

**CITY OF BOULDER
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**

MEETING DATE: November 8, 2005

AGENDA TITLE: Consideration of a motion to accept the Housing and Human Services Master Plan, 2006 - 2015

PRESENTER/S: Karen Rahn, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
John Pollak, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
Richard Johnson, Director, Division of Community Services (HHS)
Linda Hill-Blakley, Housing and Human Services Planner (HHS)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The proposed City of Boulder Master Plan for the Department of Housing and Human Services is a ten year policy guide for the department through 2015. In 1994, City Council approved the Human Services Master Plan, which served as a policy guide for the department in annually allocating over \$2 million to community agencies for the provision of human services. Now, eleven years later, the focus of this Master Plan is much broader and encompasses all services of the department, as well as funding provided to the community.

This ten year Master Plan (Attachment A) for the department presents for Council's consideration policies and investment scenarios that have been developed by staff, an advisory committee of recognized local leaders in the fields of housing and human services, community agencies and members of the public.

A Study Session on the HHS Master Plan was held with City Council on August 30, 2005 (Attachment B). Following a presentation and discussion at the Study Session, Mayor Ruzzin summarized Council's responses to the following questions regarding the Master Plan:

- Does Council agree with the general direction of the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- Does Council agree with the policy directions outlined in the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- Does Council agree with the Scenarios presented in the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- What changes would Council recommend? **No changes recommended to the draft HHS Master Plan.**

The summary of the Study Session was approved by motion by Council at its September 20, 2005 meeting (Attachment C). In the future, Council may wish to amend this Master

Plan as recommendations from Council's Community Sustainability Goal Strategic Plan are finalized.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

Master Plan Process and Production:

Budgetary and Staff Time: HHS Master Plan was developed internally as a part of the work program for HHS.

HHS Master Plan Recommendations:

Budgetary and Staff Time: The Master Plan does not include any fiscal impacts for the proposed 2006 budget.

Consistent with the City's business plan, the HHS Master Plan presents three investment scenarios based on potential funding over the coming decade.

- Fiscally Constrained Investment, based on current levels of funding (\$12.9 million);
- Action Investments, proposing moderate enhanced investments to meet established and emerging Council goals and priorities (an additional \$3.9 million or \$16.8 million total); and
- Vision Investments, proposing higher levels of investment to enhance City leadership in promoting a healthy community (\$8.3 million above Action Investments, or \$25.1 million total).

If pursued, the Action and Vision scenarios would require additional funding and staffing. The Fiscally Constrained scenario is based on current resources. It should be noted, however, that within the ten year timeframe of the plan, the Fiscally Constrained scenario requires continuation of current funding, including non-city sources (about 23% of HHS budget) and continuation of the 0.15% sales tax, due to expire in 2012 (about \$1.5 million annually for HHS). In addition to the three investment scenarios and in accordance with the City's business plan, the HHS Master Plan proposes a methodology for reducing programs and services should funding be reduced in the future. Key elements, existing programs, proposed enhancements and funding concerns are outlined in a one page chart on page 15 of the Master Plan Document (Attachment D).

OTHER IMPACTS:

Economic and Community: Housing and Human Services contribute to the health, viability, livability and diversity of the broad community. Many HHS services and those of the agencies it funds (e.g., health care and child care for low income residents, affordable housing) play an important role in Boulder's economic vitality. These services help support the community's core workforce, which assists business' recruitment and retention of employees. Department outreach and services provided to lower income populations enhance community engagement and diversity. Providing affordable housing makes it possible for employees to live in the community in which they work, which helps lessen commuting, traffic congestion and sprawl.

BOARD AND COMMISSION AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK:

The City Manager appointed an advisory committee to assist in the development of this plan. The advisory committee is composed of community leaders with expertise in education, health, mental health, senior issues, housing, law enforcement, child development, disabilities, community development, charitable giving and business.

A wide variety of sources and public input informed the development of the draft Master Plan. Local and national documents were reviewed, as well as historical documents from HHS. Census data were examined to develop a demographic profile of the community. Community housing and human service professionals and the public provided information used in the development of the plan. Additionally, staff from each of the four divisions of the department participated in “brainstorming” sessions and provided their professional expertise to the advisory committee regarding issues and trends.

