

DEPARTMENT: Human Services/HA

BY: Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly
PHONE: 966-2442

RECOMMENDED ACTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

It is respectfully recommended that your Board hold a Public Hearing to discuss the Housing Conditions Survey Report and the subsequent Housing Program Needs Assessment Report.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

Please See Attached Memo.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Please See Attached Memo.

Financial Impact? () Yes (X) No	Current FY Cost: \$	Annual Recurring Cost: \$
Budgeted In Current FY? (X) Yes () No () Partially Funded		
Amount in Budget: \$ _____		List Attachments, number pages consecutively
Additional Funding Needed: \$ _____		Board Memo
Source:		Housing Conditions Survey Report, binded
Internal Transfer _____		Housing Program Needs Assessment Report, Binded
Unanticipated Revenue _____ 4/5's vote		
Transfer Between Funds _____ 4/5's vote		
Contingency _____ 4/5's vote		
() General () Other		

CLERK'S USE ONLY:

Res. No.: 03-298 Ord. No. _____
 Vote - Ayes: 5 Noes: _____
 Absent: _____
 Approved
 Minute Order Attached () No Action Necessary

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER:

_____ Requested Action Recommended
 No Opinion
 Comments:

The foregoing instrument is a correct copy of the original on file in this office.

Date: _____
Attest: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board
County of Mariposa, State of California

By: _____
Deputy

CAO: [Signature]



**MARIPOSA COUNTY
HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

P.O. Box 7 • Mariposa, CA 95338 • (209) 966-2131 • Fax (209) 966-5943

Alcohol & Drug Community Action Housing Authority Mental Health Public Guardian/Conservator Social Services
CHERYLE RUTHERFORD-KELLY, MSW, DIRECTOR

July 31, 2003

TO: Members, Board of Supervisors
Rich Inman, CAO
FROM: Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly
RE: Community Action Division / Public Hearing on Housing Conditions and Needs
Assessment Reports

Recommendation

It is respectfully recommended that your Board hold a Public Hearing to discuss the Housing Conditions Survey Report and the subsequent Housing Program Needs Assessment Report.

Background

The Department of Human Services received a Technical Assistance Grant from the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to complete a Housing Conditions Survey and, based on that survey, a Housing Program Needs Assessment. In August 2002, the County contracted with Parsons to complete the survey and needs assessment. The Department wanted to better understand the housing conditions that actually exist in the County and what should be done to address housing issues based on facts. The Planning Department had hoped the study would assist them with their General Plan obligations.

Current Situation

The contractor has submitted two reports, the Housing Conditions Survey and the Needs Assessment for your review and public comment.

Report I. The Housing Conditions Survey Report

The Department, with assistance from your Board member that represents El Portal insisted that area be included in this study. Once it was included, it increased the documented need for rehabilitation efforts countywide.

Throughout the County, 27% (2,345 units) were surveyed. The survey included an exterior, drive-by assessment. Each unit was identified by street address and rated for five conditions: foundation, roofing, siding, windows and doors, and electrical. Overall, according to the Parsons study, 69% of all of the units are sound, while 31% need some degree of rehabilitation. Some areas were of concern and they are as follows:

- Over 90% of the housing stock were single family homes, of which 68% were houses and 23% mobile homes. The statewide average for mobile homes is 5%. One difficulty clearly outlined is that of the 2,067 mobile homes surveyed, only 51% were built after the 1976 Mobile Home Construction Standards Act. This

means that 49% were built prior to the act. In the El Portal Trailer Park, all of the units were built before 1976.

- There was an 80% rehabilitation need in the S. Preist Allotment Land area.
- Ninety four percent (94%) of the trailers/recreational vehicles that people are residing in need repair. In reality, this type of living space is not optimal under the best conditions.
- The Yosemite Valley Plan to move employees out of the park was not really considered in depth nor was the impact of the new UC campus in Merced.

Problems are pointed out not to criticize any area of the county but to identify areas that require our attention and support.

Report 2. Housing Program Needs Assessment

The Needs Assessment is supposed to give us recommendations about what actions we, as a county, should take based on Report 1, the housing conditions that exist.

The first seven pages of the Parsons Report #2 has as its focus household types, income and poverty rates. Over the past decade, more individuals and families have joined the group of people who had higher incomes (Table 2-5, page 5). However, median household income is \$48,123 (CA 2000) statewide, which is much higher than \$34,626 in Mariposa. However, although they are increasing, our housing costs are less than the California average. The study goes on to point out that 15% of our residents had incomes below the federally defined poverty level. People over age 65 had a 9% poverty rate yet this same age group owns 37% of the owner occupied housing units.

