities, Property Manager, Admin Staff,

Business Manager, Development Manager, Maintenance Supervisor, Housing Coordinator, General Counsel)

- Other County Board staff = 47 (Business Director, Residential Director, Residential Services Coordinator, Support Services Supervisor/Director, Support Services Specialist/Coordinators, Family Services, Program Services Administrator, Residential Programs Supervisor, Director of Operations, Operations Supervisor, County Board Liaison, Director of Community Support Services, Adult Services Director, Community Resource Manager, Medicaid Services Manager)

3. ***As of October 1, how many homes did you manage and how many residents lived in those homes? (Include properties purchased with CCA funds as well as those purchased with other funds).***

Of the 27 Housing Plans submitted, 52% are housing plans developed by small Housing Corporations, 37% by medium size Housing Corporations and 11% by large Housing Corporations. (Large Housing Corps= 75 or more properties, Medium= 16-74 properties, Small= 15 or fewer properties)

The responses reflect that the Housing Corporations manage between one and 506 properties, and have between three and 1043 residents residing in their properties.

	Number of homes	*Number of residents*
County One	17	37
County Two	10	34
County Three	9	24
County Four	2	8
County Five	48	110
County Six	14	28
County Seven	1	3
County Eight	99	368
County Nine	33	56
County Ten	17	28
County Eleven	506	1043
County Twelve	28	54
County Thirteen	38	93
County Fourteen	10	21
County Fifteen	4	10
County Sixteen	17	33
County Seventeen	39	85
County Eighteen	14	43
County Nineteen	19	39

County Twenty	5	12
County Twenty-one	4	15
County Twenty-two	15	30
County Twenty-three	14	24
County Twenty-four	78	270
County Twenty-five	13	27
County Twenty-six	26	73
County Twenty-seven	8	17

4. *Do you currently have any properties for sale? Why are they for sale?*

Of the 26 Housing Corporations reporting a response to this question, only three stated that they currently have homes for sale.

a. One is being sold because the older home cannot easily be made accessible without great expense.
b. One is being sold due to age, and the second bedroom doesn't meet current needs
c. The third home is being sold because it cannot easily be updated or made accessible

5. *How do you determine rent in your homes?*

The two most common processes for determining rent for Housing Corporations was to charge 30% of a person's income or based on a formula developed by the Housing Corporation, both of these responses account for 27% of the reporting Housing Corporations. Two respondents stated they calculate rent as a percentage of fair market rent, two others stated they charge a flat rate and the remaining responses varied.

6. *What is the per person rent or rent range for your homes?*

Housing Corporations reported that their per person monthly rents range anywhere from $0 to $664 per person, with 63% of the rents between $200 and $400.

7. Who is responsible for providing or paying for the following expenses? The following chart indicates the number of Housing Corporations that charge fees to the following:

	Tenant	Housing Corp.	County Board
Water/Sewer	18	8	0
Trash Removal	16	9	0
Recycling Fee	13	5	0
Electricity	23	3	0
Gas	23	3	0

Phone	26	0	0
Cable	26	0	0
Internet Service	23	0	0
Lawn Care & Maintenance	7	18	0
Snow Removal	9	16	0
Fire & Alarm Service	4	16	1
Exterminator Service	1	23	1
Other: Bed Bug Treatment, Insurance, Tax Assessment, Annual Inspections, HOA	1 (bed bug) treatment)	7	0

None of the responses stood out as irregular in the property management industry as a whole. Water/sewer, trash and recycling expenses are more often paid for by the management company and rolled into the rent charged in multi-unit projects. Residents often pay these expenses directly when the unit is a single family home.

8. ***Estimate the percentage contribution of various sources of income to your housing corporations rent revenue.***

   The average housing corporation receives 75.86% of their rent revenue from tenant paid rent, 9.2% from County Board Rent Subsidy, 5.99% from County Board Operating Subsidy and 8.95% from other sources including HUD 811, HUD Section 8 vouchers and fund raising.

9. ***Estimate the percentage contribution of various sources to the Housing Corporation's development revenue for acquisitions.***

   Community Capital Assistance funds have significantly impacted the development opportunities for housing corporations serving people with developmental disabilities. The average housing corporation's development revenue comes primarily through the Ohio Department of DD Community Capital Assistance program. The Community Capital Assistance program makes up 59.56%, private mortgages 21.57% and County Board of DD funds 11.61%. The remaining 7.26% comes from other sources including: NSP dollars, HOME, Grants, HUD 811, CDBG/CHIP, Tax Credit Equity.

10. What direct or indirect subsidies are received from the County Board?

County Boards subsidize Housing Corporations in many different ways. The most common subsidies paid by County Boards of DD include:

- Rental Subsidy to Tenant- 54% of respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual average per person of $3871.

- Payment for Vacancies- 54% of respondents receive this subsidy with a wide variance of when the vacancy subsidy is implemented. Examples include: after 30 days, after 45 days, until filled, by bedroom, $697 per month, and $1250 per month.