In the Spring of 2005, staff provided extensive e-mail notification of the availability of the draft Master Plan on the web, with over 300 copies of the March draft of the Master Plan distributed. Presentations were made to various community groups (e.g., Boulder Human Services Alliance, Boulder Housing Partners, Human Relations Commission, a Latino immigrant focus group and the Youth Opportunities Advisory Board). An open house and public forum was held for the general public in March 2005.

All materials (meeting agendas, notes, presentations and drafts) have been available throughout the development of the Master Plan on the web at: <http://www.ci.boulder.co.us/hhs/HHSMP%20homepage.htm>. Comments from the public process have been incorporated into the current draft Master Plan.

On September 22, 2005, Planning Board reviewed the HHS Master Plan and unanimously passed a motion recommending that City Council accept the Mater Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Council acceptance of the Housing and Human Services Master Plan, incorporating the changes described below in the Analysis section.

ANALYSIS:

Master Plan Summary:

The Study Session memo, included in Attachment C, summarizes the process and recommendations included in the HHS Master Plan. The Community Investment Scenarios Summary Chart on page 15 of the Master Plan document summarizes the key elements, existing programs and potential enhancements, and funding concerns of the three investment scenarios.

Changes Incorporated Since the Council Study Session:

Based on feedback from Council at its August 30 Study Session and from the Planning Board, the HHS Master Plan Advisory Committee, and staff, at meetings held throughout September, several changes have been incorporated into the Master Plan.

City Council: As discussed at the Council Study Session, the suggestion that the City explore the potential for increased affordable housing benefit when developers are given concessions such as increased height or density has been addressed in the plan (page 13).

Planning Board: Three suggestions from Planning Board have been incorporated into the Plan: 1) information about coordinated efforts between HHS and the Police Department and Municipal Court (staff also noted that coordinated efforts between HHS and Parks and Recreation and the Library should be included) (page 53); 2) recognition of the importance of continuing efforts of the City with CU regarding issues of community concern (page 53); and 3) note that in addition to deed restricted permanently affordable housing, market rate housing plays a role in the affordable housing picture in the community (page 46).

Advisory Committee: At its final meeting on September 27, the Advisory Committee reaffirmed its support of the Master Plan. Two suggestions have been added: 1) community engagement should be broadened to involve other underrepresented groups, such as people with disabilities, seniors and low income residents so their needs and concerns can be heard (page 11); and 2) acknowledge explicitly in the housing program description of the plan appendix that the 10% affordable housing goal will not be able to be accomplished within the original date—by 2011—with existing resources. The 2011 goal was contingent upon passage of the Housing Ballot Measure in 2000, which was not approved by the voters (Appendix, page 47).

Staff: Minor editing and format changes have been made to the draft Master Plan document since the study session.

Also, a substantive change that has been made to the document since the Study Session relates to the Family Resource Schools Program. Now included in the Vision Investment Scenario (for future funding) is the proposed transfer of the Family Resource Schools (FRS) Program to the General Fund. Currently, the FRS Program competes for city funding through the annual Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and the biannual Human Services Fund process. This would require an annual investment of \$322,000 from the General Fund in 2005 dollars. Consistent 5% to 7% reductions in the CDBG program over the past few years have decreased the program's funding to such an extent that the number of schools served has had to be similarly reduced. Additionally, year-to-year planning is made more difficult because of the uncertainty of funding (page 20). Most City Action and Vision Plans are currently unfunded and will need to be assessed and prioritized in the context of the city-wide Business Plan and future budgets.

Approved By:

Frank W. Bruno
City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Housing and Human Services Master Plan and Appendix
- B. Study Session Memo, August 30, 2005
- C. Summary of Study Session
- D. Investment Scenarios Summary

ATTACHMENT A

Housing and Human Services Master Plan and Appendix

(Separate Attachment)

ATTACHMENT B
BOULDER CITY COUNCIL
STUDY SESSION

August 30, 2005

Housing and Human Services Master Plan

6:00 pm

City Council Chambers
1777 Broadway

NOTE: PUBLIC WRITTEN COMMENT TO CITY COUNCIL 1777 BROADWAY,
SECOND FLOOR, OR P.O. BOX 791, 80306 OR FAX 303-441-4478 ATTN:
ALISA LEWIS, OR E-MAIL COUNCIL@CI.BOULDER.CO.US

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Members of City Council

FROM: Karen Rahn, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
John Pollak, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
Richard Johnson, Director, Division of Community Services, HHS
Linda Hill-Blakley, Housing and Human Services Planner

DATE: August 18, 2005

SUBJECT: Study Session: Draft Housing and Human Services Master Plan

I. PURPOSE

The purposes of this study session are to share with Council the attached draft master plan for Housing and Human Services (HHS), to request Council direction on the draft plan and to request Council guidance on the following questions:

1. Does Council agree with the general direction of the draft HHS Master Plan?
2. Does Council agree with the policy issues outlined in the draft HHS Master Plan?
3. Does Council agree with the investment scenarios presented in the draft HHS Master Plan?
4. What changes would Council recommend?

