



Gavin Newsom
Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health
Housing and Urban Health

Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Housing Work Group

Meeting 4 Minutes: Tuesday, December 5, 2006 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM, City Hall Room 278

Present:

Name	Title	Agency	Representing
Brian Basinger	Executive Director	AIDS Housing Alliance	AIDS Housing Alliance
Lori Cook	Health Program Planner	DPH-HUH	DPH-HUH
Silke Feldman	Executive Coordinator to CB Initiatives	Catholic Healthcare West	Philanthropic Sector
Eliza Gibson	Director of Clinical and Community Services	Larkin Street Youth Services	Larkin Street Youth Services
Chris Harris	Senior Development Specialist	SFRA	SFRA
Bill Hirsh	Director	AIDS Legal Referral Panel	AIDS Legal Referral Panel
Greg Kats	Deputy Director of Housing Programs	Human Services Agency	Human Services Agency
Shelagh Little	Consultant	Abbott Little	DPH-HUH
Rodney Murphy	Program Director, Peter Claver Community	CCCYO	CCCYO
George Simmons	Senior Program Director, Assisted Housing and Health Programs	CCCYO	CCCYO
John Tambis	Housing Wait List Coordinator	DPH-HUH	DPH-HUH
Marc Trotz	Director	DPH-HUH	DPH-HUH
Martin Uhrin	Special Programs Manager	SFHA	SFHA

Review of Meeting Topic and Goals

M. Trotz review the meeting topics and goals:

- To review the subcommittee's draft report on unmet housing needs
- To discuss the Housing Wait List (HWL) and related systems change issues.
- To hear systems change presentations by Work Group members.

Public Comment

Michael Petrelis reiterated statements made at previous meetings regarding management salary levels at AIDS organizations being too high given the unmet housing need among PLWHAs in San Francisco. He suggested that salary dollars be redirected to housing subsidies. Petrelis also said that he would like to see the Work Group produce actionable items that can happen in 2007.

Updates

G. Simmons reported that there will likely be no movement on CARE reauthorization / HRSA regs until the New Year when the new Congress is in place.

Subcommittee Report

As chair of the data subcommittee, C. Harris provided an update regarding the subcommittee's activities and findings. The subcommittee met once since the last full Work Group meeting and produced an updated version of its report on unmet housing needs for review and comment by the Work Group. The subcommittee will schedule one additional meeting to incorporate remaining comments / feedback. C. Harris invited Work Group members to submit final comments on the draft by the middle of the following week.

B. Hirsh pointed to the connection between the work of the subcommittee and the topic of the larger Work Group meeting (i.e., the HWL), noting that the subcommittee identified a need for reliable data on the level and types of unmet housing needs among PLWHAs in San Francisco. Some Work Group members felt that re-opening the HWL would be a good way of documenting need. Others subcommittee members, while acknowledging the need for more reliable data, questioned the use of the HWL for this purpose as it could create unrealistic expectations of placement.

Discussion: The Housing Wait List and Systems Change

M. Trotz provided background on the HWL:

The HWL was created to provide equal access to housing programs for PLWHAs on a "non-needs" basis (i.e., first come, first served). The advantages of this approach are that the process is fair and transparent. The alternative used by other housing programs is a system of "access points" – applications are accepted from agencies that serve the target population, and it is assumed that those agencies will prioritize applicants based on need. The advantage of this approach is that it addresses the needs of the most acute, at-risk population.

J. Tambis made a presentation regarding the Housing Wait List (see "San Francisco HIV/AIDS Housing Wait List").

C. Harris described two areas of difficulty in administering HOPWA housing with access through the HWL:

1. Overlapping eligibility criteria prescribed by funding sources. In some cases, candidates for housing must be on both the Section 8 Wait List and the HWL, both of which are currently closed.
2. Applicants are sometimes inappropriately placed in licensed care facilities due to the lack of other available options. Some clients in licensed care are unable to exit to more appropriate housing because transfers do not receive priority for open slots in subsidy programs.

