

Pa. MH Supportive Housing Initiative

Winter 2011 Update

- OMHSAS hosted *five* Regional Supportive Housing meetings with County MH/MR and Health Choices Programs in January and February 2011 to provide information on state policies, new opportunities, to facilitate information sharing among programs and obtain supportive housing plan and program updates.
- 25 County and Health Choices programs plus representatives of the 23 Counties participating in the State Option program participated in the meetings.
- The goals of the OMHSAS PSH Initiative are to: (1) create affordable supportive housing for people with disabilities, specifically OMHSAS/DPW target populations, and (2) utilize Health Choices Reinvestment, CHIPPS or base funding to access and leverage mainstream housing resources and create partnerships with state and local housing and community development entities.
- This presentation includes a summary of Counties' progress since 2008, challenges and next steps and recommendations for statewide and local policies, future investments and strategies

Progress Report: Supportive Housing Investments

- Counties have established and in some cases updated their County Housing Plans, committed Reinvestment, CHIPPs and base funding in the OMHSAS approved housing strategies including: capital, project based operating assistance(PBOA), bridge subsidies, master leasing, clearinghouses and in contingency and supportive services.
- For most counties these plans and investments span multiple years.
- The data collected this winter, mid-implementation, indicates that Counties are having great success and meeting the vast majority of their own local housings targets. There is data to suggest Counties are exceeding their goals and overall the initiative is exceeding expectations.

Progress Report:

Supportive Housing Investments

- Overall, HealthChoices investments have been used to leverage capital resources such as HOME funds, ACT 137 and Low Income Housing Tax Credits as well as federally funded tenant- and project-based vouchers by at least three to four times their original amount statewide.
- Initially, counties expected to serve over 3,300 consumers when reinvestment funds were fully expended. As of 01/10/11, reinvestment-funded housing had served and estimated 2,600 households or nearly 80% of those expected to be served. Since programs will be expanding through funds already committed for several more years, it is likely Counties will serve significantly more households than expected. This is due in large part to Counties utilizing beneficial leveraging strategies.
- Counties vary significantly in the percentages of those served who come from their targeted populations, i.e. people in institutions and CRR, people who are homeless, youth aging out and forensic population.

Progress Report:

Supportive Housing Investments

Numbers of people served/ units created by cost per person and percentage of Reinvestment funds expended to date:

- Capital:** 523 units created at an average of \$61,250 per unit or just over \$2000 per person per year for up to 30 years/ 23% expended
- PBOA:** 153 subsidies awarded for people residing in PBOA units in 25 different developments most of these subsidies extend 10 year/ 30% committed
- Bridge:** 669 bridge subsidies awarded/ 55% expended
- Master Leasing:** 285 subsidies awarded/ 58% expended
- Clearinghouse:** 983 people supported/ # supported represents 117% of people served
- Contingency:** 1,324 persons received funds/ 50% of funds expended
- Services:** 1,129 persons served/ 85% of funds expended

Implementation Challenges

- Housing needs far outpace affordable housing availability
- Reinvestment a great start-up resource for services and for short term bridge and master leasing but In Plan and Supplemental services and long term housing strategies and resources needed
- Lack of quality housing stock poses a barrier in some counties
- In most markets, criminal records histories pose a barrier to high priority populations
- Not all stakeholders “buy into” the supportive housing model
- Housing development is a lengthy process
- Some critical housing organizations such as PHAs or developers not interested in partnering with Counties

Next Steps and Recommendations

- Counties need to develop more specific strategies for sustainability especially for bridge, master leasing and services initiatives
- DPW and OMHSAS committed to Local Lead Agency model—critical to competing for 811 funds and mainstream vouchers and ensuring LIHTC set asides
- Collaborations among state and local agencies are good but could be strengthened
- Strong evidence that on-going support, technical assistance and training needed to make systemic changes to support consumers in PSH—at provider, county, HC Plans and state levels
- OMHSAS needs to monitor and Counties need to give more attention to assuring target populations are served
- Implement MFP changes
- Articulate what works for youth transitioning out of foster care and juvenile justice settings
- More fully document cost offsets and savings
- Continue assisting Counties to implement and expand housing plans