II. BACKGROUND

Overview

The proposed City of Boulder Master Plan for the Department of Housing and Human Services is intended as a ten year policy guide for the department through 2015. In 1994, City Council approved the Human Services Master Plan, which served as a policy guide for the department in annually allocating over \$2 million to community agencies for the provision of human services. Now, eleven years later, the focus of this Master Plan is much broader and encompasses all services provided by the department, as well as funding to the community. In the decade since the adoption of the Human Services Master Plan, Boulder has undergone significant change in both demographics and service delivery needs. This ten year Master Plan for the department presents for Council's consideration policies and investment scenarios that have been developed by staff, an advisory committee of recognized local leaders in the fields of housing and human services, community agencies and members of the public.

Master Plan Advisory Committee

The City Manager appointed an advisory committee to assist in the development of this plan. The advisory committee is composed of community leaders with expertise in education, health, mental health, senior issues, housing, law enforcement, child

development, disabilities, community development, charitable giving and business. Advisory committee members include:

- Jacob Blass, *Health Care Consultant*
- Helen Dorsey Corbett, *Senior Community Advisory Committee*
- George Epp, *Executive Director, County Sheriffs of Colorado, Inc.*
- Nino Gallo, *Program Coordinator, Personal Investment Enterprise, Boulder County Community Action Programs*
- Christopher King, *Assistant Superintendent, Boulder Valley School District*
- Jerry Lee, *Commercial and Residential Developer*
- Susan Moore, *Director, Clinical Education Services, Communication Disorders, University of Colorado*
- Jane Nelson, *Early Childhood Education Consultant (former Wellness Manager, Storage Tek)*
- Clara Pérez-Méndez, *Early Childhood Specialist*
- Barbara Pingrey, *Executive Director, Foothills United Way*
- Jack Robinson, *Senior Community Advisory Committee*
- Barbara Ryan, *Executive Director, Mental Health Center of Boulder County*
- Ardie Schulster, *Community Housing Volunteer and Advocate*
- Chuck Stout, *Executive Director, Boulder County Public Health*

The advisory committee met quarterly throughout the 18-month master plan development period, beginning in December of 2003. Members of the advisory committee also served on study groups that met more frequently during the summer of 2004 and reviewed the roles, responsibilities and programming of each of the divisions of the department. Several advisory committee members, as well as selected invited guests, provided “key informant” presentations to the larger group on driving trends and emerging issues in the areas of non-profits and charitable giving education, criminal justice and law enforcement, mental health, health, Latino issues and housing.

Process

A wide variety of sources informed the development of the draft Master Plan. Local and national documents were reviewed, as well as historical documents from HHS. Census data were examined to develop a demographic profile of the community. Community housing and human service professionals and the public provided information used in the development of the plan. Additionally, staff from each of the four divisions of the department participated in “brainstorming” sessions and provided their professional expertise to the advisory committee regarding issues and trends.

In the Spring of 2005, staff provided copies (over 300 distributed) of a March draft of the Master Plan to the community and made presentations to various community groups (e.g., Boulder Human Services Alliance, Boulder Housing Partners, Human Relations Commission, Latino Focus Group and Youth Opportunities Advisory Board). An open house and public forum was held for the general public in March 2005. Many comments from the public process have been incorporated into the current draft Master Plan.

Key Issues

Changing Demographics

Despite the perception of Boulder as a wealthy, affluent community, many Boulder residents struggle with incomes that are insufficient to meet basic needs. Perhaps surprisingly to many, Boulder's current percentage of residents living under the federal poverty level (14% in 2000) – *excluding* college students ages 18-22 – is higher than the national average.

