

Section I. Profile of Housing and Homeless Needs and Conditions in the Alameda County HOME Consortium

Introduction

The Alameda County HOME Consortium has conducted a Housing Needs Assessment, Housing Market Analysis and Homelessness Analysis to provide an overview of the current state of housing and homelessness within the HOME Consortium. The Housing Needs Assessment and Housing Marketing Analysis are based on information developed and compiled from the HOME Consortium members. Data was gathered on a jurisdictional level, Consortium level and County-wide level to provide a broad picture of housing and homeless needs within Alameda County with specific focus on housing development and needs within the Consortium jurisdictions. The Homelessness Analysis section describes the needs of the homeless population and subpopulations within it, as well as the facilities and services available within the “continuum of care” in Alameda County.

Backgrounds and Trends

The Alameda County HOME Consortium is the second largest HOME entitlement jurisdiction in the San Francisco Bay Area with a current total population of 982,132 (CA Dept. of Finance 2004 estimates), comprising 65.5% of Alameda County’s population. There are eight CDBG entitlement jurisdictions within the HOME Consortium – the cities of Alameda, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City, and the Alameda County Urban County (which includes the unincorporated county and the cities of Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Newark and Piedmont).

In the past five years, the Consortium has seen little growth in the area’s economy. This has been coupled with increasing costs of living in Alameda County. The economy and loss of jobs has had negative impacts as workers have had to search for housing in a tight housing market. Home prices have increased dramatically along with the costs of food, clothing and transportation. Rents had stabilized, however, now are starting to increase again. While Welfare to Work Programs moved people off of the welfare roles, many have found only minimum wage jobs. This and loss of higher paying jobs have led to an increase in the numbers of working poor who need different federal assistance. Instead of welfare, these families need housing rental assistance programs and food programs. The homeless demographics are also changing. While many long term homeless are individuals with dual diagnoses of alcohol or drug addictions with a physical or mental disability, many more families are moving in and out of homelessness as their ability to pay for food and shelter varies from pay check to pay check.

Section 8 programs continue to be a viable option for low income households. These households have severely limited incomes and often need to supplement the gap between income and living needs with subsidized food and childcare programs when available.

Recent trends indicate that affordable housing, homeless, and community development programs may be jeopardized through significant funding cuts over the next few years due to cuts in the State of California budget and the federal budget.

In the face of these challenges, Consortium members, along with the cities of Oakland and Berkeley, continue to work together to provide strategies to address homelessness, special populations and supportive housing needs. At the same time, federal funding programs for housing, such as HOME and CDBG, leverage additional financing to create and preserve

affordable rental housing, increase opportunities for first-time homebuyers, and provide solutions to a variety of non-housing needs for low and moderate income households.

The development of the Consolidated Plan for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) offers HOME Consortium members an opportunity to evaluate the housing and community development needs in their communities. It also provides an opportunity to develop comprehensive strategies to address those needs. Most of the base data comes from the 2000 U.S. Census. When possible, data has been updated utilizing more current information.

Part I. Housing Needs Assessment

Introduction

In 2004, the Alameda County HOME Consortium had 346,899 households (CA. Dept. of Finance) of mixed incomes and needs. This section will describe the current state of housing needs within the Consortium. Part I. Housing Needs Assessment is divided into the following sections:

- housing needs and problems among households of various income levels and tenure type;
- publicly assisted housing units;
- housing needs experienced by special needs populations, including people with disabilities and people with HIV/AIDS; and
- lead-based paint hazards which exist in the Consortium's housing stock.

Housing Needs and Problems

The Housing Needs Table (located at the end of Part I) shows the total number of low income households in the HOME Consortium in 2000, by tenure, household type, and income category. These categories correspond to the special tabulations of U.S. census data provided by HUD for preparation of the Consolidated Plan. Family and income types are grouped in clusters of closely related categories and are non-duplicative. The 2000 Census data also presented the percentage of households experiencing housing problems and/or cost burdens. Households with housing problems have one or more of the following conditions: 1) they occupy units which lack complete kitchens, baths and/or electricity; 2) they occupy units with one or more persons per room (overcrowding); 3) or they have "cost burden." "Cost burden," a measure of housing affordability, is the extent to which gross housing costs, including utilities, exceeds 30% of gross household income. Severe cost burden is when these costs exceed 50% of gross household income.

