

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Recommendations from Council Human Services Ad Hoc Committee
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	City Manager's Office
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Rob Beem, Human Services Manager Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

City Council convened a Human Services Ad Hoc Committee (Councilmembers Fimia, Grace, and Jepsen) to review available information about human services needs and to develop a recommendation to the full Council regarding which category (ies) it believes the City should rank higher and where it recommends doing additional work to develop strategies to address identified needs.

The Council Human Services Ad Hoc Committee reviewed needs and issues in order to determine the highest priority areas for additional attention from the City. Affordable housing and adult literacy emerged as the top priority areas to be addressed. The next steps in each area include developing a more specific understanding of the issue and its effects in Shoreline and presenting City Council with policy options for the ways the City could be involved in community efforts to address the needs in these two areas.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Approximately .25 FTE time will need to be reallocated to focus on these two needs. Likewise, an estimated \$10,000 may be needed for outside consultant assistance.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Council Human Services Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the full City Council request the City Manager develop policy options to guide the City's efforts to support the development of affordable housing and the reduction of low literacy levels among adults using the work program outlined in this staff report. The options will be brought before the City Council for their deliberation prior to the annual retreat in April 2006.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney \_\_\_\_

## **INTRODUCTION**

In May, the City Council formed a Human Services Ad Hoc Committee to further explore Shoreline residents' human services needs. The Ad Hoc Committee is composed of Councilmembers Fimia, Grace and Jepsen. This report summarizes the information the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed and presents a recommendation for follow up activity.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Human Services Ad Hoc Committee met four times from May through October to examine needs and services in Shoreline. Their work focused on defining the extent of need and identifying high priority issues in the community based on reviews of readily available data and information.

### **Define Low Income**

Initially the Human Services Ad Hoc Committee sought some clarification as to the different measures of low income used by various agencies and funders. The two predominant measures come from the Census and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Human Services Ad Hoc Committee determined that the scheme used by HUD was the most readily understood. HUD defines incomes relative to the county median income based on family size, in three ranges very-low income is defined as below 30% of median, low is defined as between 30 and 49% of median, and moderate is defined as between 50 and 80% of median. For a family of four in Shoreline, the median income is \$72,250. These ranges translate in to incomes of \$23,350, \$38,950, \$58,000 respectively.

### **Review of Service Areas**

Staff prepared and the Human Services Ad Hoc Committee reviewed assessments which identify relative levels of service demand for human services, levels of service provision and levels of unmet need. The assessments used only readily available data and often generalized prevalence rates throughout King County to apply to Shoreline. Services were examined in the following categories based on the five Goal areas that are used and accepted widely throughout King County.

1. Food to eat and roof over head
  - a. Housing
  - b. Hunger and food insecurity
2. Strong supportive relationships within families, neighborhoods and communities
  - a. Children and youth (an update of the Youth Policy Analysis)
  - b. Seniors
3. A safe haven from all forms of violence and abuse
  - a. Domestic violence
  - b. Sexual assault
4. Health care to be physically and mentally fit as possible
  - a. Dental care
  - b. Mental health care
  - c. Primary care
5. The education and job skills to lead an independent life
  - a. Adult literacy

Each area was assessed based on five criteria: need, availability of service, severity of the problem, whether support was a regional or local responsibility and the extent to which other North End cities fund this service area. See Appendix A for a detailed description of the criteria.

The Human Services Ad Hoc Committee found that the areas of affordable housing and adult literacy/family development were the highest priority for further work.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

<b>FOOD/HUNGER</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service			<b>x</b>
2. Availability of Service		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem	<b>x</b>		
4. Regional or local responsibility	Local/Federal		
5. North End Cities Funding	All cities fund food banks except Lake Forest Park		

<b>HOUSING</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service a. < 30% median income group b. 50--80% median income	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	
2. Availability of Services a. <30% median income b. 50-80% median income	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem a. <30% median income b. 50-80% median income	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	
4. Regional or local responsibility	New and Rehab – Regional Partnership. Home repair - local		
5. North end cities funding	Kenmore and Bothell belong to ARCH. LFP provides small local match for regional projects serving N. End.		

<b>CHILDREN AND YOUTH</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service and support		<b>x</b>	
2. Availability/Accessibility of service (Limiting factors include cost, service capacity)		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problems, varies from high to medium depending on the issue.	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	
4. Regional or local responsibility	Local: Shoreline has adopted a Youth Services Policy defining areas of City responsibility		
5. Other north end cities funding	All fund		

<b>OLDER ADULT SERVICES*</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service			<b>x</b>
2. Availability of services			<b>x</b>
3. Severity of problem			<b>x</b>
4. Regional or local responsibility?	All except senior center are regional services		
5. North end cities funding	All fund one or more services		

\*Defined as support services for caregivers of an older adult: respite; transportation and volunteer chore

<b>DOMESTIC VIOLENCE</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service			<b>x</b>
2. Availability of services		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem	<b>x</b>		
4. Regional or local responsibility?	Regional		
5 North end cities funding	All fund one or more components		

<b>SEXUAL ASSUALT</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service		<b>x</b>	
2. Availability of Services	<b>x</b>		
3. Severity of problem			<b>x</b>
4. Regional or local responsibility?	Regional		
5 North End Cities Funding	All fund both service providers		

<b>MEDICAL/DENTAL</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service		<b>x</b>	
2. Availability of Service		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem		<b>x</b>	
4. Regional or local responsibility?	Regional		
5. North End Cities Funding	Kenmore, Bothell, and Woodinville fund dental van through district hospital tax levy. Dentists volunteer their time. Medical care funded by Bothell, Kenmore, Woodinville.		