The nature of Boulder's low income population has changed. Again, excluding college students, while the percentage of Boulder's low income population who are under 18 years of age dropped from 14.3% to 12.8% from 1990 to 2000, the percentage represented by non-white residents jumped from 21.7% in 1990 to 31.0% in 2000.

Latinos have accounted for much of this growth. Boulder's Latino population grew from 3,999 persons in 1990 to 7,763 in 2000 – a 94% increase. Just over half of Boulder's Latino residents are foreign born, over one-third do not speak English well or at all, and nearly half have less than a high school education. These limitations leave many Latino immigrants poorly prepared to compete for well-paying jobs; consequently, the poverty rate for Latinos (27%) is nearly double than that of the general population.

The growth of this population puts additional pressure on the human services system to adapt and become more accessible to residents who have language or cultural differences and who may have greater needs because of these factors.

It is important to understand that there is a great deal of variety among Latinos: from those whose families have been here for many generations to the more recently arrived; from the highly educated to those who have not had the opportunity for higher levels of education; from the prosperous to those who struggle with the basic necessities of life.

Like the country as a whole, Boulder's population is aging as the first baby boomers enter their senior years. By 2030 it is projected that one in four residents will be 60 years of age or older – more than double today's percentage (10.8% in 2000). The intersection of three trends – a growing elderly population, elders living longer and increasing number of family members serving as care givers – points to the need for a greater emphasis on community resources, counseling support for care givers and more in- and out-of-home care options. Further, as people live longer, they are more likely to experience frailty or disability.

Changing Needs in Service Delivery

Individuals and families who require assistance in one area typically have a variety of problems and issues and may often be involved in multiple systems. For example, a family struggling with finding affordable housing may also need assistance with affordable health and child care. A signature mark of human services in Boulder is the extent and success of partnerships, collaborations, blended funding and programs among agencies. Boulder is recognized as a state-wide leader in providing a comprehensive approach to community planning and service delivery.

Since 1995, the \$2 million provided annually to community organizations through the Human Services Fund has done much to strengthen the collaborative nature of programming provided by these agencies. Bringing together service providers to address overall needs, rather than perpetuating a segmented approach, has proven to be a far more effective model that results in improved chances for self-sufficiency. For the future, the plan identifies that more care needs to be given to a regional approach to service delivery.

The city's commitment to affordable housing has grown dramatically in the past decade, as home prices have risen to be out of reach for many people, including critical community employees such as teachers, health care workers, service and retail workers, child care providers and others. In 2000, City Council established a goal of 10% of the housing stock to be affordable in ten years – a total of 4,500 permanently affordable units. While the City is over half way in meeting this goal, the current level of funding is insufficient to meet this level in the initially endorsed timeline of 2011.

In housing as with human services, trends for the future point to the need for a greater degree of regional planning to meet the needs of the entire community, particularly in light of reduced state and federal resources.

Mission, Principles and Roles

The information on demographic and service delivery trends, service gaps and emerging issues provided to the advisory committee guided its development of a department mission, guiding principals and roles that are consistent with the department's history, yet look to the future.

Mission:

To create a healthy community by providing and supporting diverse housing and human services to Boulder residents in need.

Guiding Principles:

- **Safety net services:** HHS supports services ensuring physical and mental health care, food and nutrition, emergency shelter, transitional housing and housing for very low income residents in order that basic, life-sustaining needs of all residents are met.
- **Community responsibility and social equity:** HHS has a responsibility to ensure a quality environment that promotes a livable community for all its residents.
- **Economic and social diversity:** Boulder is a mosaic of people of differing incomes, ages, abilities and cultures. HHS is committed to respect, value and support each member of the community and to seek elimination of all forms of discrimination.
- **Self-sufficiency:** HHS supports services that provide opportunities for each individual to reduce dependencies and increase self-reliance through self-improvement.

Roles:

- **Leader and Partner:** HHS is a leader in making strategic investments in the community that both create opportunities and provide critical services. HHS works with the community to understand current and emerging needs and develop dynamic, coordinated strategies and plans to address those needs.
- **Funder:** HHS contracts with community organizations to provide programs and services. In this role, HHS:
 - Funds the most efficient, quality services possible, minimizing duplication of services;
 - Makes funding decisions based on competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) processes within priority areas;
 - Bases RFP decisions on an organization's ability to deliver clearly defined outcomes; and
 - Empowers community members to make funding recommendations to City Council.
- **Service Provider:** HHS limits its role as a provider of housing and human services to those situations where there is: 1) an expressed desire of City Council or the community; 2) a demonstrated service need that cannot be met through other sectors (e.g., human rights enforcement); or 3) the nature of the service requires such a broad community collaborative effort that it is more appropriate for the city to assume leadership (e.g., multipurpose senior centers).