Tenure and Income

In 2000 there were 323,474 households in the Alameda County HOME Consortium (346,899 in 2004). From the Housing Needs Table (based on the 2000 Census), of the total number of households, 120,993 (37.4%) are renters and 202,481 (62.6%) are owners. In 2000, median income for a family of four in the Oakland PMSA was \$67,600 for a household of four (\$82,200 in 2004). Fifteen percent (15%) of renter households were extremely low income, with incomes below 30% of Oakland PMSA; 13% of renter households were very low income, with incomes between 30-50% of median. An additional 17.5% of renters were moderate income, with incomes between 50-80% of median, 19% of renters were middle income (80% and above of median).

In contrast (in 2000), only 5% of owners had incomes below 30% of median; 6.5% of owners had incomes between 30-50% of median. Another 9% of owners had incomes between 50-80% of median; 79% had incomes at 80% and above of median.

Household Type

Household types are defined as: small related households (a household of two to four people, which includes at least one person related to the householder by blood, marriage or adoption);

large related households (5 or more). In 2000, twenty-one percent (21%) of all households were single individuals; 13% were large related households; 50% were small related households; 20% were “other” not related households. Married couples with or without children make up the majority of home owners in the Consortium.

Ethnicity

Using data from the 2000 Census when comparing the ethnic composition of the HOME Consortium with the ethnic composition of income groups within the Consortium, people of color populations with the exception of Asians are more heavily represented in the lower income categories. See Table 1.

Table 1 - Ethnicity by Income Level 2000 - Alameda County HOME Consortium

Ethnicity	Total Households	% of Total Households	% Below \$19,000 Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	% \$20,000 - \$34,999 Very Low Income (31-51%)	% \$35,000 - \$49,999 Low Income (52-74%)	% \$50,000 - \$59,000 Moderate Income (75-89%)	% Over \$60,000 Above Moderate Income (90+%)
African American	19,676	6.3%	14%	16%	17%	10%	43%
American Indian/Alaskan	2,037	.6%	13%	16%	19%	8%	44%
Asian	60,958	19.5%	9%	8%	11%	8%	64%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islands	1,777	.6%	8%	16%	18%	11%	47%
White	195,622	62.5%	11%	12%	13%	9%	55%
Other Race	18,448	5.9%	13%	16%	18%	10%	43%
Two Plus Races	14,508	4.6%	15%	13%	16%	9%	47%
Hispanic*	43,438		11%	15%	17%	11%	46%
All Households	313,026	100%	11%	12%	14%	9%	54%

Source: 2000 Census; HCD * Hispanic population reflected in all ethnic categories.

Extremely low income households are 15% Two Plus Races and 14% African American. Very low income households are 16% Hispanic, 16% African American; 16% American Indian/Alaskan; 16% Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islands and 16% Other Race while the overall composition of the County’s population is 6.3% African American, 0.6% American Indian/Alaskan, 19.5% Asian, 0.6% Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islands, 62.5% white, 5.9% Other Race, 4.6% Two Plus Races.

Housing Problems of Renter Households

Low, very low and extremely low income households face a broad range of housing problems. At one end are the homeless households living in shelters or those who are in and out of temporary housing. Moving toward the middle of the range are those who have a place to call home, but who have tentative housing situations. These households often live from pay check to pay check and cannot afford to pay for both their housing and other basic necessities, such as food and clothing. They often do not have access to housing near work which is affordable and

may face discrimination in finding affordable housing. Given the above factors, the housing they may find may be overcrowded, unsafe or rundown.

Nature and Extent of Renter Housing Problems

Fifty-one percent (51%) of all renters in the Consortium had housing cost burdens; of those with cost burdens, 15% had severe cost burdens (paying over 50% of income for rent) and another 36% had moderate cost burdens (paying 30-50% of income).