- Professional staff support- 42% of respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual value between $6,330 and $100,000. The average annual professional staff subsidy is $35,400.

- Maintenance staff support- 42% of respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual value between $5,000 and $192,760. The average annual maintenance staff subsidy is $82,500.

- Office space for Housing Corporation staff– 38% of respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual value ranging between $1,200 and $10,000.

- Administrative Staff Support- 35% of respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual value between $3,000 and $82,000. The average annual administrative staff subsidy is $26,500.

- Cash Maintenance Subsidy- 12% of the respondents receive this subsidy with a reported annual value between $50 per site to $130,000 per year.

Of the 26 responses to this question, approximately 25% of the plans did not include an estimated value to the subsidies. One of the reporting Housing Corporations indicated they do not receive any subsidy from the County Board.

11. Does your Housing Corporation administer a rent subsidy program on behalf of the County Board? If so, how many individuals participated in 2010?

Of the twenty-six Housing Corporations that responded to the question, only 31% administer a rent subsidy program on behalf of the County Board. The number of people served by these Housing Corporations' rent subsidy program is from 3-410 and the range of annual per person subsidy provided by the county board is $240-$5,400.

12. What are your Housing Corporations' repair priorities for 2011 and 2012?

Below is the count of repair projects identified by 26 Housing Corporations as priority for 2011 and 2012. The higher numbers represent typical property management maintenance and replacement items.

(NOTE: The count below reflects the number of projects, not the number of properties with projects. Properties can have more than one project.)

	2011	**2012**
Windows	50	35
Floors/Carpet	**116**	**96**
Roof	57	39
HVAC	74	65
Bathrooms	68	54
Walkway	35	30
Driveway	27	27
Accessible Ramp	27	11
Stairs	2	2
Electrical Upgrades	44	21
Deck	16	15
Painting (interior/exterior)	**112**	**142**
Siding	31	18
Doors	85	36
Appliances	**161**	**161**
Basement	7	3
Vapor Barriers	4	1
Kitchens	53	35
Fire alarm/suppression systems	23	13
Foundations	12	5
Plumbing	44	33
Gutters	33	33
Porch	25	9
Insulation/energy efficiency	72	67
Garage	8	4
Sump Pump	14	11
Other	63	25

13. Indicate the number of projects you anticipate developing in 2011 and 2012 using CCA or other sources of funds.

The majority of Housing Corporations plan to develop 3-4 person projects to maximize resources for both housing and support services. Two counties do not plan to develop in 2011 or 2012. (The count below is the number of projects expected to be developed by all reporting Housing Corporations.)

	Single Person	***Two Person***	***Three-Four Person***	***Licensed Facility 4+ People***	***Other***
2011	***3***	***4***	***29***	***6***	***1***
2012	***2***	***3***	***21***	***4***	***0***

14. Housing Corporations are planning to develop housing for the following population groups:

Several Housing Corporations did not expect to develop housing specific to the population groups below and two housing corporations are not developing in 2011 or 2012. (The count below indicates the number of housing corporations.)

	Single Person	Two Person	3-4 Person	Licensed Facility, 4+ People
Ex Offenders	2		1	1
Multi Diagnosis	2	1	5	1
Medically Fragile		1	2	1
Acute Behavior	3		3	
Aging Children Services			6	
Aging Caregivers		2	7	
Former Residents of DC		1	4	

15. Is your Housing Corporation planning to develop respite care in 2011 or 2012?

Eighty-five percent of responding Housing Corporations do not plan to develop respite care housing in 2011 or 2012.

16. How many individuals required emergency respite care in the last 12 months?

Of the 25 responses to the question, 36% of Counties reported there were no individuals requiring emergency respite care, 48% served between 1-10 people, with the remaining 16% serving between 19-50 people.

17. How long did it take your organization to complete the Housing Plan?

The average Housing Corporation completed the 2011 County Housing Plan in 6 hours. The six hours included information gathering, meeting time and completing the document.

18. What are the future challenges facing special needs housing in your county? Some of the responses are included below:

- Sufficient service dollars for supports
- Increased need for accessible housing units
- Smaller, clustered housing units for people who are unable to live with others but need to share supports
- Availability of rental assistance
- Availability of capital dollars
- Increasing property management and maintenance capacity
- Provider staff trained to work with people with a dual diagnosis
- Provider staff taking ownership for the care of the houses on a daily basis
- Housing corporations are challenged with finding affordable housing options for people with severe behavioral challenges, criminal histories or for those at high risk for offending behaviors
- Housing for children with intensive behavioral needs not able to live with parents and medically fragile population
- Retro-fit for accessibility to allow people to age in place
- Increasing the energy efficiency of properties
- New sources for capital to develop affordable housing (tax credit development partnerships)
- Housing located where public transportation is available
- Sufficient operating income
- Development of new housing opportunities to meet the expected need
- Resident damage
- Locating existing one floor plan housing to accommodate 3-4 people
- The availability of funds to address capital improvements of older housing stock