The Department of Housing and Human Services (HHS) provides Boulder residents with opportunities for growth and the tools necessary to be productive and contributing members of the community. From the underlying principles that guide the Department's work to the varying roles that it plays to achieve its goals, the mission of the Department is designed to achieve a healthy community in partnership with other City departments, governmental entities, educational institutions, the private sector, community organizations and the public.

Policy Recommendations

HHS philosophy and its ability to provide quality services for Boulder residents is supported through policies regarding the nature and design of services and the roles HHS plays in the broader community as a partner with other governmental and non-governmental agencies. HHS policies help define how the city responds to local needs. They characterize the types and levels of programs and funding provided to community agencies and residents, the service delivery methodologies employed to ensure efficient and effective services, who should receive services and the collaborative nature of housing and human service provision. These policies drive the work of HHS independent of investment levels, though the amount of funding available will affect HHS's ability to fully implement them. These policies address five priority areas:

- **HHS and Community-wide:** creating a healthy community;
- **Children, Youth and Families:** helping children, youth and families be healthy;

- **Community Services:** meeting basic needs, building a healthy community and protecting civil rights;
- **Housing:** preserving and promoting affordable housing opportunities; and
- **Senior Services:** helping keep seniors active, involved and healthy.

HHS and community-wide policies contained in the Master Plan include guidance for planning with other entities for regional approaches to service delivery; the targeting of program and services to those at greatest need; adapting to meet the needs of Boulder’s recent immigrants; and increasing community and civic engagement.

Regarding resources provided to the community through the department funds (e.g., Affordable Housing Fund, Human Services Fund, Youth Opportunity Fund), the Master Plan supports consistency across all funding mechanisms, competitive bidding for funding and resident involvement in allocation decision making. Additionally policies are included to continue and enhance evaluative efforts to improve program and organizational effectiveness.

Investment Scenarios

The recommendations outline three investment scenarios:

- **Fiscally Constrained** — future services based on current funding;
- **Action Investment to Meet Established Council Goals** — new or expanded services to meet current and emerging Council goals; and
- **Vision Investment to Enhance Leadership** — high level of investment to achieve the vision and to enhance City leadership in promoting a healthy community.

In addition to the three investment scenarios, the draft Master Plan proposes a methodology for reducing programs and services should funding be reduced in the future. This methodology is consistent with the business plan being developed by the city and divides programs and services into the categories of essential, desired and discretionary.

Consistent with the City’s business plan, the proposed Master Plan presents three investment scenarios based on potential funding over the coming decade: Fiscally Constrained Investment, Action Investment and Vision Investment.

- **Scenario 1:** the Fiscally Constrained Investment plan assumes that current levels of funding (\$13 million) coming to the department will continue through 2015 and adapts programs and services over time to meet changing demographics and needs.

This scenario generally continues support for affordable housing, safety net services (e.g., shelter, food, health care) for those in need, prevention and intervention services, services to keep seniors active and involved, and enforcing civil rights. Service adjustments will be made over time to meet changing needs (e.g., increased numbers of seniors). It is important to note that only about one-quarter of the HHS

budget comes from the City's General Fund. Other sources of funding (including the City's .15% sales tax, private grants and federal funding) need to be renewed – and even slightly increased over time – in order to maintain the department's current service level.

Reduction Plan: In addition to the three Investment Scenarios, the Master Plan proposes a methodology for reducing programs and services should funding be reduced in the future. This methodology is consistent with the business plan being developed by the City and divides HHS programs and services into the categories of essential, desirable and discretionary.

- **Scenario 2:** the Action Investment plan assumes that current funding levels for the department will be continued and that additional revenues will be available, either through new sources, increased amounts in existing sources as the economic picture improves, or a combination of the two. In addition to services provided in Scenario 1, the Action Investment Plan contains services designed to meet the current City Council affordable housing and emerging community sustainability goals.

To meet the 10% affordable housing goal by 2015, an additional \$3 million will be needed annually for the acquisition, construction and management of affordable units. To implement the Action plan and address or enhance Council's emerging community sustainability goals related to community engagement, senior services, middle- and high school youth, and housing, an estimated additional \$858,000 is needed annually.