Sixty-four percent (64%) of extremely low income households (18,262) are renters. Small related households are the predominant family type among extremely low income renters (35%), followed by elderly one and two member households (27%). Eleven percent (11%) of the extremely low income renters are in large related households; the remaining 27% are other household types.

Of renters in the Consortium who have housing problems (49%), the extremely low income households have the highest percentage of housing problems. Eighty-one percent (81%) of extremely low income renters have housing problems. More than 78% of the extremely low income renters spend more than 30% of their incomes on housing, i.e. are “cost-burdened.” Sixty-six percent (66%) of the extremely low income renter households spend in excess of 50% of their incomes on housing (severe cost burden). Large related extremely low income renter households have the highest percentage of housing problems (95%).

Low-income renter households (with incomes between 50-80% of median) also have acute housing problems. Fully 88% of these low income renters had severe or moderate housing problems; 33% had severe cost burdens and 80% had moderate cost burdens. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, these figures make it clear that creating subsidized housing for renters with incomes above 50% of median will do very little to reduce the number of households with severe problems. Most renters with severe problems were either all other housing types (48%), in small related households (31%), or elderly (38%).

Cost Problems Facing Homeowners

Nature and Extent of Problem

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of all owner households in the Consortium had cost burden problems. Of the 10,291 extremely low income owner households, the majority are elderly (53%), 22% are small related households, 18% are other household types and 7% are large related households. About 86% of very low income households experience cost burdens, while around 75% of low income homeowners experience cost burdens and 24% of moderate income homeowners had cost burdens.

Housing Problems

Thirty-three percent (66,414) of all owners had housing problems. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the owners with housing problems were extremely low income (below 30% of median); 53% very low income; 56% low income; and 26% moderate income.

Need for Homeownership Opportunities

Between 2000 and 2004, the median home value by 82% increased within the Consortium area, from \$276,825 to \$505,038. While housing prices have increased, Bay Area household incomes

have not kept pace with increasing housing costs. The gap between median incomes and median home prices is sizable.

In 2004, according to HUD, the median household income (for a family of four) for Alameda County was \$82,200, a 22% increase over a four year period (\$67,600 in 2000). The median home price in Alameda County is \$495,000 (California Association of Realtors; July 2004). The inclusion of the cities of Berkeley and Oakland home sales decreases the median price for the County when compared to just the HOME Consortium. This is a 78% increase over a four year period (\$276,825 in 2000). A household would need an income of at least \$110,000 to afford the median priced home, in the absence of special lending or government programs. The median income household could afford to purchase a house for about \$365,000 without outside subsidy assistance. According to the California Association of Realtors only 14% of Alameda County residents can now afford to own a median-priced single family home.

With the high cost of ownership housing, it is very difficult for even moderate income households to become homeowners. Initial downpayment and closing costs, as well as high on-going mortgage and other costs, are significant barriers to homeownership. High rents in the area make accumulation of initial capital needed even more difficult. First time home buyers, with no equity windfall from the sale of a previous home, are not able to accumulate enough money for a downpayment on a house. Younger working households are moving further out of the urban areas in order to afford a home – reducing economic vitality, adding to jobs/housing imbalances, and increasing congestion and environmental concerns.

Assisted Housing as an Indicator of Need

Project-Based Section 8 Housing

Section 8 housing assistance provides either rental assistance or specific properties through project-based assistance or supports specific individuals or families through tenant-based assistance in the form of certificates or vouchers. Project-based Section 8 housing assistance—new construction, moderate rehabilitation, or 221(d)(3) project with Section 8 contracts represents a contract between HUD and property owners which allows owners to offer units at below market rates to tenants in very low income groups. In the next few years most of these contracts will expire and will need to be renewed to keep these units affordable. Section 8 contracts are currently being renewed for one year at a time. Owners of “below market rate” developments can “opt-out” of the program or sell their properties and set rents at “market” upon completion of their Section 8 commitment. The loss of affordability is caused by the termination of low income affordability requirements to which building owners agreed when they entered into HUD-subsidized mortgages.