<b>MENTAL HEALTH/CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service			<b>x</b>
2. Availability of Service		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem		<b>x</b>	
4. Regional or local responsibility?	Regional for diagnosable mental health conditions, local for counseling and prevention.		
5. North End Cities Funding	Shoreline, LFP, Kenmore		

<b>LITERACY AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Low</b>
1. Need for service	<b>x</b>		
2. Availability of Service		<b>x</b>	
3. Severity of problem	<b>x</b>		
4. Regional or local responsibility?	Local		
5. North End Cities Funding	All North End cities fund		

## Recommend Addressing Two Issues

Staff developed drafts of potential work programs for each of the areas. These work programs focus on 1) developing a more complete understanding of the specific issue, 2) clarifying the City's potential roles in each issue and 3) outlining policy options available to the City that would result in either increases in literacy rates or an increase in the amount of affordable housing. The end product of each is a recommendation to the City Council of specific policy direction to define the City's role and to guide its involvement in either issue. Specific budgetary involvement, if any, is envisioned to follow the City Council's review of specific policy options.

### Affordable Housing Work Program

Goal: Develop policy to guide the City's involvement in the support of affordable housing that addresses the needs of Shoreline's very low, low and moderate income households (for a family of four this means incomes below \$23,350, \$38,950, and \$58,000 respectively). Accomplishing this work program will require additional short term resources.

Task	Outcome
Establish Staff Working Group with PDS and Economic Development	Alignment of staff efforts
Convene Housing Summit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identify interested and/or experienced partners.</li><li>Series of meetings/forums with citizens, housing experts, representatives from other communities</li></ul>	Define the problem  Report outlining issues and opportunities to address in developing an affordable housing program  Stronger working relationships with potential partners
Analyze the issues identified at the housing summit in terms of feasibility including readiness of other partners to commit to issue(s), City's capacity and likelihood of success	Priority needs Committed partners
Identify the most promising development opportunities	Priority development opportunities
Match development tools with the City's capacity to select most feasible development opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identify other successful models used by comparable sized cities.</li><li>Document how the City could use its influence to encourage housing development.</li></ul>	Select priority development opportunity(s)  Specific tools the City could use (financial and non-financial) to achieve an increase in affordable housing.
Identify the most effective City policy changes that would support increasing access to affordable housing	Policy changes that would help implement housing priorities
Recommend to Council a housing development policy that includes priority development opportunities and strategies for increasing affordable housing.	Council adopted housing development policy

## Adult Literacy Work Program

Goal: Define the appropriate role for the City to play in the community's efforts to increase the literacy of the 30% of Shoreline adults who read and comprehend below the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level. Accomplishing this work program can be done with existing Human Services Office resources.

Task	Outcome
Develop more specific understanding of Shoreline citizen's literacy needs and conditions	Define the problem and the extent of need in Shoreline
Identify and convene service providers and key referral sources.	Establish relationships with service providers
Describe and inventory current service system <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• List current service providers</li><li>• Level of services provided</li><li>• Identify gaps</li></ul>	White Paper
Identify options for City's role in increasing resident's level of literacy	Policy framework
Recommend to City Council strategies for increasing adult literacy	Council adopted strategies

## **SUMMARY**

The Council Human Services Ad Hoc Committee reviewed needs and issues in order to determine the highest priority areas for additional attention from the City. Affordable housing and adult literacy emerged as the top priority areas to be addressed. The next steps in each area include developing a more specific understanding of the issue and its effects in Shoreline and presenting City Council with policy options for the ways the City could be involved in community efforts to address the needs in these two areas.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Council Human Services Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the full City Council request the City Manager develop policy options to guide the City's efforts to support the development of affordable housing and the reduction of low literacy levels among adults using the work program outlined in this staff report. The options will be brought before the City Council for their deliberation prior to the annual retreat in April 2006.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Description of Assessment Criteria

## Description of Assessment Criteria

At the direction of the Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Human Services, staff evaluated the most critical human service issues facing Shoreline, using the three criteria shown below. In addition, each issue area was described on two dimensions, whether responsibility is regional or local, and whether other North End cities provide funding to address the problem.

### Three Ranking Criteria

#### 1. Need:

The number of people potentially requiring a service based on expert estimates.

Rating	Percent of Population
High Need –	30-45%
Medium Need-	16-29%
Low Need-	0-15%

#### 2. Availability/Accessibility

The extent to which the supply of services is sufficient to meet the need, without accessibility barriers.

High – Services are both available in adequate supply and accessible by: a) hours of operation; b) absence of language or cultural barriers; c) geographically accessible within one hour on public transportation; and d) affordable to the population served.

Medium – Services are limited in supply with one or more access barriers.

Low – Services are very limited in supply with two or more access barriers.

#### 3. Severity of Problem

The extent to which the problem adversely affects the individual or family's ability to provide independently for their basic needs.

High – Serious problem affecting all other basic needs. If not addressed, has the potential to generate the highest social and economic costs.

Medium – Moderately serious, affecting one or more basic needs. Potential moderate social and economic costs.

Low – Least serious, problem has little affect on other basic needs. The direct economic and social costs are small, as the needs can be met by volunteer or family resources.

**4. Regional or Local Responsibility:**

This category reflects the prevailing consensus among municipalities as to which level of government is in the lead on supporting services related to any particular issue. This consensus is built on work done from 2002-2004 by the King County Council Regional Policy Committee and the Task Force on Regional Human Services.

**5. Other North End Cities Funding:**

This category reports on which other cities in the North End, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell, and Woodinville provide funding to services in any specific issue area.