- **Scenario 3:** the Vision Investment plan, assumes that current funding levels coming to HHS from the city and outside sources will be continued. Additionally, current programs and those contained in Scenario 2 will serve as the foundation upon which Scenario 3 is built.

Scenario 3 is a vision for the future, based on what is desirable for the community and could be fully accomplished if sufficient and significant funds were available. Through Scenario 3, the basic needs of residents are more fully met, and programs are supported to ensure families and individuals at all stages of life have the tools necessary to reduce dependencies and be successful, contributing members of the community.

This scenario proposes additional areas of emphasis, including: achieving the affordable housing goal earlier – by 2013; develop a senior services analysis and plan; expand human services fund to better meet community health needs; increase community relations efforts; increase nutritional, dental and hearing aid needs for seniors; expand mediation services and expand efforts related to children and youth. The estimated cost to implement the Vision Investment plan is \$28.4 million.

Funding Strategies

In order to operate the programs and services in each of the three Investment Scenarios, funding must be maintained and increased from a variety of sources, including the City,

the federal government, the school district, foundations and user fees. Ten options are presented for Council's consideration. It is important to note, however, that even in Scenario 1: Fiscally Constrained Investment, the department's ability to continue its present level of programming for housing and human services is dependent upon the renewal of the .15% sales tax (\$1.5 million; due to expire December 31, 2012) and nearly \$800,000 in grants from non-City sources.

Coordination with Other Efforts

The Department is coordinating the development of its Master Plan with several other planning efforts underway in the city. The internal staff Master Plan Advisory Committee provided feedback for the update to the BVCP Human Services policy section. The Master Plan update identifies development of community social indicators during the planning period. This effort will be coordinated with Planning and Development Services' current Sustainability Indicators project. The Community Sustainability Goal Committee focus areas will potentially impact department initiatives in the following areas: Expanding and Valuing Diversity, Community and City Engagement and, Meeting the Needs of Children, Youth, and Seniors. The policy recommendations and investment scenarios proposed in the Master Plan are consistent with these goals and the goals of the Affordable Housing Goal Committee. Feedback and input on the Master Plan has been provided by other city departments.

III. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

Boulder has been a recognized leader in developing innovative and effective programs to meet local housing and human service needs since the beginning of federal cutbacks in the 1970s. These efforts have been supported by the public throughout this period, but substantial unmet needs remain. The challenge of the department is to adapt to changing demographics, trends and needs; to balance and effectively prioritize limited resources without sacrificing success; and to continue to address local needs with the goal of improving independence, self-sufficiency and the opportunity for all residents to be contributing members of the community.

Next steps are scheduled as follows:

- Revise the draft Master Plan based on Council guidance from this Study Session;
- September 22 — Planning Board review;
- September 27 — HHS Master Plan Advisory Committee final review; and
- October 18 — HHS Master Plan presented as agenda item for City Council consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

August 2005 Draft HHS Master Plan and Appendixes

ATTACHMENT C
WEEKLY INFORMATION PACKET
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Ruzzin and Members of City Council

FROM: Frank Bruno, City Manager
Karen Rahn, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
John Pollak, Co-Director, Housing and Human Services
Richard Johnson, Director, Division of Community Services, HHS
Linda Hill-Blakley, Housing and Human Services Planner, HHS

DATE: September 7, 2005

SUBJECT: Action Item: Draft Summary of August 30 City Council study session on the Housing and Human Services Master Plan. **Action Requested by September 12, 2005.**

PRESENT

City Council: Mayor Mark Ruzzin, Deputy Mayor Tom Eldridge and Council members Suzy Ageton, Robin Bohannon, Crystal Gray, Shaun McGrath, Gordon Riggle, and Andy Shultheiss.

Staff: Frank Bruno, City Manager; Karen Rahn, Co-Director, HHS; John Pollak, Co-Director, HHS; Richard Johnson, Director, Division of Community Services, HHS; Linda Hill-Blakley, Housing and Human Services Planner, HHS.