According to the California Housing Partnership Corporation, there are 19 projects with 1,691 project-based Section 8 rental units within Consortium jurisdictions that could face conversion to market rents in the next five years (FY 05-09). The Alameda County Subsidized Housing Inventory (2001) shows that between 1997 and 2001 there was net gain (6%) of 196 affordable, restricted rental units for very low income individuals and families. Action still needs to be taken to preserve the affordability of potential “opt-out” units, so that they do not convert to market-rate housing. Given the large unmet affordable housing needs in the County, even with the current supply of below-market rate rental housing, it is essential that the current supply be

preserved. As developments “opt-out,” very low income families will be facing an increasing risk of becoming homeless, doubling up in overcrowded conditions and/or paying precariously high percentages of their incomes for housing.

Section 8 Certificates and Vouchers

The Section 8 certificate and voucher programs in the Home Consortium are currently administered by the City of Alameda Housing Authority, the City of Livermore Housing Authority, and the Alameda County Housing Authority. The Housing Authorities project there will be 7,906 households using Section 8 vouchers or certificates in the HOME Consortium jurisdictions as of July 1, 2005 (see Table 2). Of the vouchers available to Consortium members on 9.5% (75) are reserved for people with disabilities.

Table 2 – Public Housing Units and Section 8 Vouchers by Housing Authority

Housing Authority	Public Housing Units	Section 8 Vouchers	Vouchers for People with Disabilities
Alameda Housing Authority	120	1,625	0
Dublin Housing Authority	150	0*	0*
Livermore Housing Authority	125	719	0
Pleasanton Housing Authority	50	0*	0*
Alameda County Housing Authority	232	5,562	75
Total	677	7,906	75

* Included within Alameda County Housing Authority totals. Disability vouchers are a subset of total Section 8 vouchers.
Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development Housing Authority Profiles.

Public Housing

The public housing program was established by the Housing Act of 1937. It is the nation’s oldest and historically most extensive effort to shelter families, elderly people and people with disabilities who have very low incomes. In 1998, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act mandated that at least 40% of all public housing admissions within a year must be families who meet the definition of extremely low income (30% or below median income). The remainder of the units may be occupied by participants who are 80% or below median income.

Public housing units in the Consortium are administered by the Alameda County (and City of Dublin) Housing Authority, the City of Alameda Housing Authority, and the City of Livermore Housing Authority. Table 2 shows that there are 677 households currently living in public housing units and utilizing Section 8 programs in the HOME Consortium jurisdictions.

Supportive Housing Needs for Special Needs Populations

Introduction

This section describes specific populations within the HOME Consortium which have a range of housing and supportive service needs. This group includes elderly and frail elderly, people with disabilities, people with HIV/AIDS, and other low income groups who are trying to gain economic self-sufficiency through a combination of affordable housing and job training or educational opportunities. Unfortunately, many of these people are competing against each other for the shrinking number of subsidized housing units. Much of this section is described in greater detail in the Alameda County Homeless and Special Needs Housing Plan that will be

released in July 2005.

Low Income Populations

Families with Children

Many low and moderate income families have special needs beyond affordable housing (See Housing Needs by Income Section), especially those with children. In the HOME Consortium in 2000, there were 19,621 (6%) female-headed households with children under the age of 18 living with them. Of these families, 4,518 (23%) were living below poverty level and included 3,827 children (averaging 1.2 children per household). There were 6,109 (4.5%) families with children who lived below poverty level.

Housing Discrimination

Despite continued community efforts to increase knowledge of fair housing law, housing discrimination continues to exist. Alameda County HOME Consortium's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (December 2002) documented the housing discrimination complaints for 1999 - 2001. It was found that discrimination based on familial status occurred in 27% of all the cases (12 out of 45). This was the second largest housing discrimination category. Race discrimination was first (19 complaints) and disability was third (11 complaints).

Housing counseling agencies report that in recent years, they have received increased numbers of fair housing complaints which charge discrimination based on race, ethnicity, family composition and size. A review of the complaints received by and audits conducted by these agencies indicate that the issues identified above have been consistently identified for the past two years as the basis for complaints. The discrimination has also become much more subtle.