B. Basinger commented that he did not want to limit discussion to how to provide access to the limited supply of existing housing; rather Basinger suggested that the Work Group focus instead on how to increase housing supply. He also expressed his support of systems that prioritize based on need.

G. Simmons said that the HWL was created to give everyone equal access to housing opportunities, and that he did not want to revert to a system that resulted in placement only for those who were fortunate enough to have good case managers. He expressed support for a system that allowed transfers based on need. He said that the HWL was originally created for placement into subsidy programs, and that is why most on the HWL express a desire for subsidies and not other types of placements.

M. Trotz suggested that one idea might be stop using the HWL as the mechanism for entry into specialty programs such as Licensed Care, and just use it for subsidy programs. This might result in a more accurate sense of true need for RCF-CIs.

B. Basinger stated his support for a system that creates appropriate exits from higher levels of care, including supportive housing.

C. Harris spoke of a survey conducted on the number of RCF-CI residents who would want to and could leave if appropriate alternative placements were available. Needs that prevent successful exits mostly relate to behavioral health. Some RCF-CI residents want more independent living situations but not necessarily subsidies (e.g. Shelter Plus Care).

B. Basinger said that he had spoken to clients who wanted to leave RCF-CI type settings because of drug use there.

M. Trotz summarized the conversation by saying there seemed to be consensus that more fluidity is needed. He also stated that there seemed to be a need to get more aggressive about “combing” the HWL by reaching out to active clients and assessing the nature of their housing need. This would winnow the list down to a manageable number who could then be prioritized for new housing opportunities.

M. Uhrin said that the SFHA is very aggressive about purging its wait list based on who has not completed recertification requirements. (For the HWL, only those who are close to being contacted for placement are recertified.)

Public comment was made regarding the procedure used by Leland House to identify appropriate candidates: Leland reaches out to medical providers to see who is in need of placement there, and then checks to see if the candidate is on the HWL.

B. Basinger noted that there is a need to educate those on the HWL about how to apply for public housing if they are eligible.

C. Harris said that SFRA would like to recommend that transfers be allowed, giving priority based on the person’s original wait list number.

M. Trotz suggested the possibility that a special subsidy pool could be created for those in RCF-CIs that could live independently.

J. Tambis described how changes in the nature of the epidemic (i.e., lower morbidity rates) have created a need for new permanent housing.

M. Trotz asked the group whether it thought new housing should be attached to the existing HWL.

Public Comment was given regarding the need for “respite” or “tune-up” type beds and supportive housing beds.

M. Trotz said one option would be to create access to new supportive housing coming on-line for people on the HWL (as opposed to creating HIV/AIDS-specific housing).

E. Gibson said that youth aging out of youth programs are not served by the HWL because it closed before they could enter the system.

J. Tambis said the most time-consuming part of administering the HWL is assessing eligibility for the different types of programs (e.g., some require homelessness).

M. Trotz summarized the conversation and the recommendations that had come forward:

- De-link the RCF-CI programs from the HWL. Use it for subsidy programs.
- Possibly create a subsidy pool linked to exits from RCF-CIs.
- Possibly create subsidy pools linked to other special populations such as youth.
- Create / direct more supportive housing targeted to PLWHAs.
- Update and comb through existing HWL to better understand needs. Make this update process periodic.
- Give those at the top of current list priority access to other supportive housing.

Work Group Member Presentations

B. Basinger presented a proposal for incentivizing HIV/AIDS service organization contractors to more aggressively create appropriate employment opportunities for disabled persons with AIDS. He suggested that these positions would facilitate housing stability by providing those on disability with the allowable amount of supplemental income, which in turn could support housing costs. It would also create leadership development opportunities for PLWHAs. AHA will be opening a café that will offer employment opportunities tailored to the needs of PLWHAs who are disabled, including flexible and part-time work opportunities.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 9, 2007 from 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM, City Hall, Room 278