PURPOSE

This item provides Council with a summary of the August 30 Council study session on the Housing and Human Services Master Plan. Acceptance of the summary is scheduled for the September 20 Council session. The purpose of this draft meeting summary is to give Council an opportunity to comment on it in advance of the September 20 meeting. **Please provide requests for changes to this summary to Richard Johnson (303-441-4196 or JohnsonR@ci.boulder.co.us) by September 12, 2005.**

The purpose of the study session was to:

- Provide Council with an overview of the draft Housing and Human Services Master Plan;
- Provide Council with an outline of the next steps in the process; and
- Receive guidance from Council on four questions:

- Does Council agree with the general direction of the Master Plan?
- Does Council agree with the policy directions outlined in the Master Plan?
- Does Council agree with the Scenarios presented in the Master Plan?
- What changes would Council recommend?

OVERVIEW

After an introduction by City Manager Frank Bruno, the HHS staff team provided an overview of the Housing and Human Services Master Plan process and draft document. Emphasis was placed on demographic and service delivery trends that helped shape the Master Plan. Three Investment Scenarios were presented to Council:

- Scenario 1: Fiscally Constrained Investment. This scenario assumes the current level of funding – \$12.9 million annually – will continue to come to the department from City and outside sources. Service adjustments may be made over time to meet changing needs.
- Scenario 2: Action Investment. This scenario outlines enhanced investments to address established and emerging Council goals (Affordable Housing, Community Sustainability) at a cost of \$3.9 million annually over that required for Scenario 1.
- Scenario 3: Vision Investment. This scenario is a higher level of investment to enhance City leadership in promoting a healthy community, including affordable housing, community health programs, senior health needs, and expansions of programs for children, youth and community mediation. The cost for full implementation of Scenario 3 would be \$8 million annually over that required for Scenario 2.

The Master Plan also contains a funding reduction strategy based on the model established by the City of Boulder Business Plan.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

The following items arose during discussion:

- Council member Riggle questioned whether data exist that reveal the size of Boulder’s population below federal poverty level over time. Unfortunately, we do not have comparable data before the 2000 census, because special efforts were made with the 2000 census data to remove students from the equation. Based on anecdotal information, staff believes that the relative proportion of people under the poverty level has remained fairly constant (14% in 2000), but that other demographics of this population have changed (e.g., a growing proportion of those in poverty are Latino immigrants, with a wider range of needs because of language and cultural differences).

- Given the changing demographics of Boulder and the coming growth of our senior population, Council member Riggle suggested that singling out “senior housing” in the Washington School redevelopment RFP would be a good idea. Mayor Ruzzin agreed that this was worth doing. Staff indicated that senior housing was an option under the draft RFP, but that specifically mentioning senior housing is a good idea that would be forwarded to the staff working on the Washington School RFP.

- Council member Gray talked about the importance of diversifying revenue sources. Regarding the HHS fund reduction strategy, both she and Council member Bohannon questioned which of the Department’s programs were most important. Staff reported that the reduction strategy will be contained in the City Business Plan currently under development, and that the Business Plan divides services into categories of essential, desirable and discretionary. It is important to remember that one program cannot be singled out as the “most important.” Shelter/housing is an important factor in the stability of the individual or families, but this stability often cannot be attained without supportive human services.

- Speaking of senior housing issues, Council member Gray questioned what role Mary Sandoe house might play in future needs. Staff agreed that future senior housing will require a variety of settings and options for seniors. Much of this – and other senior needs, such as recreation – may be taken up by the private sector as the senior population grows and it becomes more profitable to serve them.

- Council member Bohannon commented that the HHS Master Plan serves not only the City, but the non-profit community as well. She asked for an update on a county-wide human services master plan. Staff replied that County Commissioner Mayer has brought up the notion of a county-wide plan, but this is just in the very formative stage. HHS is participating in several county-wide plans, however, including work with County Aging Services, the Early Care and Education Council, and a regional housing initiative.

- Council members Bohannon and Gray voiced the opinion that it would have been good if this study session could have been televised. It was noted that increased public awareness of human services issues was a need identified by the Housing and Human Services Master Plan Advisory Committee.

- Council member Bohannon questioned why increased investments for physical and mental health are not in the Action Plan. Staff responded that the Action Plan is defined to address the Council goals concerning Affordable Housing and Community Sustainability.

- Mayor Ruzzin noted the word “million” missing from the section on a commercial linkage tax, and noted the need to coordinate renewal of all taxes due to expire. He suggested Council consider some omnibus tax that would combine several existing taxes. He also suggested that current sales tax levels are about as high as he believes the public would support.