Welfare-to-Work

CalWorks (California's name for the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program) families receiving assistance or working at low-wage jobs are unlikely to be able to rent housing on their own without paying a significant portion of their incomes for rent. High housing costs in the HOME Consortium area leave low income families attempting to move into the workforce with little money for the costs that often accompany employment, such as additional clothing and food costs, child care, and transportation to and from work. By reducing a family's housing cost burden, housing assistance can free up additional dollars for work-related expenses and other basic needs. Without housing assistance, a significant portion of CalWorks families moving from welfare to work may be unable to afford decent housing of their own. Without stable housing families may lack the stability necessary to get and retain employment.

Elderly and Frail Elderly

The 2000 Census reported that there were 95,319 people aged 65 and older living in Alameda County HOME Consortium area. Fifty-three percent (50,044) were aged 65 to 74; 36% (33,955) were between the ages of 75-84 and 12% (11,320) were 85 years and over.

There were 147,591 people age 65 and older living in Alameda County according to the 2000 Census. The California Department of Finance Projection for 2010 indicates that there will be an estimated 166,875 people aged 65 and older living in Alameda County. This is an 11% increase of this population over ten years. Fifty-six percent (92,729) are between the ages of 65 and 74; 17% (28,223) are ages 75-79; 13% (22,205) are between 80 and 85 years old and 14% (23,718)

people are over the age of 85!

When the senior population was analyzed in the 2000 Census by location in Alameda County, the data showed that North County had the majority of seniors (living in Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland and Piedmont) and tended to be older than in other parts of the County, with 47% of the seniors over the age of 75, compared to 31% in Central County (Hayward, San Leandro, and surrounding unincorporated areas), 15% in the South County (Fremont, Newark, Union City), and 7% in East County (Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton). This constitutes a major shift in the senior populations (since 1990) moving from the South and East County to the North County.

The Alameda County Commission on Aging released a report (*Affordable Senior Housing Report of Recommendations and Actions*, December 1999, Legislative Advocacy Committee) that indicated 80% of seniors in Alameda County paid well in excess of 30% of their annual income in rent. The majority of assisted rental housing opportunities for the elderly are publicly sponsored Section 8 programs.

Frail Elderly

According to 2000 Census data, there were 91,692 non-institutionalized people aged 65 and older in Alameda County HOME Consortium area. Of this population, 37,544 people (41%) are disabled or “functionally impaired” (having either mobility limitations, self-care limitations, or both).

Subsidized housing units for low income elderly people within the Consortium area have significant waiting lists, which puts this population at risk of becoming homeless if they are unable to obtain affordable housing. The problem for many elderly lower income people is that they spend a large portion of their fixed income on housing, which leaves little money to pay for other life necessities, such as medical care and prescriptions, food, or transportation. For the disabled elderly population, the challenge of finding permanent housing with supportive services can be even greater.

Persons with Special Challenges

There is a wide range of disability types and needs. These include mobility limitations or more acute physical disability, mental disability, substance abuse problems (alcohol or drug - AOD) and/or HIV/AIDS.

The Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc. and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Housing Task Force recently published *Priced Out in 2002*, a national study of SSI (Social Security Administration's Supplemental Security Income Program) income and housing costs. In 2002, SSI provided an individual with a monthly income of \$750 (with State of California Supplemental). Expressed as an hourly rate, the SSI monthly benefit is equal to an hourly wage of \$4.33 an hour – more than \$2.00 below the state minimum wage of \$6.75 an hour.

Using the major findings in *Priced Out in 2002* in combination with Consortium area rents and wages, the conclusions are: 1) people with disabilities receiving SSI benefits are the lowest income households in the Consortium area. The average income of an individual with a disability receiving SSI is only 17.2% of the typical one-person very low-income (in 2002); 2)

there is not a single housing market area in the United States (Alameda County included) where a person with a disability receiving SSI benefits can afford to rent a studio apartment; 3) on average, in 2002 the cost of a one-bedroom apartment was 146% of SSI monthly income (the percentage is even higher in 2004); and 4) the average cost for a studio in 2002 was 121% of SSI monthly income or higher. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition the housing wage for the Consortium area was \$21.06 in 2002. This is the hourly wage needed to afford a modest 1-bedroom apartment at HUD's Fair Market Rent level. The housing wage in 2002 was 378% of the monthly SSI payments in the Consortium area.