Although the cost of homes in Mariposa is still below the statewide average, the availability of homes is problematic. There are multiple charts and graphs in the remainder of the document. There are some program strategies (page 50). However, the assessment of what actually needs to be done is left to the County. On page 50, Parsons mentions manufactured housing being affordable (the Draft Housing Element is cited). The Department has some concern about this statement in view of the statistics that indicate that this type of housing is already over represented. On that same page (page 50), Parsons recommends that the County "collaborate" with Yosemite Park and its concessionaires to leverage money for housing units. A collaborate effort would help to define the type of housing that is needed, where that housing should be located and identify special needs. It is also recommended that the County ensure that affordable housing is available to all economic segments of the community; that there be housing units available to serve people with special housing needs.

There is little doubt that we can use the document for grant purposes – it is general enough to support anything the County might wish to do within reason. The Department had hoped for more housing specific information in Report 2 (exactly where housing should be located, configuration and type of housing and priorities). However, with the information provided, your Board, citizens and your departments can develop an action plan if one is desired.

Financial

The County received a \$35,000 grant for the above-specified project. The County contracted with Parsons for Report #1 in the amount of \$ 23,250 and for Report #2 at a cost of \$10,000. The agency set aside \$ 1,750 for administrative expenses. We were required to have a 10% in-kind match that we have more than met in terms of staff time to this project.



COUNTY OF MARIPOSA

P.O. Box 784, Mariposa, CA 95338 (209) 966-3222

BOB PICKARD, CHAIR
GARRY R. PARKER, VICE-CHAIR
LEE STETSON
DOUG BALMAIN
JANET BIBBY

DISTRICT V
DISTRICT IV
DISTRICT I
DISTRICT II
DISTRICT III



MARIPOSA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

MINUTE ORDER

TO: CHERYLE RUTHERFORD-KELLY, Human Services Director
FROM: MARGIE WILLIAMS, Clerk of the Board *MW*
SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING RELATIVE TO THE HOUSING CONDITIONS SURVEY REPORT
AND THE HOUSING PROGRAM NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MARIPOSA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

ADOPTED THIS Order on August 12, 2003

ACTION AND VOTE:

9:34 a.m. Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly, Human Services Director;

PUBLIC HEARING to Consider the Mariposa County Housing Conditions Survey Report and the Subsequent Mariposa County Housing Program Needs Assessment Report

BOARD ACTION: Cheryle Rutherford-Kelly, Human Services Director presented the staff report and introduced Tracey Ferguson, Parsons representative, who presented a PowerPoint presentation and overview of the reports. Cheryle and Tracey responded to questions from the Board relative to consideration of the mobile homes and Native American allotment land residences and whether they were included in the needs assessment report; ability to assess electrical, etc. on a drive-by review; whether grants would be available for infrastructure needs if an area is identified for housing; being able to replace pre-1975 mobile homes; relative to program strategy and focusing on what the County can do with the National Park Service; and relative to vacation rentals and inspections as shown in the report. Tracey advised that the process to obtain the information for the reports was gained by using a "windshield" drive-by method. Cheryle stated the State would utilize the reports to prioritize housing needs within the county. Rich Inman, County Administrative Officer, noted that the timing of the reports is good as it coincides with the update of the housing element in the General Plan Update. In response to a question by Supervisor Bibby, Cheryle suggested the possibility of expanding tenant/landlord rights workshops to be open countywide instead of only to those with housing vouchers.

The public portion of the hearing was opened. There was no public input. The public portion of the hearing was closed and the Board commenced with deliberations. Discussion was held relative to the requirement to submit the reports to the State, and Tracey advised that the state has granted an extension to August 15, 2003, for submission of the reports. (M)Bibby, (S)Stetson, Res. 03-298 was adopted authorizing staff to submit the two reports to the State to satisfy the grant requirements, and clarifying that this is a random report as many of the housing reviews were not on-sight reviews. Cheryle advised that she

would submit the reports with a cover letter advising that a public hearing was held, that it was noted that many of the housing reviews were not on-sight reviews, and advising that there will be further conversation relative to the housing needs in the County. Ayes: Unanimous. The hearing was closed.

cc: Eric Toll, Planning Director
File