- Regarding the stability of non-City funding for HHS, Mayor Ruzzin asked what had happened with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding this year. Is this something that can be expected every year? Staff responded that at the federal level, reductions have been proposed for the CDBG program for several years. While local support across the county has kept the grant from being eliminated, it has eroded about 5% - 7% per year. Future reductions of a like nature are probable.
- With reference to the regional housing plan, Mayor Ruzzin asked if we would see more benefit from a county-wide plan. Staff pointed to the example of the collaborative Child Care Certificate Program in operation in Longmont and Boulder, both parts administered by HHS, which saves money for both cities in administrative costs. Also, a county-wide or regional approach is sometimes successful in bringing in outside funding – either through foundations or the federal government – that would not otherwise be coming into the city.
- Deputy Mayor Eldridge commented that he thought the Master Plan was well done and commended the Advisory Committee for its work over the previous 21 months. He voiced concern that the 10% affordable housing goal, whenever it is reached, will not meet the total need for the city.
- Council member McGrath noted that in none of the three Investment Scenarios is the 10% affordable housing goal achieved by the original date of 2011 and wondered if City Council needed to acknowledge that. Staff pointed out that the original date of 2011 assumed that the 2000 affordable housing tax would be accepted by the voters (it did not pass). Without that important source of funding the estimated date of achieving the 10% affordable housing goal has been revised to 2019. Scenario 2 would achieve the 10% goal by 2015 with an additional \$3 million annual investment. Scenario 3 would achieve the 10% goal by 2015 with an annual investment of \$6.4 million over the current level.
- Council member Ageton noted that HHS receives approximately \$800,000 in grants from non-City sources and asked about the sources and stability of that funding. Staff responded that these grants support programs in the Division of Children, Youth and Families from several sources: the city of Longmont, the Knight Foundation, Temple Buell Foundation, and pass-through grants from the federal and state governments. These funds have been very stable, and in fact have been growing throughout the past decade. However, they are very labor-intensive to maintain due to reporting and reapplication.
- Council member Ageton asked for a brief overview on the Family Resource Schools (FRS) program. Staff responded that the program was originally a Council initiative, and has been in operation since 1992. It operates in high-risk elementary schools, working with families (primarily through family case management) to remove barriers to academic success. No City General Funds are used for this program. It is funded through the School District (approximately one-third), the City's CDBG program and the Human Services Fund. Reduced funding and consolidation of schools has meant that the program now operates in three elementary schools.

- Council member Gray expressed interest in exploring the potential for increased affordable housing benefit when developers are given concessions such as increased height or density. She also encouraged continued research for new models to accomplish the City’s housing goals.

- Council member McGrath suggested that City Boards and Commissions be provided with the draft Master Plan. Staff reported that during the spring of 2005, staff informed a wide range of organizations, including all City Boards and Commissions and City staff, of the availability of the master plan on the web. Hard copies provided upon request. Additionally, copies of the March draft were distributed to key housing and human services entities, presentations were made to a number of community groups, a public forum and open house was held, and a specific focus group for Latino immigrants was convened. Comments received through the public process have been incorporated in the draft master plan presented at this study session with Council. By design, this public process and comment preceded presentation of the draft master plan to Council at this study session. All staff developed materials, meeting summaries and presentations used in the development of the master plan are available at www.ci.boulder.co.us/hhs/HHSMP%20homepage.htm.

- Council members noted their appreciation for the work of the Housing and Human Services Master Plan Advisory Committee.

- Advisory Committee members Clara Perez-Mendez and Barbara Pingrey stated that they thought the master planning process has been very creative, thoughtful and inclusive. The outreach to the community , they felt, was particularly valuable and could serve as a guide for other City processes.

Mayor Ruzzin summarized the study session questions as follows:

- Does Council agree with the general direction of the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- Does Council agree with the policy directions outlined in the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- Does Council agree with the Scenarios presented in the Master Plan? **Yes.**
- What changes would Council recommend? **No changes recommended to the draft HHS Master Plan.**

NEXT STEPS

September 20	This study session summary will be presented to Council for approval.
September 22	The HHS Master Plan will be presented to the Planning Board for it’s input.
September 27	Final meeting of the Housing and Human Services Master Plan Advisory Committee.
October 18	The HHS Master Plan will be presented to City Council for acceptance.