Without affordable housing, people with disabilities will continue to live at home with aging parents, in homeless shelters, in institutions or nursing homes, or be forced into seriously substandard housing. Many of the people living with their parents do not show up in counts of people in need of supportive housing remaining "invisible."

The 2000 Census indicates that the total population of adults (aged 21-64) in the Alameda County HOME Consortium with physical disabilities was 98,117. Additionally 13,002 of the disabled population include children ages 5-20 and another 37,636 are senior over the age of 65. The total disabled population is 148,755. In these figures people are considered disabled if they have one or more of the following: sensory disability, physical disability, mental disability, self-care disability, outside home alone difficulty or work disability.

Physical Disabilities

In 2000, the Housing Consortium of the East Bay (a nonprofit organization that promotes affordable, accessible housing options for persons with developmental disabilities) found that there are 2,150 adults within the HOME Consortium area who have developmental disabilities and are clients of the Regional Center of the East Bay (RCEB). Of this total, 364 live in their own place (apartment), a large number of them pay more than 30% of their income for rent or live in substandard housing. A total of 750 people with physical disabilities live in various types of facilities such as Community Care Facilities (CCF) and Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNF). Some of these adults are requesting to live in their own places with support funded by the RCEB. A total of 944 live with a parent or legal guardian and an increasing number of people within this group are also requesting to live on their own with support.

Adults with developmental disabilities have very low incomes, most of them only receiving only SSI benefits (\$750/mo.). Finding an apartment for 30% of their income in the Consortium area is next to impossible. Over the last several years the Regional Center of the East Bay has facilitated the move of adults with developmental disabilities from facilities and from living with aging parents to independent supported living by purchasing support services from various community agencies. For people with developmental disabilities the biggest obstacle to living in their own place is the scarcity of affordable housing.

Individuals with physical disabilities require housing which is both affordable and adapted to their physical impairments. There is a significant need for supportive services in addition to housing, such as assistance with daily life activities, in-home assistance, and social services such as employment training, counseling, benefits advocacy, and independent living skills.

Mental Disabilities

The Alameda County Department of Behavioral Health Care Services provides estimates on the number of people with mental disabilities in the County. The Department serves approximately 18,024 adults a year who have serious emotional disturbance and serious mental illness which include the need for periodic psychiatric hospitalization and other types of 24-hour care. For Alameda County it is estimated that 30,581 people, including 9,805 youth ages 0-18 and 20,775 adults ages 18 and older with mental illness are in a household with an income of less than 200% of poverty. Table 3 shows the housing situation of adults served by Behavioral Health Care Services.

Table 3 - Housing Situation of Adults Served by Behavioral Health Care Services

Housing Situation	Number	Percentage
Independent Living	3,908	22%
Independent with Support	1,631	9%
Board & Care	1,103	6%
Treatment Facility	1,008	6%
Criminal Justice System	3,185	18%
Homeless	1,077	6%
Temporary	184	1%
Unknown	5,660	31%
Other	268	1%
Total	18,024	100%

Source: Alameda County Behavioral Health Care – Data on Homeless Populations (August 2004).

The majority of non-homeless mentally disabled people are consistently threatened with homelessness. Studies show that many mentally disabled people can live successfully in supported housing with adequate access to treatment and peer supports.

Persons with Alcohol/Other Drug Addictions

The Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency, Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs administer the count of admissions to alcohol and/or drug (AOD) programs in the County during fiscal year 2003. During this time period, a total of 9,357 people entered AOD programs. Table 4 shows the number of Behavioral Health Care Services Agency clients served under Mental Health Program and Drug and Alcohol Program through June 2004 in select cities. Other cities do not have facilities/services for these populations.

Table 4 – BHCS Clients by Selected Cities

Jurisdiction	Mental Health Clients		Drug and Alcohol Clients	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alameda	162	2%	223	2%
Berkeley	791	8%	591	6%
Fremont	327	3%	286	3%
Hayward	631	6%	1,476	16%
Newark	-	-	1,632	17%
Oakland	3,420	34%	4,077	44%
Pleasanton	270	3%	457	5%
San Leandro	4,510	45%	615	7%
Total	10,111	100%	9,357	100%

Source: Office of Management Services, Behavioral HealthCare Services (6/04)

In July 2000, the Alameda County Mental Health Board issued the *Front Door Project: Final Report*. This report recommended short-term and long-term solutions for the integrated service needs of mental health population in Alameda County. Two of the top priorities deal directly with shelter and housing: increase crisis stabilization beds; and increase supported independent living housing. The recommendations regarding increasing stabilization beds included: 1) expanding Detox within AOD Residential programs. This could add detox beds without creating a detox unit; and 2) establishing designated crisis shelter beds. Recommendations to increase supported independent living opportunities included: 1) increasing housing with treatment, including residential treatment programs, supported by independent living, availability of day programs for Board and Care residents, etc.; 2) all available housing stock should be known to providers (eliminate duplication efforts with a centralized resource); 3) dual diagnosed clients need residential AOD treatment services, and supportive housing; 4) providing unconditional housing; this would include guaranteed rent payments, housing that could be maintained during short hospital stays, and housing management that will work with residents to solve problems; 5) developing housing that is close to public transportation.

Persons with HIV/AIDS and Family Members

According to the Alameda County Public Health Department's *AIDS Epidemiology Report, Alameda County* there are 2,720 people living with AIDS in the County as of December 31, 2003. Table 5 shows the number and percentage of people living with AIDS by race/ethnicity, gender, age at diagnosis and transmission mode. A total of 1,162 HIV cases had been reported to Alameda County as of December 31, 2003. This total is not considered complete due to the recent change in regulations mandating reporting of newly diagnosed HIV infections has not been in place long enough.

Due to changes in treatment options people living with HIV/AIDS have an increased life expectancy. This has important ramifications for Alameda County, particularly in terms of an increased demand for affordable, long-term housing among people utilizing combination drug therapies, who are attempting to move from fully-subsidized, low-income housing environments, to self-sufficient, housing units in the county. Through Project Independence - a HOPWA special project of national significance funded program, low income people with HIV are eligible to apply for shallow rent subsidies with case management, in-home care, and supportive services. They also have the opportunity for accessibility improvements and/or moving assistance to ensure that housing units meet their needs and enable them to live independently. Most of the individuals served in the program (approximately 60%) live in Oakland, and the amount of rental assistance is based upon household income, number of persons per household, and unit size.

Table 5 - People Living With AIDS by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age at Diagnosis and Transmission Mode

Demographics	Number	Percent
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>		
White/Caucasian	987	36%
African American/Black	1,274	47%
Hispanic/Latino	344	13%
Asian/Pacific Islander	96	4%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	12	<1%
Unknown/Not Specified	7	<1%
Total	2,720	100%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	2,257	83%
Female	463	17%
Total	2,720	100%
<u>Age at First Diagnosis</u>		
0-12	15	1%
13-19	16	1%
20-29	352	13%
30-39	1,168	43%
40-49	802	29%
50 and older	367	13%
Total	2,720	100%
<u>Mode of Transmission</u>		
Men who have sex with men (MSM)	1,560	57%
Injection Drug Use (IDU)	374	14%
MSM/IDU	151	6%
Heterosexual Contact with HIV+	505	19%
Transplant or Coagulation Disorder	37	1%
Mother with/at Risk for HIV Infection	12	<1%
Not Reported/Other	81	3%
Total	2,720	100%

Source: Alameda County Public Health Department, CAPE Unit (7/04)

Housing with Lead-Based Paint

Lead poisoning is a serious issue in Alameda County with significant numbers of older homes occupied by low income families with children. These older homes are most likely to contain lead hazards. Lead-based hazards are defined as any condition that causes exposure to lead from the lead-contaminated dust, soil, or paint that is deteriorated or present in accessible surfaces, frictional surfaces, or impact surfaces that would result in adverse human health effects. The most common sources of lead poisoning are lead-based paint hazards from dust, deteriorated paint, and soil.

According to 2000 Census data, the HOME Consortium has 234,998 houses that were built prior to 1980, where lead-based paint is most often found (See Table 6). The number of houses within this category decreased 3% between 1991 and 2000 (8,359 housing units) even with another year (1979) added to the category due to changes in the census categories.

Table 6 – Percentage Occupancy by Low Income Households by Date of Construction

Date of Construction	Number of Units	Number of Renter Units	Renter Units % of Low Income	Number of Owner Units	Owner Units % of Low Income
Pre-1940	21,254	7,992	67%	13,262	4%
1940-1959	28,010	9,283	71%	18,727	4%
1960-1979	178,588	68,908	57%	109,680	6%
Total*	227,852	86,183		141,669	

* Table does not contain information from 1980 so total number of housing units is different from above paragraph. Source: 2000 Census and ACLPPP

Older housing is more likely to contain lead-based paint. Older housing inhabited by low income households is often in poor physical condition, which increases the risk of exposure to lead hazards for children in those homes. See Table 7 for a distribution of Pre-1980 dwelling units by jurisdiction.

Table 7 - Distribution of Pre-1980 Dwelling Units in Alameda County by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	# of Pre-1980 Units	% of Total Pre-1980 Units	Total Units	Pre-1980 Units as a % of Total Units
Alameda	26,209	11%	32,003	82%
Albany	6,463	3%	7,299	88%
Dublin	4,254	2%	12,898	33%
Emeryville	2,510	1%	4,720	53%
Fremont	42,774	18%	70,704	60%
Hayward	35,703	15%	46,985	76%
Livermore	16,883	7%	28,200	60%
Newark	9,368	4%	13,415	70%
Piedmont	3,828	2%	3,861	99%
Pleasanton	11,505	5%	25,042	46%
San Leandro	26,636	11%	31,831	84%
Union City	11,837	5%	19,625	60%
Unincorporated County	37,028	16%	50,316	74%
Total	234,998	100%	346,899	68%

Source: 2000 Census

Childhood Lead Poisoning

Lead-poisoning is a serious problem in Alameda County with 3,572 cases over the last ten years, of which 1,414 were in the HOME Consortium jurisdictions. Housing-related hazards are considered a factor in the majority of these cases. Since the passage of the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1992 (Title X), HUD and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have established disclosure standards and regulations aimed at residential sales and leases, the pre-renovation education requirement for construction and remodeling regarding lead-safe housing for federally supported housing and establishing HUD as a model for lead-safe property management. In addition, the EPA has established standards for lead hazards and set the requirements for certification of lead hazard control workers. The State of California regulates lead hazard control certification. In addition, recent changes to Health and Safety Code establish lead hazards as a substandard housing condition and provide lead enforcement

authority for local building, code enforcement, and environmental departments.

The Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP) is an integrated health, environmental, and housing program. It provides case management of lead poisoned children throughout Alameda County and property owner services, education, and lead hazard remediation within a County Service Area which includes the HOME Consortium cities of Alameda and Emeryville. The ACLPPP also works to address other environmental hazards affecting health in the home. The Alameda County Environmental Health Services Department provides compliance and enforcement support for properties related to a lead-poisoned child.

The Housing and Community Development Department conducts lead-based paint inspections on tenant-based rental assistance for HOME and HOPWA units built before 1978 on an annual basis. Units that are managed by the Alameda County Housing Authority also conduct lead inspections as a part of the Housing Quality Standard (HQS) Inspections for all Shelter Plus Care participants. Lead-based paint inspections would also take place for any homeownership programs administered by HOME, CDBG, Alameda County Housing Trust Fund and Redevelopment funding. Each HOME jurisdiction also has its own lead-based paint inspection program and requirement that are in compliance with HUD regulations.